

Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/Environmental Impact Statement
Correspondence Received on the Preliminary Management Alternatives

The following table was generated from the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website. It includes all public correspondence received on the preliminary management alternatives through the close of the extended public comment period, ending September 11, 2009. The table is organized by correspondence identification number. For privacy purposes, the names and addresses of those who submitted individual correspondence are not included unless they included their names in the body of their comment.

The numbers in the correspondence entries refer to the five questions asked on the comment form that was included in Newsletter #3, as listed below:

- 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (no action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it close to your ideal?
- 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways?
- 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways?
- 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately?
- 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they?

Please refer to the separate files of the Public Comment Summary Report, the Open House Flipchart Notes, and the Public Comment Distribution Map for more information.

ID No.	Correspondence	Receipt Date	Form Letter	# of Signatures (Form Letters Only)	Organization	State	Zip Code
1	1.) NO ACTION! I tell you what would be closer to my ideal...leaving everything exactly the way it is. Unless you would like to educate tourists how to behave on the river! If I had a dollar for every naked tourist I and my children have seen I would be rich! Why would they have to behave? They don't know anyone here, they come down here and act as if it is Spring Break. 2.) LESS INTERFERENCE! NO ACTION! 3.) Closing parts of the river to boats, limiting boat motor horsepower, closing roads and river access, anything at all that limits people from using the river! I think that everyone should be able to enjoy the river, they can't do that with any of these "proposed" changes. So don't do any of these things! 4.) Every single one of those 134 miles is important to me, I would like my children to be able to enjoy the river IN A BOAT the way I do. 5.) How about the strategy to leave us alone? I am so sick of trying to drive down a road that is closed for some unknown reason. Protection of some endangered beetle or something of that sort I'm sure. If you want to change the visitor experience educate the people who come here from other places and TRASH THE RIVER AND BEHAVE INAPPROPRIATELY! The locals and the boats aren't the problem. Note, I'm sending this plan and the notice for these meetings to everyone I know, then asking them to forward it to everyone they know. I am looking forward to seeing everyone in the towns and areas beside these rivers attending your meetings to oppose these changes! If I can find the time I am also handing out pamphlets of your plan and the addresses to send the comments and letters. You may propose these changes no matter what we say, (as if what we say matters to you) but at least the people in these towns will know and have the chance to voice their views!	6/2/2009	No			MO	65466
2	1. I strongly believe that the NPS is overstepping their bounds. Every year there are more and more statutes enacted and/or changed to be made to fit the ideals of someone who sits behind a desk in Washington, D.C. and has more than likely never been near our rivers. The No-Action alternative is close, but still leaves a lot to be desired. It seems as though the focus of this entire publication is directed at controlling what the "locals" do at the river. This, of course, is absurd! It is not (usually) the locals creating these disturbances (nudity, drunken behavior, littering, etc.). I would think that the NPS would pay more attention to the court filings and who the tickets are written to. Most of the time it is someone that is on vacation. Perhaps if you want to solve the problems on the river, you should restrict the people causing the problems. On another note, I would like to address the proposed horsepower limits for motorized water craft. Many of the residents of this area are residents because of the beauty and recreation of the area. It is wonderful that tourists are appreciative of our area and choose to vacation here. However, in reading this	6/2/2009	No			MO	65466

	entire pamphlet front to back, I have yet to see anything that protects the residents' right (yes, RIGHT!!!!) to enjoy the area that we have chosen to make our home. By imposing yet another horsepower limit, the NPS is taking away part of what makes this such a great place to live!! I'm sure that it seems as though you are making way for more tourists to enjoy our area, but (refer to paragraph 1) they are most of the problem!!! Perhaps, since we already have so many regulations regarding the rivers, they should be ENFORCED!!!! "Weeding out the culls", may be the best way to stop these supposed "problems" in their tracks. 2. I think that littering, nudity, and illegal drugs are the ONLY problems on the river that need to be addressed. And, as I said before, if the laws that we ALREADY HAVE were enforced, these would be minor issues as well. Controlling how many horsepower our boats have IS NOT going to address these issues. 3. LEAVE OUR BOATS ALONE!!!! IT IS NOT YOUR BUSINESS!!!!!! 4. Each and every mile in, around and along the Scenic River Ways is important to me. I have lived in this area for as long as I have been alive and growing up learning how to hunt, fish, canoe, swim, and yes drive a motor boat make up the best memories that I have. I want my daughter to grow up the same way and loving our area as much as I do. I think that these proposed changes are going to diminish future generations' thoughts and care for the area. Why should they be concerned about protecting it if they aren't allowed to enjoy it? 5. My biggest suggestion is to place the blame where it belongs!!!! If you don't want people naked and littering on the river, STOP THEM!!! I believe that you will find yourselves with a jail cell full of "visitors", not the locals you expect. Enforce the laws that we have before trying to make more. You obviously aren't doing a great job with the laws we have, so how do you expect to keep up with more?? By the way - I am sending this publication to everyone on my contacts list, so that when the issues are discussed this time, our area residents WILL know about it!!!!					
3	I object so strongly to these "so called plans" that I have contacted Kit Bond, Joann Emerson, and Claire McCaskill about this. I believe you are violating our constitutional rights and overstepping your bounds. Your Truly, Sondra Montgomery	6/3/2009	No		MO	65466
4	1) No-Action 2) I believe that the current horsepower restrictions should remain in effect parkwide. 3) Alternative A and Alternative B should not be included in the future management of the national riverways. 4) Logyard/Powdermill area. Either No Action or Alternative C addresses the area adequately. 5) I would like to see more cultural events, similar to the demonstrations that were held at Powdermill when I was a kid. I would also like to see the Lesh complex utilized as a working depression era farm.	6/3/2009	No		MO	63638
5	1. No Action. Things are just fine they way they are. 2. None. 3. There should be no horsepower restrictions for boats at all. No roads should be closed. People need to have access to the rivers. 4. All of the river is special. We especially utilize the river from Owl's Bend to below Log Yard. The boaters are good people and help others. 5. Make sure that the tourists don't bring their drugs onto our rivers. Make sure that the tourists don't litter. They don't have the same appreciation for the rivers that local people do.	6/3/2009	No		MO	65588
6	First let me thank you for taking the time to read this. I would like to say that the number one choice for me would be the no-action choice. First question answered. Strongly included to answer the second question would be the more boat ramps and camping sites but then how would that cut down pollution? The horse power of a boat does not effect the flow of the river or it's inhabitants. There has been boat traffic on the river for years and the places where big motors are ran is actually deeper and better than where they are not allowed. Those areas of 40 horse power limits are filling in with gravel because the motors actually can't flush out the gravel and set at this rate the river will be full of gravel in a few more years. Jacks fork is a perfect example of this. You have to drag a canoe through most of it because with no boat traffic it cannot be cleaned out this makes it very difficult for anyone to enjoy. Horse power limits only restrict the speed the boat will go not the disturbance of the water in which it will create. If I drive a car at 100 mph I get a ticket but it's not because the horse power is too much it's because I was driving too fast. On the river it should be the same way if I drive reckless I get a ticket the horse power of the boat has nothing to do with it. Lets talk about "overuse" of the park there are at least two times the amount of canoes and tubes on the river than there are boats. With all these tubes and canoes people use sun tanning oils and other chemicals, more pollution comes from the canoes than the boats. I gig here all winter long and I can tell a difference in the river in the summer and in the winter when the river is more clear there is not hardly any pollution in the summer however there are t-shirts and bottles and tubes and canoes sunk some days the river almost has a film of oil on it because of all the people in it. The only reasonable change for this would to limit the amount of canoes or tubes that can be rented per day to help keep the overuse down. I could write more but it seems redundant at this point. That will answer questions 4 and 5. Thank you for your reading this.	6/3/2009	No		MO	63965
7	1. No action is needed. Limiting horsepower on boats is not the answer. I boat between two rivers and Van Buren and never encounter problems. Also most people that live in the area and use atv's abide by the laws. Again I stress that no action is needed. 2.This alternative would not let anybody enjoy the rivers except die-hard naturalists. 3.No horsepower limits and no more atv regs. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!! 4.Blue Springs and the Rocky Creek areas are special to me and I like them just the way they are. 5.Upper Current River is what needs to be regulated. Floaters on that part of the river are the rowdy ones. Why punish everyone else?	6/3/2009	No		MO	65753
8	1. After reviewing the plan Alternative "A" is more in line with how I hope the park moves forward for me and my family. 2. The elements of your plan that are most important to me are keeping the upper Current (upstream of Powder Mill including Jacks Fork) as primitive or natural as possible. If you want to have a resourced based/motorized area have it from Van Buren down. I don't visit that area, and never will again due to the congestion and a less pristine setting. 3. Please, Please do not further develop the upper Current beyond maintaining the put in facilities already there! This is the most beautiful area on the planet. My father started taking me yearly (sometimes twice a year) 30 years ago on multiday float trips, and we keep coming back every year. Now my son is getting old enough to take on the river floating. I truly hope that he can see the same river I saw, and not something that is developed. I will be VERY upset if I pull off the river at Akers Ferry or Round Spring and find a Starbucks and WiFi connectivity. That is NOT what the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are about. 4. The most special areas of the River for me are from Akers Ferry to Powder Mill. This is a magical area for me. It is very quiet and primitive for the most part. There are only a limited amount of private houses	6/4/2009	No		TN	37211

	(which I think should go away). Out of all the options that you offer, Alternative A best fits how I would like the Park Service to move forward. 5. Ok, I understand that people like me who are interested in primitive camping and quietly floating the river with their own boat with their own gear make up a minority of the river users. Based on my observations over 30 years of floating people who float the river and camp on the side of the river on gravel bars with either their own gear or rented gear make up maybe 10-15% (with that percentage dropping in the past 10 years)of the total people who come to the River. The vast majority (maybe 60-70%) are day trippers on rented equipment. The rest being locals with motor boats. Here is the deal: There is no other place to go floating in a primitive natural setting, on Federally owned and maintained land. Period. This is it. I live in Tennessee, which has several nice rivers, which have since been destroyed perminantly by development. They will never come back. The Current and Jacks Fork are it as far as I am concerned. Once you open it up to motorized traffic, 4-wheelers, more concesions, more roads and trails, bigger access for large RV's, and more people then the River is done for, and will never come back. I even enjoy periodically checking my cell phone and am happy to see "NO SERVICE" on it. I can understand the pressure on the Park Service to open the River up to more and more users, and more and more development. Fine, if you want to do that downstream of the Logyard, go right ahead. With the road improvements to US60 more people can go there and that be their river experience. Maybe not everone would enjoy a more primitive experience, however please do not take that option away. Very Respectfully, Arran Addington					
10	NO ACTION to suggest that a b c would improve the park for the majority of users is foolish at best.This would be changes that would only suite a few users. we can not change the use to satisfy extreme thinking on non motorized use. go to the upper jacks and current where low or no use already exist by boaters . horse power changes from 2 rivers down absolutly no reason to change.	6/4/2009	No		MO	63965
11	1.) I feel the No- Action plan is the best. If the other action plans take place, my family and I can not enjoy the river with the horse power cut to 25 hp. I do under stand that every body needs to get along. But I feel that the local people are the ones that are having to do all of the sacrificing. 2.) No Action Plan. I was born and raised in this area. I like to keep my freedom. And one of these days I would like to take my grand kids to the river ways for boating recreation. 3.) Option A B, and C. I feel we are giving our rights away and freedom. 4.) I like area from two rivers, to round springs. It's close to my house, so access is very conveint for me. I also don't have to spend so much in gas getting there. 5.) I feel the boaters are getting pushed off the river because the NPS is trying to increase canoes revenue. Which with the tough economic times I think everybody is hurting. There has not been a fatality in many years with boaters. With the horse power cut a family could get hurt in a boat, because the motor just can't push a family up and down the river safely. Also the canoes have the Jake Fork River and the upper part of the Current River to Round Springs which is 69 miles out of 134 miles of available river way. These areas are used very little by boaters. Why are the area people getting push away from our culture and heritage?	6/4/2009	No		MO	63638
12	Topic Questions: 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? I favor option A, but I would like to see a decrease on the number of rental boats allowed on the riverways. There are too many people floating down there, and most of them arent there to fish or enjoy nature. I'd also like to see limits on horseback riders in the Baptist to Cedargrove stretch..The horse trails cause a ton of erosion, do damage to the stream banks, and the mess the leave is a real nuisance. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Fewer jet boats, fewer rental canoes, close UA roads, limits on horses to designated trails and make the horse people pack out their horse poop. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? I'd oppose an increase in motor boat traffic, rental boats, and unlimited horse access. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Parker Hollow...increased horse use has really torn things up down there. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Enforcement has always been lacking, and the river is overcrowded. Both problems need to be addressed.	6/5/2009	No		Ozark Fly Fishers, Missouri Smallmouth Alliance	63119
13	1. No-Action 2. I do not feel any changes should be included in the future management of the national riverways. 3. I strongly feel that no boat motor horsepower limit should be set other than the limits that are already in place. Also, I strongly feel that access to camp sights and river accesses should not be further limited. 4. I have been boating, camping, fishing, and hunting on the area between Powder Mill and Paint Rock all of my life. As a new parent it is my wish to be able to continue these activities with my child the way my parents have with me. 5. The Scienic Riverways Park is wonderful place that I have been very fortunate to grow up experiencing on a regular basis. It is my suggestion that No-Action be taken by the National Park Service in any future management plan. The Scienic Riverways are more than fine just the way things are.	6/5/2009	No		MO	63080
14	1. No-Action 2. I do not feel any changes should be included in the future management of the national riverways. 3. I strongly feel that no boat motor horsepower limit should be set other than the limits that are already in place. Also, I strongly feel that access to camp sights and river accesses should not be further limited. 4. I have been boating, camping, fishing, and hunting on the area between Powder Mill and Paint Rock all of my life. As a new parent it is my wish to be able to continue these activities with my child the way my parents have with me. 5. The Scienic Riverways Park is wonderful place that I have been very fortunate to grow up experiencing on a regular basis. It is my suggestion that No-Action be taken by the National Park Service in any future management plan. The Scienic Riverways are more than fine just the way things are.	6/5/2009	No		MO	63080
15	Question #1: Alternative C is my choice. I think that additional boat ramps should be provided and the 40 horsepower limit that now exist on certain portions of the Current river should not be changed. The Big Springs tract should not be proposed for a wilderness designation. Question #2: As I mentioned in question #1, I feel additional boat ramps are necessary. Question #3: Alternative A in its entirety should be excluded from any future management plans of the Ozark National Scenic River ways. Alternative A of the preliminary general management plan (GMP) on its	6/5/2009	No		MO	65466

	surface appears to be discriminatory in nature. Alternative A flagrantly discriminates against a specific group of tax paying citizens that patronize the park on a daily basis, specifically the hundreds of local people that own and legally operate jet boats on the park. Question #4: The stretch of the park the runs from Round Springs down to Log Yard on the Current river is the area in which I visit the park most frequently and the No Action Alternative and portions of Alternative C appear to address them adequately. Question #5: Hundreds of times every summer I answer the question "how far is it to Two Rivers"? I think signs marking river mileage should be posted on the major gravel bars. (IE) Jerk Tail, Sutton Creek etc.					
16	1) Alternative A was closest to what I would like to see, though only through restrictions of motor traffic - and that alone. Motorized craft used in the waterways tear up shoreline, muddy the water and terrorize canoers and fishermen with excessive side effects. Terrestrial vehicles entering the water cause similar problems. I do not support limiting access to control the number of people using the waterways because it is the sheer number of people who get enjoyment which makes it so important. There are many more people who benefit from visiting the waterways than the number who are inconvenienced by it. If anything, more waterways should be secured to distribute the population. If lewd behavior is a problem, it should be addressed on a case-by-case basis through direct intervention and not through passage of legislation that would unfairly affect the vast majority of us who use the streams responsibly. (for example, tightening alcohol control is not a desired approach though apprehension of trouble makers is to everyone's benefit). In other words, be wary of casting that net too wide. 5) Fishing pressure is now so high that the experience is affected in the form of fewer and smaller fish. Because fishermen over the past twenty years have shifted our anticipation from keeping fish to catching fish, the majority of us probably support much tighter creel and size limits. Though catch and keep is still popular, I would bet if you asked fishermen a question phrased this way, most would overwhelmingly prefer a stream where they can catch more, bigger fish over a stream where they are permitted to keep more of what they catch, but with a lower population of larger fish. Nobody wants to give up their own fish unless everybody else does too but the tradeoff is in everyone's best interest. Also, rather than developing campgrounds and nature centers I would prefer to see funds spent on acquiring new property. The increase in public property would both facilitate more visitors as well as decrease the density of visited areas, while funds focused toward specific sites like visitors centers would only serve to concentrate population into congested areas, further complicating the existing problem of perceived overuse.	6/5/2009	No		Ozark Chronicles	IN <

20	<p>I have lived in the Eminence area most of my life. I chose a career that would allow me to live in this area because I enjoy the river so much. My wife and I float the Jack's Fork 20 to 30 times a year and we recently purchased a new jonboat with a 40 HP to use on the Current. Most of our activity on the Current will be from the Log Yard area up to Two Rivers. One of the reasons for choosing this area of the Current is to avoid conflicting useage between canoes and jonboats. Topic Question 1. My initial response would be no action because it reduces the risk of reducing or losing existing priveleges. In reality Alternative C seems to be what I would want. It provides opportunities for river/park usage that considers the desires and activities of both local citizens and visitors to the area. Topic Question 2. I prefer the mixed use concept. Provide facilities such as boat ramps with adequate parking, as many restrooms as possible along the river to reduce human waste in the river itself, trash recepticles and recycling bins for aluminum and plastic. Keep a high level of NPS patrols to protect the visitors (locals and tourists) and the environment in the ONSR. Topic Question 3. Any further HP restrictions would be of little benefit and would cause further resentment on the part of the local people. Rude behavior will not be curtailed by these restrictions. Rudeness will still be present unless NPS Patrols and the MO Water Patrol have a higher and more visual presence on the river and in the park. Topic Question 4. Myself and my family enjoy a considerable portion of the ONSR. We float and fish the Jack's Fork from Bay Creek to Two Rivers. We enjoy the Current mostly from Two Rivers down to the Log Yard area and often we will go above Two Rivers. When on the Current we use our jonboat. When we encounter canoes we consider their enjoyment by reducing speed, stopping, or moving as far away on the water as possible. Alternative C would be the best fit for our style of usage. Topic Question 5. Suggestions. * Instead of HP restrictions, impose speed limits. NPS officers and Water Patrol with radar would enforce this. Set the limit where a stock 40 HP would not surpass the maximum speed. * If the NPS feels they must restrict HP in areas with high floater useage then allow 40 HP in areas with less floater traffic. An example would be to allow 40 HP from the Two Rivers landing to the upper part of the Van Buren floater area. This seems somewhat selfish on my part, but maybe it could be a compromise that would try to address the desires of floaters and boaters. * If 25 HP restrictions must be made eventually, set them far enough in the future that the people with 40 HP can replace them with 25 HP when their existing motors wear out. We have thousands of dollars invested in these motors and quickly replacing them would be cost prohibitive for many people and would effecively deny them useage of the river in the way they enjoy. * Provide as many restrooms as possible along high traffic areas along the river and provide easy access to them. Signs need to be posted and the public educated about their existance. I have witnessed far to many people urinating in the river. * Remember that rude, inconsiderate, and dangerous behavior is not limited to people with "jetboats", but the NPS already knows this. * Consider the level of resentment toward visitors (tourists) and the NPS by the local people if alternatives A or B are implemented. There is a strong chance that visitors will not be welcomed by the local people if our ways of enjoying the river are drastically altered. Not all local people will react this way, but enough will that many visitors to the area will not find this area a pleasant place to visit. * Enforce the laws that the few are breaking rather than curtailing the enjoyment of the rest of us.</p>	6/7/2009	No			MO	65466
21	<p>I am sorry for sending this twice. I sent it the first time without checking my spelling. I have lived in the Eminence area most of my life. I chose a career that would allow me to live in this area because I enjoy the river so much. My wife and I float the Jack's Fork 20 to 30 times a year and we recently purchased a new jonboat with a 40 HP to use on the Current. Most of our activity on the Current will be from the Log Yard area up to Two Rivers. One of the reasons for choosing this area of the Current is to avoid conflicting usage between canoes and jonboats. Topic Question 1. My initial response would be no action because it reduces the risk of reducing or losing existing privileges. In reality Alternative C seems to be what I would want. It provides opportunities for river/park usage that considers the desires and activities of both local citizens and visitors to the area. Topic Question 2. I prefer the mixed use concept. Provide facilities such as boat ramps with adequate parking, as many restrooms as possible along the river to reduce human waste in the river itself, trash receptacles and recycling bins for aluminum and plastic. Keep a high level of NPS patrols to protect the visitors (locals and tourists) and the environment in the ONSR. Topic Question 3. Any further HP restrictions would be of little benefit and would cause further resentment on the part of the local people. Rude behavior will not be curtailed by these restrictions. Rudeness will still be present unless NPS Patrols and the MO Water Patrol have a higher and more visual presence on the river and in the park. Topic Question 4. Myself and my family enjoy a considerable portion of the ONSR. We float and fish the Jack's Fork from Bay Creek to Two Rivers. We enjoy the Current mostly from Two Rivers down to the Log Yard area and often we will go above Two Rivers. When on the Current we use our jonboat. When we encounter canoes we consider their enjoyment by reducing speed, stopping, or moving as far away on the water as possible. Alternative C would be the best fit for our style of usage. Topic Question 5. Suggestions. * Instead of HP restrictions, impose speed limits. NPS officers and Water Patrol with radar would enforce this. Set the limit where a stock 40 HP would not surpass the maximum speed. * If the NPS feels they must restrict HP in areas with high floater usage then allow 40 HP in areas with less floater traffic. An example would be to allow 40 HP from the Two Rivers landing to the upper part of the Van Buren floater area. This seems somewhat selfish on my part, but maybe it could be a compromise that would try to address the desires of floaters and boaters. * If 25 HP restrictions must be made eventually, set them far enough in the future that the people with 40 HP can replace them with 25 HP when their existing motors wear out. We have thousands of dollars invested in these motors and quickly replacing them would be cost prohibitive for many people and would effectively deny them usage of the river in the way they enjoy. * Provide as many restrooms as possible along high traffic areas along the river and provide easy access to them. Signs need to be posted and the public educated about their existence. I have witnessed far to many people urinating in the river. * Remember that rude, inconsiderate, and dangerous behavior is not limited to people with "jetboats", but the NPS already knows this. * Consider the level of resentment toward visitors (tourists) and the NPS by the local people if alternatives A or B are implemented. There is a strong chance that visitors will not be welcomed by the local people if our ways of enjoying the river are drastically altered. Not all local people will react this way, but enough will that many visitors to the area will not find this area a pleasant place to visit. * Enforce the laws that the few are breaking rather than curtailing the enjoyment of the rest of us.</p>	6/7/2009	No			MO	65466

22	1. I have been going to van buren for years and i believe that lowering the horsepower limits would do more harm than good. the people that own boats are the ones that are there every weekend in the summer months and sometimes weeks at a time enjoying boating on the river. i feel like current river is one of the safest places to boat, the people that navigate this river are always alert and i think the rate of boating accidents here are few and far between. i don't believe anyone here runs smaller motors so that would force everyone to quit coming here or be forced to spend 6 or 7 thousand dollars on buying a new motor and alot of the boats that people use for big families are to big for these smaller motors and they would be forced to buy a different boat. if they were to change the horsepower limits we would all be stuck with boats and motors that we couldn't sell or use and these boats generally run about \$14,000 to \$15,000 dollars new and i don't believe in an economy like this many people has the money to just let these set in a yard and go buy a new one. if a new horsepower limit was passed i would be forced to quit coming to van buren and probably go to Mountain Home Ar on norfolk lake as many people would do since this is one of the nicest lakes around to enoy boating	6/7/2009	No			MO	63877
23	1. Yes - A is the most close. 2. No motorized boating on certain rivers - Jacks Fork especially. 3. Encouraging reckless party behavior - I stopped floating certain rivers because of this 5. Allow different activities on different rivers. Keep some sections wild and for kayaks/canoes. Let others have more variety.	6/7/2009	No		St Louis Adventure Group, Sierra Club	MO	63011
24	1. Preliminary Alternative A is close to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark Nation Scenic Riverways. I was born in a cabin built by Warren Bland on the banks of the Current River in 1942. My grandfather is buried, along with a baby or two, in a long lost grave yard there in the area. Though we love the river and would love to still think of it as ours, its protection from the loving abuse of so many players, is critical. It is only surviving as a wonderful river because of the springs, and how long will they be ok? Protect the river as in Alternative A and it may stay beautiful for many more centuries. The lovely peaceful historical activities can be preserved and protected by this alternative. 3. I am very concerned about the runoff into the Current and Jacks Fork from the horse riding activities and corrals. 4. Obviously the Powder Mill area where I was born, and the Rocky Falls area from which both families, Simpsons and Blands, lived at one time or another, is important to me. 5. Though locals, including relatives, perhaps, may want their noisy airboats, I recall how a nephew of mine threw an aluminum can out the window of a pickup truck (when my teenagers and I visited in the 70's). When my sons expressed surprise at his disregard for nature, he said,"Oh yeah, nature freaks!" He knew it was wrong, yet no one was educating and reminding about respecting natural beauty while it exists. Respect for the beauty and quiet natural sounds along the Current may need to be taught and as well as enforced.	6/7/2009	No		Audubon	NE	68506
25	Question 1) The alternative which affords the most protection to this area is the alternative of choice. Many people enjoy the area but the area must be better protected in order to continue to provide that enjoyment. I most prefer the protections of Alternative A. I would increase protections for the watershed and the wildlife. I would reduce and restrict the use of horse activity in the area. Limits should be place on the size and number of organized trail rides. Wilderness and natural areas should be created and motorboats removed from upper stretches of the river. Question 2) Make Big Spring a wilderness area. I would provide stronger environmental protections to reduce pollution and protect the watershed. I would dfinitely make Big Spring a wilderness and would increase public ownership of land around it creating a large buffer zone. I think it is extremely important to create a large protected wildlife corridor from Big Spring to the Peck Wildlife area. Remember this is a National SCENIC River, keep it as natural and undeveloped as possible. I recommend the greatest amount of natural zones and primitive zones possible. Keep motorboats off a longer length of the upper stretches of the rivers and limit horsepower. Question 3) Do not allow increased commercial overnight camping trips. I am opposed to any increase in commercial overnight trips on the river. I strongly favor reductions in and limits on motorized usage. I am not in favor of increased development. I think some of the proposed demonstration and interpretive programs are nice, but I worry about funding and development. I think money should instead be focused on aguring land and providing protection for that land. I am opposed to any increased usage of any commercial horse operations. Question 4) There are many special areas and they should be monitored for overuse and abuse with a concern for protection and best management methods applied. Question 5) I believe the wild horse herd currently in the area is not natural and should be relocated or eliminated and native species such as elk introduced into the area. Create a protected wildlife corridor to the Peck Wildlife Area.	6/8/2009	No			MO	65810
26	1. I liked alternative B out of the three choices. 2. I feel that limits on motorboating are necessary. I also like provisions that aim to protect wilderness areas by limiting the way humans can access and occupy these areas. Also, mandatory education for park visitors before they set out to canoe, camp, hike, horseback, etc., in order to emphasize the value of preserving the quality of the scenic riverway for future generations of wildlife and human visitors. 5. Perhaps limits or regulations for the type of disposable food and beverage items that may be taken on excursions into the park, could help curb the amount of pollution inflicted by visitors.	6/8/2009	No			MO	64110
27	I have read the preliminary alternatives A, B, and C. I feel there are good ideas in all three. I have lived here for 35 years and was born here. I have a 40 h.p. motorboat. I feel restricting the river to 25 h.p. is too much of a restriction. But yet again I feel there should be a restriction of anything above 40 h.p. because of the churning up of the river has to be harming the river stream. I and several other families would like to see MANY MORE camping areas that we can drive to. So please incorporate into your plan more places to camp for the locals.	6/8/2009	No			MO	65466
28	1) definitely Plan A 2) Natural and Primitive 3) any motorized use (other than low-power johnboats in some areas for fishing) 4) all the areas, and no, I don't think they are adequately protected 5) ban ATVs, jetskis and powerboats	6/8/2009	No			MO	63122

29	<p>1.No-action on changing the horsepower limits would be the best news. I am a property owner in Carter County and have built a home there. I have a 40 horse jet and use the river both up and down stream from Van Buren. A 25 horse limit would restrict my river travel and keep me from enjoying the area from Round Spring to Watercress. I love to fish and boat in this beautiful stretch. Below Big Spring it is appropriate to allow even larger motors as the nature of the river is wide there. Twenty-five horsepower is too small to negotiate the river in times of strong flow between Round Spring and Watercress. Any change in horsepower limit would devastate myself and the hundreds of fisherman who use the river. PLEASE DO NOT RUIN MY DREAM LOCATION BY TAKING AWAY MY MOTOR! 2. Make any changes that you feel are best, EXCEPT FOR CHANGES IN THE CURRENT MOTOR HORSEPOWER ZONES! 3. Horsepower limit changes should NOT be included in any future plan. 4. Any changes are fine, EXCEPT for changes in the horsepower limits. It would be devastating to the local people. Charge a tax if need be to operate a 40 horse, but please don't change anything else regarding where I can go boating. 5. Suggested changes- More strictly enforce creel and size limit of smallmouth bass. Increase fines and penalties for violations. I practice strictly catch and release. I use the river year round. I love the park and all it has to offer. Please do not restrict my boating any more than it is now. Thank you for your attention. Kenneth E. Kram, DMD</p>	6/8/2009	No			MO	63017
30	<p>I never thought I would see the day that my freedom would be taken away by the same govenment that was formed to stand for it.The last time I checked the Constitution stated "We The People" not "We The Government" or "We The Park Service", and it sure as hell did not say "We The enviromentalist", so why is it up to the government and the environmentalist to have their way regardless of what the people say or think. Is the river not clean? Is it not beautiful?Is it not the way it was 20,30,or 40 years ago?Now I'm not very old,but I have seen little changes over the years that I've been on the river, and most of that has been due to flooding,not jet boating.If you look on the back of the summary newsletter,there is a couple of pictures.One that has ONE jet boat and the other with 20 or 30 canoes.Just looking at the picture, the one with all the canoes looks to me like it is causing more damage to the river than ONE boat going down the river.Let me ask you this,if someone is in trouble on the river,such as being hung up in a rootwad or injured somehow,are you going to paddle a canoe up the river to rescue them or put a canoe in at Paint Rock and float down to them? NO!!You are not, you're going to get in your boat and DRIVE to them.If these people who want us off the river want to be in peace, then they can find somewhere else to go.I don't go to St.Louis and whine and cry because traffic is too heavy or go to Columbia and whine and cry because there are too many frat parties. You know what I do? I stay home and do what I like, and that's going to the river where I was born and raised. That's the beauty about this country, or at least it was, if you don't like something, you don't have to do it,don't try to run the people off that LIVE HERE and do like it just so you can have your way about things. Folks here have done a damn good job keeping the river clean, that's why the people from the city like to come and see it,right? I know the tourist is a Big part of the local economy and I'm not trying to run anybody off, I'm just saying that if a person has a problem, then find somewhere else to go, that's what I did.The reason I started going to Log Yard and Paint Rock to lauch my boat was because there was too many tubes and canoes on the river at Van Buren to suit me, so I left and went up river where traffic was less aggrivating.Now, I'm being forced to cut my horsepower again or even worse, leave the river for good.I have done NOTHING to deserve to be kicked off the river that I truly love by a bunch of damn communist. And I'm not the only one that feels this way. Everyone else that I have talked to feels the same way. Our forfathers are probably in greater disbelief than I am. You know something? The way I see it, this is about the same as if I came to your house, did'nt like the way it was set up, and made you,your wife, and kids move out so that I could move in and decorate the house the way I thought it should be. Now how would you like that? That's what I thought, you would'nt. Please.... Be American,leave us alone. is that too much to ask?</p>	6/8/2009	No		Voice of the Ozarks	MO	63638

31	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways management. I am a avid camper, hiker and floater in the Ozarks. As a transplant to Missouri and the Midwest, I am greatly appreciative of the recreational opportunities provided by the natural areas such as the National Riverways. In the nine years I have lived in Missouri, I have become an ardent supporter of environmental preservation of the state's natural resources. I have also become increasingly aware of the degradation caused by over-development and over-use. A user of these resources as well, my focus is on sustainable management to preserve and protect while still allowing for some human development and commercial use. Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding my comments. Thank you. Lori Allen. Topics with answers: 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? As a frequent visitor to the Buffalo National Scenic River, my ideal management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways would be one similar to what I have experienced there: preservation of the ecology, natural resources, and cultural heritage of the area through limited access and a variety of interpretive and recreational activities. I believe such a plan would combine select aspects of both Preliminary plans A and B. Plan C, with increased access and environmental degradation, is not acceptable in any form. In addition since the current management has failed to protect the environment of the area, business as usual is not a viable option. Future management should focus on SUSTAINBLE recreational use that preserves natural resources. Combining Pans A and B would focus on non-motorized, quieter, less crowded forms of activity that limit access and preserve the ecological balance and cultural heritage of the region. These recreational activities should be kept safe for families and those who seek an authentic outdoor experience that does not include partying, crowded waterways, trailer park style RV camping, motorboats, and ATVs. Certain areas should be maintained in primitive (wilderness) states and all activities should promote on Leave No Trace practices. Commercial activities should be modified/limited in different sections of the Riverways to provide a variety of visitor experiences and resource conditions. The agency should focus on restoring and maintaining biological communities and ecological diversity while improving the overall natural setting. The plan should include resource monitoring, research, and preservation projects that would actively support and strengthen future management capabilities. Interpretive access should focus on environmental education and Ozark heritage with the goal of educating the public on the importance of preservation of both natural resources and cultural history. Interpretive programs should focus on living history programs to provide visitors with a better understanding of traditional, subsistence ways of life in the Ozarks as well as guided opportunities such as ranger-led tours of special features including old settlements, caves and springs, and native river environments. Resource management staff should develop opportunities for visitors and volunteers to participate in hands-on resource management projects that actively engage the community in the preservation of the Riverways. Learning center programs could provide more structured environmental education opportunities, especially for school groups. However, rather than numerous interpretive centers, the agency should focus on a regional center that provides a variety of staffed/directed activities. Development of numerous interpretive facilities should be avoided due to increased ecological impact. Other opportunities for more adventuresome, self-guided interpretive experiences should also exist and provide visitors with a sense of being the first to discover remote, hard-to-find places, such as an old homestead or a secluded spring. These opportunities could be provided in a variety of areas where no permanent development or inhabitation is required. Such opportunities should still be within designated areas to limit ecological impact by human occupation/use. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Commercialization of the area should be regulated to prevent over development and over use. Motorized access should be STRICTLY limited. The area should be maintained or restored so that the area's natural resources reflect more pristine conditions that lack signs of substantial development or use. Illegal access points should be closed and the areas restored and rehabilitated. Continued monitoring and enforcement of limited access should be a priority. Mountain biking and equestrian access should also be limited. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Future management of the National Riverways should NOT include additional facilities to accommodate higher levels and different types of visitor use that would increase resource impacts and crowding ("higher levels of social interaction"). There should not be a higher tolerance for resource impacts in any area. Increased access by motorized vehicles should not be a part of any management program nor should increased mountain biking or equestrian access. All aspects of Plan C are unacceptable. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Development of agency run camping facilities should be focused on quiet, quality outdoor experiences. Camping for RVs should be limited to only a few developed facilities and kept separate from tent camping areas in all facilities. The majority of camping facilities should provide only tent camping with various amounts of access to flush toilets and showers. However, a majority of camping facilities should have access to water, preferably year round via a frost-free hydrant. Walk-in camping such as that found at Kyle's Landing or Rush on the Buffalo National River should dominate over drive-up campsites with concrete pads. Only a limited number of drive-up campsites for handicapped access should be provided per facility. Cassatot State Park in Arkansas, for example, provides a primitive campsite with a solar-powered light and a composting vault toilet. Such a facility not only ensures future generations the ability to enjoy the campsite, but also provides a more desirable experience for current users. Most vault toilets have no light and frequently are unusable due to the smell. A composting toilet has no odor therefore providing a clean, usable facility at a lower operating cost. A solar powered light costs nothing to operate but greatly enhances the usability of the facility. Such development could eliminate the need for flush toilets at many facilities thus lowering operating costs. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? ALL development should focus on sustainability. Any constructed building should use green building practices and materials. Paved surfaces should be limited and pavestones should be used instead of concrete/asphalt whenever possible to eliminate runoff and environmental impact. Use of solar energy should be extensive and facilities should provide composting vault toilets instead of flush toilets</p>	6/8/2009	No			MO	63143
----	--	----------	----	--	--	----	-------

32	To Whom This Concerns. I am not sure I can offer any solutions, or ideas how to save the river, only to do as much of recycling as possible, park/forest personal to maintain the cleanliness, montitor the river(s) and natural areas around the rivers. I attend meetings for the MSD, and learn about run-offs via sewers, and the infrastructures. I feel we made the mess, and we all should participate to clean and preserve the river(s), but no one wants to pay for this, mostly who can afford the fees, etc. However, once something is gone, it is very difficult to bring that something back, if "at all". A perfect example is the River Jorden that Christ was baptised in is dried, let alone the life that was there! Then, there is the recreation or the enjoyment of "playing" on the river(s). I am from Chicago, but the issues are the same. Illinois has lost much of its natural areas due to the constant build-up. Unless some areas are protected, and in other states, these natural areas are chopped down, build on, and lost. Arizonia has lost most of its natural deserts and the fragil ecology/habitats, too.The same for New Mexio and other states. I lived in Wheaton/Glendale Heights on Olive Court, off of Bloomindale road and route 64/north Avenue. I played in a swamp, hopefully still there to catch rain falls, but support life.Unfortunatly, a lake area in Oak Lawn was filled and built on, forever GONE, INCLUDING THE LIFE IN THE LAKE. Sincerely, Beverly Long.	6/9/2009	No		WAGAN Productions	MO	63104
33	Please protect the cores of the Current & Jack's Fork. Thank you.	6/9/2009	No			MO	63376
34	1) A combination of "A" and "B" are close to ideal. "A" may be a bit too restrictive, but is on the right track. The greatest problem in our opinion is the pollution of the water caused by horses and boats. 2) While all citizens should have the right to use the national parks, there need to be limits in place to protect nature and the beauty of the area. My husband starting visiting Alley when he was a teen, over 25 years ago. When we married, we continued visiting Alley and Eminence, usually 3 or more times per year, and continued to do so after our children were born. We used to look forward to our trips, and couldn't wait to return. However, in the last 4-5 years, that has changed greatly. We now only visit once, maybe twice a year. This is mostly due to the horses and boats. For example, we considered going for a quick trip the week of June 8 this year, but when we saw there was a trail ride that week, we decided to forget it. We feel the large NUMBER of scheduled trail rides and amount of riders per ride need to be limited. There is currently a scheduled trail ride each month, many a week long, from April through the end of November, with some months having two rides. The impact of this many people and horses is great. The horse manure has caused the biting flies and gnats to increase substantially over the last few years and has polluted the water. We now look at the trail ride schedules in order to avoid that week and the following week due to the water pollution and increased biting flies and gnats. This really limits when we can goe camping and canoeing and takes the joy out of it. In addition, the number and high horsepower of the boats have degraded the shoreline and polluted the water. The fast speeds of the boats stir up the dirt and silt from the bottom of the river and push it onto the shores. We now have to search for a gravel bar that isn't covered in slime or silt, where we never used to have to. There are more and more sections of the river where the rocks on the bottom and shore are covered in silt and dirt instead of clear water. Also, most of the boaters are conscientious to the canoers, but it can be quite scary to see a boater zooming down the river headed for our teenage daughters in their canoe! We feel restricted access for boats during the on-season and lowered horsepower, as suggested in Alternative B, would help this as well. #3) We do not think there should not be stricter limitations on the number of floaters allowed than there are now. We also do not feel there is a need to limit the size of coolers or amount of alcohol per person. In keeping with the "back to nature" feel of the river, we do not think the river should be a "police state," with NPS personnel at the boat ramps and all over the river. There should be a balance between personal freedom to enjoy the river and park personnel telling you what can and cannot be done. #4) Not only are there large amount of horses and riders crossing and swimming in the river, but they also take over the campground showers at Alley Springs. During the August trail ride one year, the showers were full of mud and the riders were showering with their dogs! The rangers said there was nothing they could do about it since it is a free park. I don't understand why we pay for camping, but they can use the facilities for free, make them filthy, and then leave us to shower in their mess and the park personnel to clean up after them. The park should be free, but the shower house should be for campers only! I do not see anything addressing this issue. We look forward to improvements on the Jack's Fork and Upper Current Rivers. We hope the park can get back to what it used to be--a retreat back to nature. We do not have issue with college kids enjoying themselves on the river, other than when they litter. However, if we want polluted water, we can stay in the city. Thank you for the opportunity to comment without attending the meeting.	6/9/2009	No			IL	62024
35	I am commenting to question #1. and I among many many others feel that NO-ACTION needs to be taken.	6/9/2009	No			MO	63638
36	#1, No-Action!!	6/9/2009	No			MO	63638
37	1) I favor Alternative A all the way. 2) Eliminate as much motorized traffic on the Riverway as possible. 3) Do NOT encourage continued motorized traffic on the river. 4) I would love to see canoe traffic only on the Current between Montauk and Round Spring, if not all the way to the mouth of the Jacks Fork or beyond. And canoe traffic only on the entire length of the Jacks Fork. 5) Put some serious teeth into enforcement.	6/9/2009	No			MO	65284
38	Leave it alone!!! What did your 40hp regulations help in Van Buren? We still get you trash down stream!!!! I have paid my taxes for 30 years as my father an grandfather, to help pay for this land and now you want to tell me i can't use it!!! You took the forest service trail riding out for ATV and you still let the horses crap everywhere. Next your going to say no hunting!!!!	6/9/2009	No			MO	63953

39	1. I feel strongly that you do not change the horsepower regulations in the park. The negative aspects of this change include the following: loss of revenue in the town due to reduced number of boaters, inability of residents to use their boats to go upriver from Van Buren. What are people supposed to do, go out and buy new engines? I am a property owner in Carter County. We specifically purchased our property to use our 40 hp boat on the Current River. A change in the hp regulations would severely limit our recreational opportunities. We love the park and respect all of the rules. We do not believe our 40 hp motor affects the river in any negative manner. In these economic times, towns such as Van Buren are struggling terribly. People are not traveling far from their homes for recreation. A loss of use of the river in their 40 hp boats would be devastating to the boat owners and to the few shop owners in town who depend on these people for revenue. My recommendation is that you require ONLY jet boats to be used in the park. I have witnessed open props churning up the river bed. My final word is that you do not make any changes to the current boating regulations. The hp zones are perfect as is, keeping the larger engines below the Big Spring. I wish there was more manpower to enforce creel and size limits with regard to the fishing regulations. I would willing to pay a yearly tax for the right to use the 40 hp on the Current River.	6/9/2009	No		Current River Sm. Mouth Bass Assoc.	MO	63017
40	1) Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage the park. I would encourage you to maintain the park as it was before development began. That would preclude the use of any kind of power boats. The "jet boats" destroy the peace of the river and damage the river banks. I also would encourage you to eliminate canoe rental businesses. They encourage overcrowding and objectionable behavior on the river. 2)Traditional nonmechanized forms of recreation. That includes floating the river in the old "john boats", gravel bar camps, etc. Also, protection of the Ozark heritage. 3)Development. We don't need a circus. We need a protected environment. 4)It is all special to me. All of it must be protected. We have so few really "natural" places remaining. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Park Service to resist the pressure of those wanting to make money on the river. It is a special resource and must be preserved.	6/9/2009	No			MO	65588- 9730
41	1. *What kind of restoration will personnel do to promote healthy ecosystems in primitive "brown" areas?--remove invasives,prescribed burns? *In plan for ONSR: NO additional access seasonally by motorboats. How does allowing seasonal access to motorboats deviate from the current OSNR plan? *Adequate resources, including financial and personnel, to implement and enforce chosen plan. Choose a plan the NPS/ONSR can support. Consider that the Administration and Congress may not allocate necessary funding to maintain some of these activities. Consider how fundraising alliances might impact natural resources. (influence of ATV user groups, pressure from outfitters to increase visitor numbers, expanded commercial areas near park--like Gatlinburg, or worse yet Pidgeon Forge near the Smokies) 2.INCLUDE: *Provisions and personnel for strict enforcement of regulations and limits *Resources to do biological research. *Consider Wilderness designation for Big Spring area. *Coordinate control of timber harvests and road building to protect watershed of ONSR *Limit # of visitors to enhance natural resources *Limitations on motor boats NO LESS RESTRICTIVE than in present plan. Places on river where NO motorboats are permitted at any time and other parts where only lower power motors are permitted. *Limit substantially # of horses and river crossings in ONSR to protect ecosystems, water quality and enhance experience for other users *Restore natural ecosystems and remove any invasive species damaging or threatening ecosystems *Hands-on education about natural and historic resources, such as living history experiences 3. *EXCLUDE: ATVs in river anywhere and off-road vehicle travel. *EXCLUDE: motor boats anytime on Jacks Fork in ONSR above Two Rivers and on Current above Round Spring. Most peaceful and scenic time to canoe is fall/spring. Motor craft can use lower stretches. What are the reasons for allowing seasonal access to motor boats? How does this deviate from the current plan for ONSR?	6/9/2009	No		Sierra Club, Audubon, MONAPS, Coalition for Environment	MO	63130
42	1) I like the Alternative A with some aspects of B integrated such as the learning sites. I like the Natural Zone alternative as well. 2) Keep the motorized boats off the rivers and retore the native plants and animals. Repair erosion at the banks. 3) I don't like the idea of increasing commercial where it promotes the young party crowd - they can be dangerous. I am not in favor of more hunters/guns in the area. 4)I love the entire stretch - Big Springs is very special. 5) Signs to help people stay on paths or identify plants or ecosystems is educational and nice. Park Rangers are important for enforcement and to ID problems - please increase park rangers.	6/10/2009	No			MO	63143
43	1) Further restrict use of motor traffic--boats, ATV's etc. 2) Enforce lewd/drunken conduct rules/laws, have officers arrest people. 3) Lower limits for keeping of fish, less keeping. 4) Buy new property along the river rather than develop existing property.	6/10/2009	No			MO	65802
44	1) No action is the best plan in my opinion. The river already has plenty of regulations. 2) Wildlife is important but it is already hard enough for people to hunt along the river so closing them in anyway will have virtually no effect. 3) I feel the horsepower limits below big spring are nonsense. Hardly any tubers or canoes go that far and there had been very few accidents. 4) The whole river is special to me, thats why i don't want you guys to take it away from us by inforcing useless restrictions. 5) What is wrong with the way it is??????????????	6/11/2009	No			MO	63937
45	I would like to see NO ACTION taken. I think the current river is a wonderful source of recreation and should continue to be available to all users. If the river is restricted even more than it is already, then we the tax payers lose.	6/11/2009	No			MO	63956
46	1. Alternative "A" would be my choice of management. No motorized boats should be allowed on the rivers because they are such a disruption to the natural state of the rivers. The Current and Jacks Fork are floating rivers, quiet and serene, and it's almost blasphemy to hear a motorboat on the river. It scares all the wildlife away, takes away from the river experience. I think interpreting Ozark culture and river use is also a good idea and should be expanded upon. 2. I feel very strongly about the points in Alternative "A". 3. I feel that Alternative "C" should be avoided. 4. As a child, my family vacationed at the Missouri State Teachers' Association campground called "Bunker Hill" just north of Mountain View on the Jacks Fork River. We went there every June for 30-some-odd years and it is a haven of peacefulness and natural inspiration. The campground had a large beachfront on the Jacks Fork and we canoed, fished,swam and hiked. Bunker Hill has done a very good job as a steward for the Jacks Fork	6/11/2009	No			MO	64149

	and everyone there was very respectful of the river and its environs. Alternative "A" is the best strategy for areas like Bunker Hill where people can enjoy the river and still keep it pristine for generations to come. I remember when motorized boats were not allowed on the river and then I also remember when motorboats were allowed and the impact on the river was intense. The noise, the vibration, the beer cans, etc. was a total disruption of the area and it was much better when motorized boats were NOT allowed. 5. I believe the soundest strategies are in Alternative "A". Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinion. I feel very strongly about this area.					
47	1) I feel choice "A" is the best way to manage ONSR. I would add floater caps to restrict the number of people that can tube or canoe through certain stretches in one day. I would also eliminate horse trails along or through the park. The definition of "primitive" also needs to be changed to allow the use of prescribed burning in the wilderness areas so fire-dependent natural communities may flourish. 2) Future management should include horsepower restrictions and limited development, such as with alternative "A". 3) I feel strongly that alternative "C" will severely degrade all natural features of the park and disrupt ecosystem processes. This alternative should not even be considered. Alternative "B" does not go far enough to protect the biodiversity and should not be considered. 4) I have floated all stretches of the Current River from Cedargrove to Big Spring. I have floated all stretches of the Jacks Fork from the Prongs to Alley Spring. Alternative "A" is the only option that would protect the resources along those stretches, and I feel it does not go far enough because it does not restrict floater usage or horse trail usage. I use the park frequently, but I have had several negative experiences which include: canoe congestion, motorboat congestion while canoeing, trucks crossing at the Flying W, motorboats frequently cruising by my float camp, horseback riders crossing near Two Rivers, and drunkards. I love the ONSR, but trying to appeal to all multiple users is (and will) lessening my positive experiences in the park and degrading the natural character of ONSR. 5) As noted earlier, I feel daily floater caps and horse trail restrictions are needed. Also, prescribed fire is a necessary tool in the designated wilderness areas and should be included in the management plan. I'd also like to see no motorboats above Big Spring.	6/11/2009	No		MO	65775
48	We live on one of the roads that go back to one of your primitive camp, and canoe launch sites on the Jack's Fork in Shannon County. We love that we live so close to the river and have access to use it. What we would love to have is some dust control for the constant dust in the air all spring and summer from the many cars, trucks, and buses that bring people to and from the park, and the river. On many lovely days we have to have our homes closed up and the air conditioner on because of the heavy dust in the air. This costs us extra electricity to run our air conditioners, and our homes and vehicles are always covered in dust. The traffic is almost constant on the weekends and it would help out the folks who live on the gravel roads that lead to your campgrounds if you could spray calcium chloride in front of our homes. We who live near the river are the first people your guests come to when they have trouble on the route in and out. Tho we don't mind helping anyone out, it would be nice if you could help us in this small way. It is an inexpensive solution to a real problem. Thank you, Linda and Jim Strauch	6/11/2009	No		MO	65438
49	1. Alternative A would be my first choice. Alternative B would be acceptable to me. 2. I feel especially strongly about non-motorized areas and horsepower limits. 3. I do NOT want any more developed access points and campgrounds along the rivers. 4. The upper Jacks Fork above Alley Spring offers the best high quality primitive stream experience in Missouri, and should be totally off limits to motorized travel at all times and protected from all ATV abuse. I have floated it many times, and I see too much illegal ATV activity in the stream bed as you get close to Bay Creek and Alley Spring.	6/11/2009	No		MO	63670
50	1) I only support the option of NO-CHANGE. Option C effectively bans 75% of the 40hp outboard motors in use on the Riverways by stipulating that the horsepower rating is at the power head not the output shaft as it is now. This puts a financial hardship on the motor boat users of the Ozark Scenic Riverways. Horseback riders, hikers, naturalists, hunters, and motor vehicle users can all coexist under the current management plan. 2) If improper behavior of some park users is a concern than I think that increase park ranger presence on the high use areas is in order. Enforce the rules we have now rather than restrict access and limit use. 3) I oppose any actions that restrict access or limit use to these public lands. The elderly and disabled should be allowed continued open access to all park areas by motorized vehicular use. 4) I have raised my children to respect and enjoy the free access that we have to our public lands. As a family we enjoy motorboating in our 40hp equipped john boat, ATV and Jeep riding to secluded scenic and historical sites in the riverways and using motorized transportation to hunt and fish. 5) I strongly support strategies that continue to keep our public lands free and unrestricted by all users. Horseback riders, hikers, naturalists, hunters, and motor vehicle users can all coexist under the current management plan. If there are problem areas I support enforcement of existing rules and policies.	6/12/2009	No		MO	65560
51	1) No-Action I have been using this river for over 40 years. My family and I use the upper current every weekend when we are off boating down to mouth of big creek we enjoy sunny and swimming in the warm water of big creek, eating lunch and playing games. If any of the plans other than the non-action were used this would restrict us from doing this as a family. We also use the access roads in the fall hunting season. My elderly father in law who is unable to ride in my boat. Still enjoys driving down to jerk tail area and fishing. I have been blessed to be able to enjoy this area year round thru boating, trail ride, hunting and fishing. hopefully I will be able to share this with my grand children. 3) plans A B or C would restrict the recreational use and access of this area to elderly and handicapped limiting the number of people that could enjoy this national treasure. 4) The entire 134 miles is my favorite. Some of my special spots like fly w, Round spring, Log Yard need more public presence of the Park officials instead of hanging out at the public parks and campsite last year My family was on the river almost every weekend. from April thru October. I saw one Ranger during this entire time. We have laws on the river but no one to enforce them.	6/12/2009	No		MO	65560
52	June 12, 2009 Dear Superintendent of the National Parks Service, I would like to voice my concern of the negative connotation given to motor boats that travel the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In recent publications, I have read and reviewed the National Park Services' new General Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am deeply concerned about the possible limitation or omission of the motor boat usage on part or all of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As an owner of a motor boat and nearby resident of Current River, I take my wife and 2 small children to the river nearly every sunny weekend during the warm months. I also take my family to see the beautiful fall foliage and gig during the gigging season. On the off season, we drive just to look at the river and anticipate the warm months when we can take the motor boat	6/12/2009	No		MO	63638

	<p>back to the river. During our frequent visits to Current River, we are careful to pick up our trash and even pick up the occasional litter left by others. My family and I have a deep care for the river. We also live approximately ten miles from this haven, so we treat it like our carefully kept back yard. Our family has also chosen to keep the vacation money to spend for our Current River outings. As many motor boat owning families like us, we are keeping money in our surrounding towns by spending our vacation in Reynolds and Shannon counties. The new General Management Plan (GMP) is suggesting that our number one family activity will be nonexistent: motor boating. Instead, the new GMP is catering to canoers who mostly live in urban areas such as St. Louis. On the river I have encountered many canoers. Some were very friendly, some were unfriendly and some even were behaving so poorly, I wished a park ranger would have been present. My children were exposed to vulgar language and gestures, excessive drunken and drug-induced behavior, violent outbursts, and otherwise outrageous behavior by poorly behaving canoers. However, there was no part of the GMP that addressed correcting this conflict by penalizing those responsible for this behavior. There are many possible causes to this behavior, however, I believe there is one major cause for discord between canoers and motor boaters. This cause is the lack of knowledge of some canoers. Some canoers do not realize or care about the cost to own, maintain, and repair a motor boat. As a motor boat driver, I have to be more careful of the course in the river I take than canoers. If I take the wrong path in the river I could harm my boat, or even worse, injure my precious family. Some canoers do not realize the speed needed for motor boats to cross more shallow areas of the river. Motor boats cannot stop during a shallow section of the river. I do always put the safety of lives before the safety of my boat. Some canoers, however, do not trust the experience of motor boat drivers and perceive some of the afore mentioned safety actions as wrongdoings. To remedy this situation, I would like to propose an educational approach. I would like to have canoers read or be taught about the motor boats they may encounter on Current River. They should also be check for illegal drugs by a drug dog at canoe rental facilities. Also, the motor boaters should have higher horsepower limits to equal that of our southern Current River motor boats. Thank you for reading my concerns. I look forward to seeing you at the upcoming meetings. Sincerely, Garrett Gore</p>						
53	<p>June 12, 2009 Dear Superintendent of the National Parks Service, I am writing you this letter to address the proposed boating practice changes as stated in the New General Management Plan (GMP) for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am a motor boat owner and use my motor boat to enjoy Current River from Blue Springs to Round Springs. Your proposal for a new GMP would directly affect me and my family's leisurely trips to Current River. A phrase used in Alternatives A and B is: "Park managers would create conditions that help recall earlier days along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. There would be more opportunities for traditional, no mechanized forms of recreation, and activities that are quieter, less crowded, and slower paced." I am deeply concerned by this statement when it is directed at removing motor boats from the river. I compare canoeing to walking and motor boating to driving a vehicle. Traditionally walking was the only means of transportation on land. While walking, one could hear nature and have a slow pace, much like that of canoeing. However, after the Industrial Age, motorized vehicles were invented and soon became the choice mode of transportation. In vehicles, much like motor boats, they are faster-paced and a bit noisier. Also, the relationship between pedestrian and vehicle driver is comparable to the canoe and motor boat driver. One similarity is the law of vehicles yielding to pedestrians. Motor boaters also yield to canoes. In this comparison, however, there are differences. As the years progress, vehicle drivers can use bigger, more powerful vehicles. Motorists have also earned the privilege of driving at higher, but not excessive, speed limits. Vehicle drivers have been given more privileges as time progresses. The age of walking to your destination has given way to driving. The management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are proposing to limit, or make obsolete, the use of motorboats as they are currently used. This action will be severe to all motor boat owners. Imagine if the government told you, a vehicle owner, that you could no longer use your vehicle to visit your favorite destination. Instead, you must walk if you want to visit. In fact, it seemed as if the government wished to please the pedestrians that don't even live beside the place you like to visit. This, sir, is exactly how I feel when you propose GMP's that will forbid me to use my motorboat on any part of Current River. I would like for you to propose an Alternative D that would limit canoes to float the part of the river already designated for them: upriver from Round Spring. Also, raise the horsepower limit to better accommodate the gaining technology available to us. Also make more concrete permanent boat ramps at places like Powder Mill. Publish more literature about lewd behavior and drug use of visiting canoers. Thank you for reading my concerns. I look forward to seeing you at the upcoming meetings. Sincerely, Rachel Gore</p>	6/12/2009	No			MO	63638
54	<p>1. The alternatives are so vague that it is hard to choose with confidence. Alternative A is the place to start. The motorboat traffic on the river should be reduced in horsepower or eliminated. It is unfair to have so few people taking so much of the resource. The rest of Alternative A sounds overmanaged. The river doesn't require much but patrolling--by uniformed rangers--in sight--on the river--even though they don't like to do that. 2. Reduced motor boat traffic. Also reduce the number of canoes that can be rented on the river at any one time. 3. The plan should not encourage a particular use. Set the rules and let people use the area on their own. "Wilderness" is not feasible or desireable. "1950's or 1960's" use is not panacea. That was just one moment among millions of years. Keep the river clean and safe, that's all that needs to be done. 4. The upper reaches of the Current especially need to have the congestion reduced. There are way too many canoes rented there. You can't stop stupid people from renting canoes but you can patrol the river, which would help. 5. Don't be extreme from any aspect. It may be better to allow small motors than to ban all motors. Don't ban canoe rentals but don't allow the present over use. Keep the park accessible and inexpensive. Thank you. Ben Lewis</p>	6/12/2009	No			MO	63701
55	<p>We have friends in St. Louis, and I (George) have visited Missouri on work assignments. 1. Alternatives A and B are close to our thinking on future management of Ozark NSR. 2. We favor the wilderness designation for Big Spring. It will help protect this area against unforeseen pressures for development. We like the idea in Alt. A of closing illegal roads and trails and restoring them to a natural condition, so they can serve the public as part of the natural landscape. This type of restoration is being done in many national forests under the Forest Service's "route designation" process. It should certainly be done by NPS here. 3. We oppose the emphasis on "access" in Alt. C. Providing more and more roads and developments would detract from ONSR's greatest asset to the public, namely its wild and natural lands. 4 and 5. We have no comment on</p>	6/14/2009	No			MD	21228

	these topics. Please keep us informed of further action, and send us future newsletters. Thank you for considering our views.						
56	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Alternative A would be the best in my opinion. Jet boats are taking over the river and are dangerous to canoers/floaters. Drinking/lewd behavior is dangerous and should not be allowed in such a pristine place. 2. Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? A more natural area would be a great thing for the area, it is heavily used and should be used, but not at the current levels. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Increased use by motorboats/people on the river. Historic sites/caves should be veiwed, only if it doesn't cause unnecessary harm to the area. There should be some more restrictive limits on fish in the area. Black bass/goggleye management areas should be used. 4. Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? The area below van buren could be utilized as a motorboat area, anywhere upstream from two rivers should be floating only, and a black bass management area. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Black bass management area. These rivers have the ability to grow some giant smallmouth bass/goggleeye and the amount of use/harvest limits they're size and numbers. Illegal trails/roads should be removed, as well as limiting impacts of horseback riding (manure) in the area.	6/15/2009	No		Missouri Smallmouth Alliance	IL	62901
57	4: Greer Spring on the Eleven Point and Welch Spring on the Current are my favorites. Protection of spring watersheds is of utmost importance. 5: My vote would include further limitation of motorized boats on ONSR streams.	6/15/2009	No		MO Master Naturalist	MO	65571
58	I say all you city people should just stay away from our river. I have been on Current River for 28 years now and I plan for my grand children to enjoy it as much as I have. Just leave us alone and let us enjoy what we have in our back yards. I like nothing in your document other than the do nothing option. Just let us enjoy what we have and you enjoy you malls and concret. The locals are not your problem. We go over there to destress and let our children and grandchildren to enjoy the water. We do not trash the river we chase down the trash from the floaters. Just let us be stay out of our back yard and we will stay out of yours.	6/15/2009	No			MO	63638
59	NO-Action!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	6/15/2009	No			MO	63638
60	1)No-action 2)The proposals are dangerous! 3)Any further efforts to imperialise the region without local representation should be stopped. 4)Two Rivers to Gooseneck. A,B,C are burdensome to the point of criminal. 5)Visitor experience will be greatly diminished as virtually all boating and floating traffic will be confined to the four mile stretch at Van Buren. The vast majority of motors in that area will become illegal because the plans call for restriction of horse power at the power head and not the jet. Confining people to the small section of river above and below the bridge at Van Buren will cause a substantial in crease in casualties and deaths on the part of the river NOT controlled by the NPS.	6/15/2009	No			MO	63901
61	topic q#4: I have strong memories of the section on Current River beginning at Cave Spring (north of Akers Ferry)and down river to Pulltite. Summer of 1979 I was privileged to be selected to work for ONSR as a high school student in their youth conservation education program. The Youth Conservation Corp brought teens from all over our state from all backgrounds to work, learn and live together. We were taught the importance of protecting the natural resources of this beautiful part of our state. We spent many hours improving campgrounds, building handicap accessible areas and maintaining hiking trails. Twice weekly we floated the Current from Cave Spring to Pulltite Campground picking up trash/debris either deliberately dumped or accidentally left behind from canoe tipovers from the hundreds of visitors who passed that way. It is my hope that every effort will be made to preserve the area and all the richness it contains in both wildlife and plants. It was a true loss when budget cuts ended the program.	6/15/2009	No		GIRL SCOUTS OF MISSOURI'S HEARTLAND	MO	63701
62	I am in opposition of the horsepower regulations, I support NO ACTION.	6/15/2009	No			MO	63119
63	1.) The preliminary alternative of my choice is the No-action alternative. I think the NPS is doing a fine job protecting our riverways. The hoserpower limits on boat motors is fine the way it is. Wether the people are in a canoe, kayak, raft, or anything else it always makes for an enjoyable time. However there are some complaints from tubbers or canoers about the boats. I have been on these rivers here by my home all of my life, and my family and i respect everyone else out on the waters also. I think the only thing that would help out on the water would be the ban on all alcohol.Out of the many many times i am at the river in the summer there are tubers and canoers everywhere, and there is a very high percentage that they are drinking some kind of alcholic beverage. They get intoxicated and cannot make proper judgement about the boaters. I have had to stop and idle by them many of times because intoxicated tourists have swam out infront of me or attempted to. i have first hand witnessed a fatiatility due to intoxication on the river. An intoxicated tuber clumb a rick bluff and jumped off hitting the water and breakins her neck. By taking away the alcohol it would save lives, complaints, and make it safer on the waters, with less trash in our streams. The plan for the NPS is to make the river like it was several years ago with the boating, by reducing the horsepower limits. This will not make the effect that they are hoping for. In the earlier years the boats used props on the motors. Boats ran the same speed then as they do now, the only difference now is that motors are bigger, however now they are powered by a jet due to the lower water levels in the stream. It would make no sense to but a lower horsepower	6/15/2009	No			MO	63638

	<p>limit on motors. The economy is struggling to its worst now, and it would only have an even worse effect on it if the NPS decides to make all of these changes. I have been raised on these rivers and my father taught me alot out of a boat fishing riding on the river. I just hope that the NPS will not take my priviliges away on the river because i want to be able to teach my kids what my father taught me. 2.)I think the parts of the alternatives that should be included in the management of our riverways would be the construction of more parks, and the repair and construction of new boat ramps. Also i think there could also be more employees hired to direct tourists and show them the ins and outs of out beautiful part of the country. Also it probably wouldnt be a bad idea to make it a requirement to have a boaters license to be able to operate a motorized boat oun our missouri streams, like it is required on missouri lakes. 3.) I think the parts of the alternatives that should not be included are the limits on the horsepower on motorized boats, there should not be a regulation on which parts of the river you are allowed on. There should not be a regulation on where you are allowed to take your boat certain times a year. 4.)All parts of the river are special to me. Owning a boat by self lets me be able to enjoy all the parts and scenery. The only concern i have is the tubers and canoers, leaving all of their cans and trash all over our stream beds. 5.) If people really want to come for the scenery that is great, it is beautiful here. The NPS could construct more informational buildings around, make more trails, mark hidden caves and other beautiful landmarks. It would be fine to hire more personel to guide the tourists, and it would be fine to have a couple more patroll men on the river to help stop the alcohol, and help keep everyone safe on the waters. Thank you for your time and i really hope that you will take time to consider the options that i have mentioned. I live in the area and i can see all the things that happen, that most out of town people cannot see. The best change that i believe would solve the majority of the problems would be putting a stop to alcohol. Lets start small and not take away the large priviledges for everyone else, due to the poor decisions of certain people. Thank you again, Ethan Hoffmann</p>						
64	I fish the Current River several times a year with my brother-in-law and I am very concerned about the modification of the existing horsepower zones on the river. I might suggest that such modifications would devastate the local economy in Van Buren and it would eliminate the enjoyable fishing that so many of us participate. Please do not change the existing horsepower regulations.	6/16/2009	No			TX	75011
65	1. Alternative A 2. Restrictions on horses in the river. More restrictions on motorized boats in the rivers. 3. Any rule that will restrict the use of prescribed fire in areas where this is the appropriate management activity. 4. Two Rivers to Big Spring and all of the Jacks Fork managed by NPS. These area should not have motorized boats on them. None of the alternative adequately address this problem. 5. Manage the park for a more primitive outdoor experience. The park should be managed for the greater good of the people and the environment and not for the immediate satisfaction of the local population. The park should not be managed in a way that is detrimental to the native ecosyetem.	6/16/2009	No		Forestry and Fire 4 Hire	MO	65604
66	No action!	6/16/2009	No			MO	63640
67	1. No. 2. Limiting motor h.p. size is fine for managing boat impact. 3. Closing areas to motorized boating will limit exposure of floaters to boats, but will do little to enhance to floating experience. Areas with high traffic floating are commercialized by the floaters and any attempt to return them "to nature" is going to fail unless the number of non-motorized floaters is limited. I find the presence of a bunch of drunks in canoes and on tubes to be much more disruptive to nature than an occassional boat load of fishermen who are as interested in preserving our environment as am I. In addition, alternatives that leave the entire riverways open to non-motorized uses while closing some areas to motorized uses seems to favor one type of use over the other and I am unaware as to why this should be the case. All types of public use that do not harm our natural resource should be treated equally. All types of public use that present a danger of harm to our natural resource should be treated equally. 4. The areas of concern for me are the areas of high commercial floating traffic. The number of people allowed to float should be limited in such a way as to enhance the experience for the remainder of the people using the river. It should not be the policy of the National Park Service to implement plans that will increase the commercial use of our natural resources (as all of the alternatives presented will do). Again, I do not have a problem with limiting motorized use so long as the NPS is consistent and will limit non-motorized use, more importantly, non-motorized commercial use. If it is the desire of the NPS, as stated, to enhance the experience of the user to allow a more "traditional" experience, doing away with, or severely limiting, commercial floating is an important part of the equation. 5. See answer 4.	6/16/2009	No			MO	63937
68	No-Action	6/16/2009	No			MO	63050
69	1. NO-ACTION Keep our national scenic river ways and all navigable river ways open to public access and public use of according to the National River Laws. I think we need to stop/educate adjacent landowners of such navigable river ways from preventing public access on such navigable rivers is violating tax paying public rights. If a person wishes to walk, swim or float such a river they should also have access to the high water mark also. According to the National River Law.	6/16/2009	No			MO	63640
70	Olease take NO ACTION on this. Rhe Riverways are perfect the way they are and need No interference.	6/16/2009	No			MO	63640
71	I support NO ACTION.	6/16/2009	No			MO	63028

72	No Action--Keep our riverways scenic.	6/16/2009	No			MO	63640
73	It is my opinion that the No-Action plan is the best leave the park how it is. I have lived in the Current River area all my life and when I have time I enjoy running the river in my jet boat below Round Springs to enjoy the scenery, fishing or just enjoying the weather. I know that sometimes that boaters and floaters clash, but I think a little education for the floaters about sharing the rivers ways would help a lot I'm not saying that it is all ways the floaters fault, I've seen behavior from both groups that I do not approve of. But some fliers on your notice boards about how jet boats operate and how the floaters should not try to beat the boats to the shoals and to move to one side of the river or the other so the boats do not have to pass so close would benefit both parties. More hiking trails and possibly mountain biking trails in the park would be nice to enjoy and if ever it could be arranged, I think if there where ATV trails where people could purchase a daily or yearly permit to ride the trails would be a great idea like the US Forestry offers in some of their areas. Sincerely, Todd Hamilton	6/16/2009	No			MO	65560
74	1) No action!! 2) No new regulations should be added to the current management of the ONSR! 3) Any regulations that prohibit public access or public use of any part of ONSR. Any limits to outboard horsepower on any section of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. And do not rate horsepower from the powerhead of the motor. Horsepower is rated from the output shaft of an outboard motor. 4)My special stretch of the ONSR is from Bay Creek to Two Rivers on Jacks Fork and Jerktail to Log yard on the Current River. These parts of the river are special to me because I have spent so much of my life on them. When I was a youngster my family went to the river alot. Swimming, floating, camping, fishing, hunting, gigging, and boat riding. Nearly every weekend we were on the river somewhere. Now I have my own wife and kids and we still spend alot of family time on the river. I want my kids to have a very special memory of our river. I want it to have a place in their heart that draws them to the ozarks and home! I don't want them to think of the Park Service that kicked them off the river and stole their heritage and homeplace as they did in the early 60's. 5) I would like to see inforcement of the regulations already in place. Not just add new regulations and not inforce them. Also, I would like to see the Park Rangers on the river, and gravel bars. Not hiding in the brush but greeting people with a presence that commands respect of the regulations but gives respect to the users of the park. Check points for alcohol users and abusers. A welcome attitude to the local people. Clean the brush back along the banks at places like Alley Spring branch, and Round Spring branch. Like in the days when Alley was a State Park! Hire local Park Rangers instead of bringing in outside people who know nothing of the heritage and local people here. (Such people don't care about our culture and heritage!) On a personal note: I remember when the park put a limit on the horsepower on the river the first time. At the time it took our family off the river because my dad owned an 80 hp motor. He couldn't afford to trade for a 40 hp motor and we had to quit going boating. After he had already spent money to buy an expensive motor then the new law came in and we couldn't enjoy the river in that way any longer. Please don't allow this again! Leave the regulations alone! If anything open up the entire river to public use as it is meant to be!	6/16/2009	No			MO	65466
75	1)No-Action. Let's revert back to 1964 charter and make this park a recreational area. NOT a WILDERNESS. 2)Less control on the local population. We are here 52 weeks a year and the people you are trying to save it for are here only 10 weeks per year weather premitting. 3)Anything controlling motor size or what kind of conveyance can be used in the park. People gave up using horses and poling boats when technology got better. Lets not go back in time to try and save something that isn't going away anyway. Try to walk thru the old farm places that use to be open fields 20 years ago and you will find how much of a wilderness you have already. Thickets that a rabbit can't even get thru. 4)I spend most of my time between Jacks Fork and Van Buren. We use to have big enough motors to haul the whole family but now we have to take 2 boats. Cutting the horse power only caused more traffic on the river. Every time the Government tries to help they only mess things up. So please don't try to save us anymore. 5)Go back to Washington and try to cut down on the BS we have to put up with. Current river will be running clear and clean 100 years from now as it was 100 years ago with out the help of the National Park Service. Art Sullivan told me in 1984 that if he had his way by the year 2000 I would have to put in an applacation 1 year in advance to swim in "HIS" river. I truly hope it doesn't come to that but reading this new management plan we are headed in that direction by 2010.	6/17/2009	No			MO	63638
76	As one who appreciates the outdoors in its natural state, I am most in favor of alternative A. I believe that (with a few exceptions) motorized recreation does not belong in national park settings... I do a lot of camping, hiking and photography. I cannot tell you how many times an otherwise relaxing vacation was comprimised by loud and incessant generators, ATVs and personal watercraft.	6/17/2009	No			MO	63701
77	I support Alternative A. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of the few remaining truly beautiful reminders of our past and what the future could be if we're good stewards of the Earth. Your grandchildren and mine deserve to enjoy this treasure and I admire you for taking such good care of it. Thank you. One comment: NO lead mining of any kind should be allowed in the head waters or within many miles of the park under any circumstances, they pollute everything they touch... Sincerely, Dr. Jay Hodges	6/17/2009	No			MO	65588
78	Question 1 No Action As a Poplar Bluff resident, I can attest that a large number of Poplar Bluff residents are also property owners in Carter County. The impact of the reduced horsepower limits are not going to make a difference in the number of tubers but will dramatically reduce the number of property owners and "weekend regulars" on the river. Economically speaking, a tuber is going to visit the river once or twice per season. Weekend regulars pay property taxes, buy gas and groceries, and frequent restaurants on a weekly or semi weekly basis. Additionally, the property values of current river properties have multiplied exponentially in the last couple of years due to the increased demand for cabins and lots. This measure will not only reduce the demand for property in the area, it will increase the supply of current property due to the fact that this measure has run off the current owners who will relocate to river areas without these unreasonable limits. The reduction property market values and property taxes will be significant. Locals and property owners are boaters and fisherman, not canoers and tubers. Canoers and tubers are not going to significantly increase because of a further reduction in horsepower limits. R. Chance Whitehead Poplar Bluff, MO	6/17/2009	No			MO	63901

79	<p>1.)Alternative C is close to my idea of the direction ONSR should be steered. 2.) River Use Management to include motor boating. As a long time Current River boater and resident of Carter County I believe all forms of river use have grown exponetially in the last decade. Summer weekends draw large numbers of canoist, tubers and boaters, making it nearly impossible to enjoy any type of solitary or natural experience on or near Current River. The Big Spring boat ramp has parking spaces for twenty-nine (29) vehicles with attached trailers. However,routinely, on summer weekends, one may see in excess of seventy-five vehicles with trailers parked there. Overflow parking, originally established for canoist and other floaters, is now predominately filled with vehicles and boat trailers. ONSR has made no attempt to limit or control the number of boaters, or any other user type, within the Riverways. Like many other Park Service areas, I believe a permit system is needed to control and reduce the number boats, canoes, tubes, rafts and kayaks. This reduction would provide for a more natural experience and would probably reduce conflicts between different user groups. I do not believe areas near Big Spring should become a Wilderness area. 3.) A ban of motor boats should not be included. The Wilderness area proposal should not be included. 4.) All of ONSR is special and should be managed as such. The extremely large numbers of floaters in the Upper Current area, Alley to Two Rivers area and Waymeyer to Van Buren area should be reduced. The extremely large numbers of boaters in the Log Yard area and Big Spring to Gooseneck area should be reduced. Trail rider numbers should be reduced in the Two Rivers to Alley area and in the Upper Current area.</p>	6/17/2009	No			MO	63965
80	<p>NO ACTION. I feel that things should be left as they are. There is already a good balance between the boats and the floaters. Many times there have been incidents where floaters have been kept out of harms way by the presence of boaters. Not to many years ago in fact I rescued one women and a young child who had been caught in a current and would have drowned if I would not have been there to rescue them in my boat.Further restrictions on boaters would have an adverse effect on local businesses along the riverway. Also the individuals including me,who have purchased boats in accordance with the current regulations would be unfairly restricted from using the riverways.Instead of making restrictions why don't you make improvements, Such as better access to present facilities. You could even add a marina somewhere along the river which would increase revenue. In my opinion if you make restrictions to the river it will result in a huge drop in tourist that like to boat. I would Like to thank you for taking time out of your day to listen to my opinions and suggestions. Roger Hayes</p>	6/17/2009	No			MO	63901
81	<p>This is in response to Question 1: No Action is my recommendation, in all of the proposals, one key factor is the same, regulating the horsepower limits and limiting the use by boater on stretches of the river. The problem in this thought process is that the general public perceives that this would help correct the problems that floaters encounter with the boaters. To the contrary, the gaps around Eminence and Van Buren are not within the control of the NPS, it is controlled by the state water patrol and local law enforcement. If any of the A,B or C alternative were to be imposed, the boaters would then have two options: 1. Downsize their boating equipment to meet the new regulations or 2. Keep their current boats and use the river in the for mentioned gaps. While this may not be perceived as a problem around the Eminence area, this would be a huge problem in the Van Buren gap. In the current state, many boaters avoid this gap due to the known amount of floater activity the uses this area. By implementing horse power restrictions within the Park, people would then be forced into these gaps, only increasing the likelihood of boater/ floater conflict and an diminished floater experience in which the NPS would have no control over. Many boaters us the river below Big Spring were there are no floaters and enjoy the experience of the beautiful gravel bars and peaceful surroundings. All alternatives except the "No Action" would likely have a major impact, not only on the visiting floaters, but on the localized boaters as well. Through the development of infrastructure around the local area, the area is much more easily accessed. Better highways have lead to a huge surge of seasonal landowners to take root in the lower Current River area. This has not only increased the property value around a struggling economic Carter County, it has generated many dollars of tax revenue to help support the local law enforcement. Property values are another item that has seen the increased value due to the influx of seasonal landowners. By limiting the use that these landowners may experience in using the Park, in my opinion, many would revert back to past experiences and leave the area, only causing economic hardship on a county already under a stranglehold.</p>	6/17/2009	No			MO	65714
82	NO ACTION	6/17/2009	No			MO	63965
83	<p>.1. No Action .2. I grew up in Eminence Mo on the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. Eminence is a tourist town. If the rivers are unaccessible the town will die. Many people including many of my family run canoe rentals as well as inns that provide thier only income. there are no factories or sources of employment in that area of the state. i take my children to eminence so that they can experience the natural beauty of the waterways and they love it. it would be a travesty to many vacationers that enjoy an inexpensive getaway, as well as the entire shannon County population if those rivers are restricted</p>	6/17/2009	No			MO	63050
84	1. NO ACTION	6/17/2009	No			MO	63627
85	I enjoy all of the Ozark Riverways, they are some of the greatest in the world, the only thing that should change is stricter littering laws. Thats it, everything is perfect, if its not broke don't fix it.	6/17/2009	No			MO	63965
86	<p>1)I favor the no-action alternative. I think that the Ozark heritage that needs protection is that which we have come to enjoy as residents today. I would like to see illegally developed road and trails closed. However, roads in the park such as the tram road along Granite Quarry Hole should remain open for horseback riding, ATV use, and passenger car and truck use. I see no benefit to a change in horsepower limitations. I do not</p>	6/17/2009	No			MO	63965

	<p>think that lower horsepower motor boats are necessarily a good thing. Older, "traditional" john boat motors were noisier, less efficient, and more polluting than modern, higher-horsepower alternatives. Their propellers were more likely to cut fish and other aquatic wildlife, and their wakes were larger and more disruptive to the shore. Floaters would be at greater risk. From what I have seen, the river users most interested in ecology are the motor boaters. We are the ones who have compulsively picked up trash floating in the river that was strewn by those in tubes or lost from capsized canoes. We are the river users in power boats who have rescued countless floaters in tubes tied together and caught in rootwads 2)I think there should be a greater emphasis on educational activities for visitors such as is offered in the Smokey Mountains. Also, I think any floater needs to be educated prior to their float trip regarding the nature of power boats on the river. They need to know that most are jet boats that have no dangerous prop and can travel safely quite close to them. They need to know that there are only certain areas of the river where power boats can safely travel in water that is deep enough or free enough of obstructions. I recommend the development of a required, standard, pre-float seminar. This would decrease floater-boater conflict. 3)The NPS is suggesting historical prejudice when recommending doing "things people did on the river in the 50's and 60's". I don't think it is reasonable to suggest that we all be required to use birch-bark or dug-out canoes, including the law enforcement officers in charge of running after the bad guys. Glass bottles and steel cans in coolers are probably worse than aluminum cans of present days. I do like the idea of more ranger-led programs such as demonstrations of traditional Ozark lifeways and hunter and fishing education. 4)No comment 5)Protect the local heritage of our time. Many local families have endured the loss of family farms along the riverways when it was first developed. Please do not further alienate the local people by further restricting their currently traditional recreation. The best allies for the protection of this area have always been the people who live here.</p>						
87	<p>For over 25 years we have been landowners and taxpayers in Carter Co. I came here to build a vacation property for myself and my family reason being the Current River. I realize we have to protect the river and watch how it is used. From my perspective the worst enemy of the river is the use of inner tubes. I know your trying to provide for all, but the majority of the trash,alcohol and drug problems are brought in by the tube crowd more so than the canoest or boaters. I have witness this first hand year after year. We have picked up there trash and reported them to the rangers. We have heard them cuss the rangers after they were given tickets and have seem them sink bottles and cans in the river after given these tickets. Look on a clear day as to how many cans are laying on bottom of the river. Look some Monday after a heavy weekend of tubes and see how stirred up the gravel is and how many fish beds are disturbed. Canoes and boats don't do this kind of damage. I use to help tubes in need but after helping a few tubers and returning them to their take out, we noticed later they stole our suntan lotion. The problem I see with banning boats is on two occasions in the past few years my wife and I saved two different women who would not have survived had it not been for us being in that part of the river. The second time it took two boats to rescue that lady as to where she was caught in the log jam her head was going under the water. I had to idle in the current while my wife held her head above water. The second boat beached and the driver crawled out on the jam and grabed her while my wife cut the wrope that was wraped around the logs and got her loose. They also had a child with them did not have life jacket on. We got her in the boat before anything happen to her. There isn't enough rangers to cover the entire river. Ban the boats and look for more drownings. Alot more trash. We do a lot of good on the river. I think with less impact. We enjoy the river and hopefully we can continue to do so.</p> <p>The Cracrafts Mo.</p>	6/17/2009	No			MO	63755
88	<p>1)NO-ACTION 2)none 3)Anything to do with limiting horsepower or the use of any motor vehicle in the park. 4)2 rivers to Van Buren 5)All the old beautiful farms have grown up where you can't even walk thru them. You should be ashamed to even think you are doing something good for the people.</p>	6/18/2009	No			MO	63638
89	<p>First off I voted for No-Action. I own and operate a jetboat on the river, so I'm very concerned. The 40 hp limit has been working good for over 10 years. I grew up in the area and love coming back every chance I get. Fishing and camping at Two rivers is my favorite place. I have always given canoes the right of way unless it was physically dangerous. I have seen a few bad apples and do not feel like the rest of us good boaters should be punished. I vote for the water patrol or park service to ticket those jetboaters. Enforce those few bad apples. I see alot of enforcement of drug related events, why? How about more all around service. What ever happened to " To Protect and Service"? Now it only seems that law enforcement want to do is enforce, ie arrest, write tickets, hide in the woods. I have never had one come up to me and ask how I was doing or if I needed any help. It's always: Been drinking or I want to check your boat. How would that make you feel? If I treated my customers that away , I would be out of business. And I really have a problem with rangers hiding out at night around my campsite at Two Rivers. It has happened more that once!!! That is a real postive imagine for the park service! Feel free to contact me at anytime. Stephen Summers</p>	6/18/2009	No			MO	65049
90	<p>1. NO-ACTION. From my heart! What more does the National Park Service want.ver. I am 55 years old and as a younge child grew up on Current River. It breaks my heart to think you want to take away from the local people something that we enjoy with our families. Leave us ALONE!!! 2. NO-ACTION. This is the only thing that should be done. 3. Lowering Horse Power, Closing the river to no motorized. Closing our gravel bars. 4. The whole river. We travel mostly around paint rock to blue springs and we would want that all left alone. 5. I understand that you want to preserve our area, but we would like to still be able to enjoy it at the same time. This is our place to relax and enjoy our families. Our children have grown up here and it is in our blood to be on and enjoy this place. We just want to be left alone and let us enjoy what is ours.</p>	6/18/2009	No			MO	63638
91	<p>1. NO - ACTION. My mother was born around the river 55 years ago. I have been on Current River since I was a few weeks old. My children have been on the river since birth also. We just want to enjoy what is right here in our back yard. We have never been rude to the floaters and we have pulled many of the out of bad situations. With out the boats, there would have been alot more injurys and maybe even deaths. I can only think about a few accidents that have happened in our area with boats. I just would prefer the NPS stay out of it and let us raise our children on the river and let them beable to bring there children also. 2. NO - ACTION 3. Lowering Horse Power 4. I think you should leave the entire river alone, but we mostly travel from paint rock to blue springs. I would hate to see us unable to us this part of the river. 5. I want the river to be preserved</p>	6/18/2009	No			MO	63638

	just as much as you, but in very different ways. Our boats are not causing any damage, the floods in the spring cause much more damage than a few boats. Its not likly that you are going to stop flooding. Just stay out of our way and let us enjoy what we love. It would kill me if I was unable to go over there and relax and just enjoy myself.						
92	#1 No Action is favorable. I am opposed to any further horsepower limitations on the ONSR. The current restrictions are plenty.	6/18/2009	No			MO	63901
93	SIMPLY PUT- THIS WILL HURT MOST OF THE BUSINESSES IN TOWN. PEOPLE WHO RELY ON THE SUMMER MONTHS TO GET THEM THROUGH THE WINTER MONTHS. THIS IS WRONG. HERE IS A SUGGESTION-HAVE PERMITS/NUMBERS ON TUBES. THIS WOULD BE HELPFUL WHEN SOMEONE IS FLASHING/ACTING CHILDISH WHILE FAMILIES ARE TRYING TO ENJOY THE CURRENT RIVER. WHAT WILL PEOPLE DO IN AN EMERGENCY IF BOATS WITH MOTORS ARE BANNED? HOW WILL LAW ENFORCEMENT BE INVOLVED WITH ACCIDENTS? IF THE PUBLIC AREN'T ALLOWED TO HAVE MOTORS WHY SHOULD THEY? IS MEDICAL HELP/LAW ENFORCEMENT GOING TO PADDLE TO THE SCENE? THIS IS CRAZY AND THE DOWNFALL OF CARTER COUNTY.	6/18/2009	No			MO	65615
94	1 I would prefer to see the no-action alternative. The only thing that I would like to see is in the log yard and powder mill area we need some boat ramps. 2) Boat ramps and camping areas. 3) The decrease in motor size. If a family of 4 wants to go to the river or if 3-4 people want to go gigging you need at least a 40HP motor (RATED AT THE PUMP, NOT THE POWERHEAD) to do this safely. We could really use a bigger motor, not a smaller one as the smaller motor will go slower and the slower you go the bigger the wake will be and that will cause the banks to erode more that the bigger motors which produce a smaller wake, but the annual floods that we have is doing a lot more damage to the river than the boats do to the river. 4) All of the places are special and we should be able to enjoy them whether it is by motor boat, foot access, or horse access. I understand that we do not want these places destroyed but at the same time we should be allowed to enjoy them. I would like for my kids to be able to take a boat to the river and float downstream and fish, not have to rent a canoe to fish. 5) It seams to me that the agenda of the NPS is to someday remove all of the motor boats on the river. I think that this would be a mistake as the majority of the local people that are on the river in a boat take a lot better care of it than the people who come from out of the area and float it in a canoe or inner tube a few times a year, and it would also take away a lot of business for the small towns around the river. If you have a problem with the motor boats it is not the motor boats themselves it is the person operating it and the agents should monitor that a little closer. You can buy a car that goes 150MPH but that don't mean that you can drive that fast on the highway.	6/18/2009	No			MO	63638
95	1) Plan A is great ... REALLY GREAT! I can think of nothing to improve on it. 2) I like Big Springs being designated a wilderness area [primitive]. I like the emphasis being placed on quiet river journeys in Plan A. 3)I'm generally opposed to all new development around the riverways. Plan C in general should be given the ax. Plan C is 180 degrees off base, in my opinion. 4) Sadly, "river dorks" are known to frequent all ranges of the riverways. Horse manure and its attendant problems in the lower stretches is something I'd like to see addressed. Current regulations appear to cover the problems but enforcement seems to be the problem. 5) Nothing to add here.	6/18/2009	No			MO	65201
96	NO ACTION	6/18/2009	No			MO	63965
97	1. Yes. No-Action is already close to my idea of the best way to manage ONSR. 2. I feel that more effort should be made to encourage mixed usage in the ONSR and not segregate the different users of this wonderful blessing. Alcohol and its abuse, in my opinion, is the single greatest problem. If alcohol is removed from the river, then the "trouble makers" (canoers, boaters, and campers) will not be in the park to disrupt others. 3. I feel the restrictions imposed on the local and state wide boaters as indicated by alternatives A, B, and C will be very detrimental to the local economy. The restrictions imposed will also be detrimental to the local families that come numerous times per year. We are the ones that promote family atmosphere in the park. 4. The area my family and I spend most of our time on is from Two-Rivers to Powder Mill. This area is beautiful, provides plenty of water year round to navigate our jon boat and has adequate facilities (restrooms, camping, concessions). I have had the privilege of enjoying ONSR my whole life, and relish in every opportunity I have been given to enjoy ONSR with my children. We have so many memories of spending time together cooking hot-dogs, swimming, boating, fishing, gigging, and camping. The alternatives do not address the problems. The alternatives only try to address the symptoms. 5. I feel concessionaires should be further limited on the number of canoes they can operate. I feel there should be no alcohol allowed inside the park. There is more than enough recreation in ONSR without the addition of alcohol. I think there should be more activities planned within the park; clean up days, swimming lessons, summer science camps, canoeing lessons, boating lessons, special fishing events, etc. I think ONSR should team up with the State of Missouri and promote their stream team initiative.	6/19/2009	No			MO	63629
98	#1 - No Action would best describe my view towards the issue #2 - To NOT restrict recreational activities on the national riverways anymore than what is already in place. #3 - Do not include the "limited recreational use" alternative. I believe that there should be unlimited use for recreation. #4 - The entire scenic riverways are special to me. I have been using that area on current river since I was 2 years old. My best memories have been made on that river with friends and family. A change to the current regulations would devalue my opportunities for future memories. #5 - Please remember that local individuals use these areas monthly, weekly, and some even daily. Individuals that only use these areas once a year should not be the voice that is making the drastic changes that have been proposed. If the NPS wants to see the tourist dollars go "bye bye" and watch small businesses in river towns go out of business among other problems, making changes to your current plan will do just that. I am	6/19/2009	No			MO	63901

	strongly against ANY changes to the current plan.						
99	I feel like their should be NO horsepower limitation on the river. Let the boat length, width, and passengers determine where one can go rather than the park board! During July and August boats are almost useless because of the tubes and rafts. I do not live in the area, however the local economy is very dependant on the vacation season. Looks like the administration would look for ways to limit litter and abuse of nature by not letting people trash the river with sacks, coolers, tubes, cans, campfires, and other unsightly things. I vote for no-action! Stop adding regulations! There are plenty already!	6/19/2009	No			MO	63877
100	I would be in favor of no action. I have been a boater for many years and more regulation is not the answer. Boats and motors of any size are not the problem. Profanity, vulgarity, Alcohol, illegal drugs, and general disorderly conduct are the main problems I have seen and encountered over the past thirty years. I would be willing to bet the Missouri State Water Patrol would agree with my assessment. Our law enforcement does a great job, however they can't be at every bend in the river. I own and publish the local paper(Daily American Republic Newspaper)in Poplar Bluff and would be willing to help in any manner to help curb this very questionable behavior.	6/19/2009	No			MO	63901
101	1. Plan A 5. I have been visiting and using these waterways since 1978. Initially, I was single and came there for an experience of nature with friends. Eventually, I have married and raised 3 sons. We have continued to come to Eminence throughout the years and almost yearly over the past 14 years. We come during the week to avoid the crowds and problems that happen at weekend. When our sons were little they were in their own kayaks by age 5. The rivers are welcoming to families. Several times over the years we have panicked when hearing or seeing a motorized boat coming around the bend toward us. The occupants are usually coming fast enough that I worried about the safety of our children. I was not aware that there were horse power restrictions and they boats were coming fast enough to put the safety of our children at risk. We had no recourse as they sped by with no way of reporting them when we get out of the river. Our sons are old enough now to get out of the way. We were just there this month on both the Jacks Fork and Current. The only boat we saw was manned by DNR. My wife's uncle was a camp ground host at Pulltite and had a shelter dedicated to him. I do not see any reason for motorized boats to be on the riverway. From reading the Shannon County Current Wave of June 10th, it is apparent that a few vocal people view the riverway as their playground with the Park Service as the villain. Many of the local people I mentioned this topic to were in favor of change to restrict motorized craft on the water. We all benefit from the oversight of those dedicated to preserving the parks of our country for future generations. Where would Yellowstone be if locals were demanding and still driving ATVs through the park where they pleased? I understand that those who have grown up in the area accept the river as a normal part of their lives. Having lived around the midwest, I understand just how precious and unique these bodies of water are. Maintaining the pristine condition will benefit all who come to visit and invigorate the local economy. We have spent much money at motels River Edge, Riverside, etc and visited local restaurants many times. I write in support of restricting the motorized travel to preserve these treasures for future generations.	6/19/2009	No			IA	52411
102	1) No Action 2) No horsepower restrictions 3) No horsepower restrictions. 4) shoat hole. we purchased a new boat just for the river. 5) I think the tubes should have restrictions. So they don't go totally across the river so no one can go in between them. And enclosed containers & coolers so when they flip over its not spilled in the river. And they keep their trash with them and not throwing it in the river.	6/20/2009	No			MO	63965
103	1) I favor alternative A. It is the closest to my preference for the way ONSR should be managed. 2) Protection of local plants and animals should be a priority. This is a truly unique area not only in Missouri but in the mid-west. 3) I would like to float parts of the river without being swamped by jet boats, having horses defecate in waters I would like to swim in, or having wild parties destroy the peace and quiet I am seeking. I would like to see the impacts of these reduced and, at least on parts of the river, eliminated. While I respect the right for some to earn a living from this unique area, over development and overuse will destroy the very resource they are using to make a living. This area does not have an infinite carrying capacity. 4) The spring areas (Big Spring, Blue Spring, Round Spring, Cave Spring, Welch Spring, Alley Spring, and a number of smaller springs) and the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers are what I think of when I think of some of the truly special places in the Missouri Ozarks. 5) Consider the national importance of this resource for this and future generations not just the local importance of the area to make a living in the here and now without consideration of the long term consequences of over development - degradation of the resource and resultant reduction in the number of the very visitors this businesses want to attract.	6/20/2009	No			MO	64506
104	1. no action 2. no action	6/20/2009	No			MO	63638
105	1. no action 2. no action 3.a, b, c 4. no 5. leave the riverways alone	6/20/2009	No			MO	63638
106	Question #1: Answer: No action: keep HP rating 40hp at the pump for boat motors Question #2: Answer: No action Question #3: Answer: Alternatives A, B, and C Question #4: Answer: No action - love the whole river, leave it alone Question #5: Example answers: build boat ramps, camping hook-ups, bathrooms, etc	6/21/2009	No			MO	63303

107	1) NO ACTION!! 2) NO ACTION!! 3) NO ACTION!! 4) NO ACTION!! 5) NO ACTION!!	6/21/2009	No			MO	63901
108	1) NO-ACTION 2)Preserving the recreational use of the river by Boaters, Hikers, Hunters, Fisherman, Canoeing, Camping, ATV riding, Horseback and Wagon riding, any and all forms of usage premitted on all other rivers in the State of Missouri. This Park was set up as a RECREATIONAL AREA in 1964 and should still be today. 3)Anything to do with a Wilderness and the removal of the people of the State of Missouri. 4) Jacks Fork to Van Buren, this area has less usage by anyone other than boaters. Very few canoers and not many tourist to deal with. 5) I think the Park Service is doing a fine job having their Rangers sitting in tree stands and taking pictures of tourist and giving tickets for smoking dope on the river. But remember "YOU" invited them here in droves. You have very few problems with the local people but we seem to be the ones you want to punish for the overcrowding and use of the river. Remember we are here 52 weeks a year and that tourist you catter to he is here 1 week-end every year or two. I know there are an endless supply of them and only a few thousand of us locals. BUT who do you sit down and eat by in the winter time at the resturant. And if your family has a disaster which group do you think will be there to help. I really hope Mr. Detring does not get his way with this plan.	6/21/2009	No			MO	63638-9711
109	1. NO - ACTION 2. NO - ACTION 3. NO - ACTION 4. NO - ACTION If you did not get my point I think NO - ACTION is the ONLY way to go!	6/21/2009	No			MO	63638
110	1. No - Action. This is the only option that makes any sense to me. Just leave the river alone. I have been there for nearly 30 years and other than flooding changing the way the river flows nothing has changed. 2. No - Action. 3. All of it. 4. All of it. Just leave the river be. 5. No - Action. Just leave the river as it is. We are not hurting anything being there. We LOVE this place more than anything and it would be heart breaking not to feel comfortable going over there and relaxing. I was raised on the river my mom was raised on the river my grandparents grew up on the river and I want to raise my children and grandchildren on the river. My family has a cabin on the river near paint rock and it will not be the same if we can not use the river how we do now. I just want it left alone!!!	6/21/2009	No			MO	63638
111	I vote for No-Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	64060
112	Please stop developing all our natural recources! It is already a shame what is happening on our beautiful rivers in Missouri. I owned property on the Huzzah and had to pick trash out of the river every weekend. People that enjoy nature and not abuse it will still enjoy the beauty of our state. I often get comments from friends and family in other states visiting. Their comments are always on the beauty and serenity of our scenic rivers. As a concerned and avid outdoorsman, please, please do not develop the last of our prestine heritage.	6/22/2009	No			MT	63052
113	1) Alternative 1 2) Float boating, not motor boating. Primitive camping along shore. 3) I oppose development for more motor boating. 4) Keep as natural as possible. 5) Keep as natural as possible. James	6/22/2009	No			CA	94954
114	1. No-Action alternative. Things are fine how they are. 2. None of them. 3. Nothing needs to be done to to further limit hp on the river. 4. 5.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65560
115	1. No Action .. there is enough regulation on our waterways already.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65109
116	Please keep our country free. We support the no action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63627
117	1. Our preference is no action or Alternative A. 2. No comment 3. No motor boats should be allowed. This would definitely take away from the pleasure of canoeing on the river. Although we live in Collinsville, Il, we own property in Salem, Mo.	6/22/2009	No			IL	62234
118	My dad taught me to fish on the Jack Forks River 48 years ago. I stopped taking my family to the Jack Forks about 15 years ago. The environment is horrible. Alternative A is not strict enough! The Park Service has allowed the people that live close to the Park to bully them into permitting fast boats, all terrain vehicles, and horses that should only be allowed on private property and in huge lakes like Table Rock, not the Jack Forks River! The "locals" that I began running across 15 years ago viewed the river as their property, to do with what they may. This mindset has been allowed to persist way too long by the Park Service. Enough is enough. We pay taxes to be able to use these wonderful resources and they can't used enjoyed as intended. No boats. No horses. No all terrain vehicles. If the "locals" don't like it, that's tough. The Parks belong to all of us, but have been highjacked by a select few. I think you'd be amazed at how many people there are just like me in St. Louis. We grew up spending our parent's summer vacation camping and fishing on the Jack Forks, and have forced to travel much farther to the western states to enjoy what the	6/22/2009	No		MO. Conservation Society	MO	63122

	National Parks were originally intended for. Anything but Alternative A will doom this area to becoming a playground for a few at the expense of the many. That's not how a democratic republic is supposed to function. Respectfully submitted, Festus Wade Shaughnessy III						
119	1. WE WANT NO ACTION...LEAVE AS IS....WOULD BE BETTER TO GO BACK TO 1964 PLAN; LEAVE MOTORS RATED AT 40 HP AT THE PUMP, NOT THE POWER HEAD...NO ACTION IS WHAT WE WANT 2. AGAIN, STAY WITH NO ACTION...PLAN A-B-C ARE NOT BENEFICIAL TO LOCAL PEOPLE WHO USE AND LOVE THE RIVER AND TAKE CARE OF IT ON A DAY TO DAY BASIS, UNLIKE PEOPLE WHO COME ONCE A YEAR WE ALWAYS LEAVE OUR RIVER BETTER EACH TIME WE ARE THERE THAN IT WAS BEFORE WE CAME....WE PICK UP TRASH; HELP CANOERS; ONE TIME WE WERE CAMPED, A FAMILY CAME IN TO CARDAREVE GRAVEL BAR, WAY AFTER DARK IN A CANOE, IN THE RAIN...HUNGRY, COLD, TIRED....WE FIXED THEM ALL HOT CHOCOLATE, GOT SOME FOOD IN THEM AND TOOK THEM TO WHERE THEY HAD LEFT THEIR VEHICLE....YOU DON'T READ STUFF LIKE THAT ANYWHERE IN THE REPORTS AND I COULD TELL YOU MANY MORE STORIES OF HOW WE HAVE HELPED PEOPLE ON THE RIVER...NOT LOCAL PEOPLE, BUT WE DO HELP THEM, TOO....BUT PEOPLE WE DON'T KNOW, WON'T EVER SEE AGAIN, BUT HELP THEM BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT YOU DO. OUR LOCAL BUSINESSES BENEFIT FROM OUR LOCAL PEOPLE USING THE RIVER, GAS, FOOD, ETC.....A TRIP TO THE RIVER CAN EASILY RUN OVER \$100 THESE DAYS W/PRICE OF FUEL. WE DO THIS WEEKLY, NOT ONCE A YEAR LIKE PEOPLE OUT OF THE CITY 3. A - B - C NONE OF THESE SHOULD BE PART OF THE PLAN....WE WANT NO ACTION, GO BACK TO BEFORE 1964....WE TAKE CARE OF OUR RIVER OURSELVES....BETTER THAN TOURISTS WHO COME AND GO..OUR FAMILY ALWAYS CLEANS UP AFTER THE PEOPLE WHO COME IN AND USE IT AND GO HOME....WE WANT OUR BOAT MOTORS TO BE RATED AT THE PUMP, NOT THE POWER HEAD, SO WE CAN MOTOR UP RIVER SAFELY WITH OUR FAMILY IN THE BOAT 4. CARDAREVA GRAVEL BAR, LOG YARD, THE RIVER FROM SALEM TO VAN BUREN, INCLUDING OTHER SPOTS WE FREQUENT AND TAKE CARE OF ARE: SPRING HOLLER, ANT HOLE, PAINT ROCK, GRAVEL SPRINGS, MARTIN HOLE...ETC. ETC....WE WANT NO ACTION / ALTERNATIVES A-B-C WOULD PREVENT US FROM ENJOYING OUR SPECIAL PARTS OF THE RIVER, AS WELL AS OUR CHILDREN, GRANDCHILDREN, AND CHILDREN NOT YET BORN IN OUR FAMILY. WE LIVE HERE, WE TAKE CARE OF WHERE WE LIVE...WE DON'T TELL PEOPLE IN ST LOUIS, KANSAS CITY, ETC. HOW TO CARE FOR THEIR NATURAL RESOURCES IN THEIR AREA...OUR IS SPECIAL, AND WE ALL KNOW IT; WE ALREADY MANAGE IT AND HAVE FOR YEARS, BY TAKING CARE OF IT ON AN ONGOING BASIS 5. LEAVE IT BETTER, CLEANER THAN YOU FOUND IT EVEVY TIME....LEAVE MANAGEMENT PLAN AS IS...WE DO NOT WANT OR NEED ALTERNATIVE A-B-C. LEAVE MOTORS RATED @ 40 HP AT THE PUMP, NOT THE POWERHEAD. THE RIVER BELONGS TO ALL OF US TO ENJOY, NOT JUST A FEW....PRIMITIVELY.....ROADS TO THE RIVER HAVE ALWAYS BEEN THERE...THEY ARE NOT DETRIMENTAL TO THE RIVER, AS IS HORSE MANURE...WHERE DO YOU THINK THE DEER MANURE GOES? SAME PLACE AS HORSES, AND IT'S ALL THE SAME STUFF	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
120	Alternative A is the closest to my idea of the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. If I were to modify Alternative A in any way, it might include a goal to purchase privately owned property as resources and opportunities became available. I would suggest that keeping the park as primitive as possible should be the number one goal of the National Park Service in the future management of the national riverways. Visitors should have a sense of remoteness and isolation from the sights and sounds of other people. Areas should be managed for low levels and densities of visitors year-round. I most strongly oppose the use of motorized boats on the national riverways. I also strongly oppose a modest to high level of facilities to meet visitor use and administrative needs. The Upper Jack's Fork is a treasure. Without question, this stretch of river is a favorite for my wife and I. Alternative A addresses my concerns for maintaining the primitive quality of this part of the river.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63104
121	1.) I like No-Action, except there should be more limits on Horsepower limits upstream of Two-River, no restrictions on floating though. 2.) Further limits on motorized boating, because of safety and polution and no limits on floating and non-motorized boating. 3.)Restrictions on Non-Motorized boating. 4.)Current River from Baptist Camp to Two Rivers, reduce motor boat travel. 5.) NA	6/22/2009	No			MO	63601
122	Get rid of of NPS altogether. Run them out of Van Buren. We do not need any more restrictions on Current River. Current River is fine the way it is.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65583
123	Shut up NPS, quit trying to get boaters off of Current River and make it totally tourons. You should be trying to get the annoying, drunk, rude tourists off of the River. Wonder why there is only 1 concesionaire in Van Buren now??? Wonder if this has anything to do with NPS little plan? This is ridiculous. Don't ruin it for the LOCALS!!!!!!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63935
124	I will love to be a part of this with Kevin.	6/22/2009	No		ozark hsr	MO	63047
125	1) Alternative "A" seems to have a good balance between human usage and nature. It's much better than "No Action". 2) Designate the Big Spring area as wilderness as proposed. 3) No development areas. 4) I have been concerned about the stretch from Big Spring to Gooseneck, since that is the area I run in my 20 HP boat. Alternative "A" will remove the 275 HP outboard barges that tend to tarnish my trips. For me, it has been a concern over both my (and my passengers) safety, and the aquatic habitat destruction that has obviously been happening over many years due to the unlimited boat horsepower. The people traveling up and down the river at 50 MPH don't have time to enjoy anything other than the racing aspect. I never understood how this could be legal on a national scenic riverway. It just never made sense to me. I grew up on the river and still use the same boat we had as kids and its always been more than adequate. 5) I think your alternatives (other than "no action") are all workable	6/22/2009	No			MO	63939

	and appropriate. Just think of all the money the people will save over what they spend now, while receiving a higher quality experience.						
126	1. The "No Action" plan is close to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I would consider modifying it in the following way to improve it. a. Put in another boat launch ramp, permanant concrete, around Big Tree (Between Big Spring and Cataract). b. Put in a permanant ramp at cataract that is easier to launch a boat at and provide parking for a limited number of boats/trailers. c. Outlaw loud foul language. Tubers are the reason I try to avoid areas below where they are launched because of the language. Whether it's the Current River or Eleven Point, it seems more than 1 beer and foul language go hand in hand. My last two outings involved this kind of situation. It's not just happening, it's common. 2. 3. Limiting boats to a max of 25HP on areas on the Current River seems excessively conservative and should NOT happen. FYI, I do have a 25HP jet, so it wouldn't affect me, HOWEVER, a 40HP maximum above Van Buren is acceptable and seems reasonable for a river the size of the Current River. Further restriction is unnecessary. 4. Waymeyer boat ramp is a big concern to me. It is currently dangerous to launch a boat there with the poor ramp situation. I understand that a recommended launch near Pin Oak Bluff is recommended, which I support. 5. Although probably not within Park Service authority, a length limit on goggle eye (Rock Bass) would be welcomed by most anglers. A 7 or 8 inch minimum would be great!	6/22/2009	No			MO	65775
127	Folks, My wife and I currently live in Imperial, MO (St. Louis); however, we are buying our retirement home in my home town of Doniphan, MO (on Current River). While the Ozark National Scenic Riverways does not affect Ripley County, I sincerely feel that I need to weigh in here concerning Current River flowing through it. Our experience, as well as NUMEROUS Ripley County natives, is that inboard Jet Boats (i.e. running 350hp car motors) should be OUTLAWED On Current River through Ripley County to the Arkansas border. These boats are KILLING the river for both the natives of the area and others that like to fish and float this very beautiful stream. We see more and more of these high price jet boats on the river GOING FLAT OUT with no regards to either fishermen or floaters. The biggest problem that we encounter is people from out of the county, mainly from Poplar Bluff, MO., who come over on weekends and destroy any hope of others having a peaceful, relaxing time on it. I'd bet that Mr. Yabor has one of these boats or he's representing others that do. I, and a number of others, would like to see a maximum of a 200hp outboard with a jet unit / 150hp with a prop. Is there ANYONE that can help us reclaim the once fairly peaceful and beautiful Current River for ALL. I have no problems with others from outside of Ripley county using it, but big jet boats HAVE to go somewhere else like the lakes if wanted. Please, Please, HELP us to try and save this treasure that is VERY quickly going downhill. It's no longer any fun on the weekends when all the big boats take the river over. And if you have to work during the week you're out of luck pretty much in being on it. Any help that you can give us would be appreciated VERY, VERY much!!! Sincerely, Harry Truman Herring 2804 Terrace Vw Imperial, MO 63052 htntsl@yahoo.com	6/22/2009	No			MO	63935
128	1. I strongly believe in no-action. I was practically raised on the banks of the current. I moved away not long ago, for better paying jobs, but what I miss the most is being able to float, tube, horseback ride, or fish whenever I wanted, wherever I wanted.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65501
129	1. Alternative A best describes my idea of how to manage and conserve this beautiful precious resource. I would definitely like to see this scenic riverway remain as slow-paced and natural as possible with no further commercial development, roads,motorized vehicles or people to pollute the natural communities in the ONSR. 2. "There would be more opportunities for traditional,nonmechanized forms of recreation, and activities that are quieter, less crowded, and slower paced." "To help restore conditions, many signs of park overuse would be fixed.For example, the park would close roads and trails that have been illegally developed." "Protection of Ozark heritage, such as local plants and animals and Ozark structures and settings, would be important parts of creating these conditions." --"more hiking/walking trails" (non-motorized access) 3. Any parts that allow motorized boats & vehicles in the rivers(crossings). Also if there are horse or cow operations that are affecting the water quality of the water. These are my top 2 concerns for these scenic rivers. 5. Public outreach & education on how to help preserve & conserve these precious resources. i.e. More DNR directories available to folks to identify & report pollutuion. Thanks for the opportunity to comment & taking care of some of the most beloved streams in Missouri!	6/22/2009	No		Missouri River Relief	MO	65205
130	1) Alternative A is the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Restricting development and encouraging preservation is the best way to ensure that this area will remain enjoyable for future generations. Although increasing development and roads might lead to a seem like a good solution to increase accessibility, in the long-term it will lead to a disappearance of our natural resources. Development might be good for specific individuals, but it will be detrimental to everyone collectively. If I could improve A, I would prohibit motorboats from the entire river and expand the park to a wider swathe of land along the river. As I recognize this is likely impracticable, A is a solid alternative. 2) The most important parts that need to be included in the future management are the chance for non-mechanized and quiet activities. This means the prohibition of motor boats from as much of the river as possible. Reduced crowds would also be nice, but crowds are definitely fine so long as they respect the river and others around them. I also very strongly support the proposal of wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. Less important, but still good ideas, are eliminating the illegal roads that exist in the park and reducing the impact of overuse. 3) I am strongly opposed to more boat ramps and trails. I am opposed to more buildings. 4) I greatly enjoy the Jack's Fork river, and I really dislike encountering motorboats when I enter the Current River. It would be nice if the ambiance and feel of the Jack's Fork river could continue into the Current River.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63112
131	We are frequent visitors to the entire area and I like it much the way it is and would not like to see many changes. One definite change though would have to be limiting the number of horses allowed at the Cross Country Trail Rides. We have been swimming in the river when an official came by testing the water and told us it was not fit for swimming due to the recent trail riding. I would hate to see a large amount of development because it may bring in too many crowds that would just destroy the peace and solitude available now. More casual development would be	6/22/2009	No			MO	63129

	appreciated such as hiking trails and interpretive activities.						
132	<p>1. I believe that alternative A should be chosen for the long-range plan for the ONSR. I believe that if changes in the management of the resource are not made, we are in danger of losing this unique resource. My only suggestion for modification of this alternative is that the numbers of innertubes and rafts should be controlled in addition to the number of canoes. 2. The part of the alternatives that I am most concerned with because it affects me the most personally is river usage. My husband and I have floated and fished on Current River for many years. We had property at Van Buren until about 10 years ago. We fished for smallmouth bass between Paint Rock and Watercress and for trout at Montauk State Park regularly. We quit smallmouth fishing because the river became so crowded and the behavior of the visitors was so offensive that those trips were not enjoyable. Two years ago, we were fortunate enough to purchase a cabin at the north end of the park. We have once again begun to be able to float and fish in the traditional way, though now we are fishing from our canoe for trout instead of smallmouth. There are other places besides the ONSR that people can ride around in fast boats. There are other places that people can party and drink. I know of nowhere else that we could fish in the traditional Ozark way, and I would very much like to be able to continue fishing and for others to be able to experience what we are so fortunate to do. 3. I think all parts of this alternative should be included. 4. My main concern is the northern part of the park; from Montauk State Park to Akers Ferry. My concern about this section of the river is finding a balance between maintaining the resource, providing an enjoyable experience for as many people as possible, and making sure the experience is indeed enjoyable. I believe that limiting the numbers of rented innertubes and rubber rafts the way the number of canoes is limited would help by allowing a reasonable number of people on the river at any time. 5. I have no other suggestions.</p>	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
133	<p>(1) NO ACTION - This Alternative provides the best option for residents of the area who primarily access the park by boat. I would improve it by improving and adding boat access in the Upper Current - South Segment and the Lower Current areas where floaters do not frequent. This would allow boaters to conveniently use these areas and voluntarily avoid the heavily floated areas where the well developed accesses currently exist (Two Rivers, Watercress, Van Buren Bridge and Big Springs). I would also modify the regulation verbage to allow the 60 HP engines, rated at the powerhead. This would allow the use of the popular engines being used today, including those being used by the National Park Service. These engines provide sufficient power to plane a boat with a normal family without creating excessive speed that creates a concern with the Park Service. (2) No Comment (3) Any decrease in the engine horsepower should not be included. Not only would a decrease in horsepower render millions of dollars of local citizen's investments in boats illegal, but would restrict our ability to share the river experience with our children and families. This plan should be about increasing opportunities with reasonable protections for the Park, not about restricting them. I also believe that no additional lands should be given Wilderness Status. Past experience has proven that this would severely restrict access to all but a very minute portion of the population, and again the plan should be about increasing opportunities to enjoy, learn and appreciate. (4) My biggest concern, that is not address by any alternative, is the lack of adequate and developed boat access points on the Winona side of the Upper Current - Lower Segment (Rocky Creek area) and the west side of the Lower Current Segment (Cedar Springs area). Additional access in these areas would allow boaters an alternative to the landings at Two Rivers, Watercress, Van Buren Bridge and Big Springs, all of which see high concentrations of canoes and tubes. (5) The most important concept that I think the Park Service should always keep in mind is that, while it is your job to manage and protect the Park for all citizens of the United States, it is the people of the area who will always be the ones who feel a true ownership of the river. It is a part of our daily lives, our history and our heritage.</p>	6/22/2009	No			MO	65438
134	<p>1) I am STRONGLY in favor of leaving the beautiful Ozark National Scenic Riverway just as it is. Please do NOT alter it to include any more development of any kind! Indeed, generate a plan that would have short and long range plans to REDUCE the over development of these areas! The very reason people discovered and returned time after time was for the scenic riverways natural beauty; it's rustic untouched splendor. Any proposal to further develop these areas will result in more of the same over development that currently exists! More development will bring only more beer and loud obnoxious people. I used to visit the Current River every year, and did so for some 15 years. I rarely go now. In fact, I haven't been to the Current River in more than 8 years. I have located a few other areas that remain less developed; where I can canoe without seeing houses on the cliffs, hear loud music coming from canoes and camp sites. If I want noice and "attractions" I can always go to Six Flags! Reverse the trend! Change the objective from attracting "more people" to attracting and keeping people who appreciate southern Missouri's unique charm. The Ozark Scenic Riverway was just fine. Was. I hope the Current River area return to it's former glory so that I may return. Thank you, Dan Bartelt Quincy, IL</p>	6/22/2009	No			IL	62301
135	<p>1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Although it is difficult to wade thorough the numerous color coded charts and lengthy descriptions of like sounding terminology, I cannot say that any of them seem to strike me as a successful way to manage the riverways. I think you all are in a pickle. The subject that seems to be in question is polite and courteous behavoir, which is certainly out of your jurisdiction. I do believe the most likely to be successful is the no action plan as it requires minimal change for locals, who will definately be the most queroulous to'manage' The window of management that was perhaps missed by the ONSR was at the onset of jet motorized boats. Before jet boats, it took skill to navigate the river with a prop, and the horsepower issue took care of itself. But in a single generation, the local population now feels a right to do something years of boating on these streams did not-- invade on the solitude and pace of a stream that is rightly deserving of the national endowment it has received. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? This would be so much easier if I were able to cut and paste from your</p>	6/22/2009	No			MO	65560

	<p>alternatives... I feel strongly I should be able to take my privately owned canoe to the river to fish and float. I feel strongly any activity that prevents me from enjoying the fishing, ambience and quietude of the river should be minimized. I think all the alternatives consider these two aspects. I think having the Big Springs area wilderness is good, but probably unrealistic, let's stick with something you can enforce, like primitive. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? I feel strongly the more you try to do the less effective you are going to be. And more importantly the less the river experience is being supported. These rivers are teachers in themselves, and need nothing to augment them. Although Ranger presentations sound good, they detract and suppress the ability of nature to be its own teacher. No one needs to be taught how to enjoy this river. If someone can't enjoy what is naturally there, go home, and let those of us that want to be alone with the river be. A visit back to the past sounds unrealistic and unnecessary. Again, let the river do the planning and talking. More areas for people does not sound like a good idea (alternative C) This is more upkeep, more management, that may sound good, but never really works out as good as it sounded on paper. In short, most of the alternatives include new programs that will require money and management and, well, if this was a theme park, ya, but it is not. Hey there is an idea- why not a theme park run by the ONSR in St Louis? that might solve a LOT of problems... 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Since the alternatives were ambiguous in which areas (with the exception of Big Spring area) would be 'restored to more pristine....' this is a hard question to answer. So, no, I guess without specificity the alternatives did not address them adequately. However, I got a kick out of no camping on gravel bars above Round Springs- are you kidding? Did Eugene Maggard write this? 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? YES! This is a public river. The public should be able to use it as long as they don't hurt it and are polite to others. This is your job, to make sure these two things happen, and then sit back and let the river teach and guide and help people to appreciate what an exceptional piece of our world it is. Micromanaging the public's experiences outside protecting the river is a mistake- the river has plenty to offer (that is why it is a national treasure). If horseback riding, ATV's, jet boats, fourwheelers.... are harming it, then it is within your power and obligation to protect it. If people are naked and puking and cussing and fighting, then it is within your power and obligation to stop them. The public has a right to enjoy the river, let them decide how that is to be done. One other comment- I know the jet boat issue is huge. I enjoy the upper river, and so this doesn't effect me much, but I think an important point that might be brought up in the defense of lowering HP limits is the amount of impounded water in the state of Missouri available to motorized boats, vs the amount of canoe dedicated waters. These guys can get all uppity about Ozark culture etc, but I'm pretty sure their grandpa's didn't use a jet boat.</p>						
136	<p>1.no-action i am on the current river most every weekend and as much as possible i work for the us forest service the problem with the river is not the horse power limits its all of the alcohol on the river drunks driving boats,paddeling canoes,floating in tubes,alcohol should not be allowed on the river.in my years on the river i have pulled many of drunken tubers & canoers out of many bad places and drowning situations.throwing rocks at people and obscene gestures,drunken fights on gravelbars,many beer cans in the river one year below the big spring there were thousands of beer cans in the water on the bottom of the river.As for boaters alcohol in any form should not be allowed. floaters should have to wear bright life jackets and bright floatation devices as a seasoned boater these are very easy to see black tubes are not. We also need more officers on the river these officers have a very tedious job and lots of river to cover We should give them all the materials and man power they need.</p>	6/23/2009	No			hc2 box 592	63787
137	<p>Question #1-I am for the No-Action plan. We already have a limit on our motors and they do not go very fast. The majority of us are considerate of other people on the river and slow down or move over as far as possible when passing them by on the river. For those few who are rude, you should have more water patrol on the river to control this issue. Question #2-I believe you should keep the No-Action plan because you already have in place limits on the boats that was put in place years ago. It has made a difference and now families can actually enjoy going to the river without being run over by racing boats. Question #3-Action A, B, and C are not even close to what you should do to protect our waterways for the enjoyment of the public. It looks as if you are trying to take away all rights for any citizen, especially those who keep this town running, to enjoy the rivers. Question #4-We very rarely go on Jack's Fork because it usually is too low for a boat to run up that way. We go up and down Two Rivers and sometimes you cannot go very far because the water level. So I think you should just leave it alone the way it is! Question #5-We were at the river two weekends ago and within a 5 hour time we did not see any Park Service or Water Patrol about. We went up past Big Creek and down to the bridge. There's your problem. This would be like griping that people are speeding on the highways and being unruly when you don't have any law enforcement out to control the issue. As anyone knows, when the law is around, the people will behave better.</p>	6/23/2009	No			MO	6566
138	<p>1. No Action is not only close to my ideal, it is my ideal. However, none of the alternatives restrict or further limit the number of tubes allowed on the river. In my experience it seems like 99.9 % of the litter in the river is from drunken tube floaters. The local residents in motorized boats respect their home and take great pains not to harm it. The tourists don't have that same respect, it's just a playground to them. 2. Many of us local people have made an investment in our motorized watercraft and have larger horsepower motors to carry our friends and families to gravel bars down river below where the tourists go. Please leave us one place for us to go. Down river from Big Spring to Gooseneck is perfect for us. 3. I really believe the best way to preserve this river is not to further restrict the local boating folks, but to further restrict the tubes rented on the river. Those are the people that mess everything up. Go out and see for yourselves.</p>	6/23/2009	No			MO	63965
139	<p>1) Alternative A. 2) Keep horses and human waste away from the water. 3) Boats and motors should be allowed. I rented land adjacent to one half mile of the Huzzah about ten years ago. Many locals used larger boats and acted responsibly. The only people who abused it were visitors. 4) The springs. Alternative A best addresses it. 5) The older I get, the more I like horses, but horses do too much damage to the river banks and water quality. Somehow, the number of canoes that are rented must be held in check. There are just too many people floating the river. Their party atmosphere must be balanced with quiet time for fishing or other outdoor activity. I'm not against having fun on the river, but most of the</p>	6/23/2009	No			MO	63074

	floaters belong at Six Flags, instead. Law enforcement spends too many resources busting people for nudity, and minor drug and alcohol use. You can spot officers dressed in black, hiding in the woods, waiting to bust someone for a lighting up a joint. I would have like to have seen them bust people for using glass bottles and foul language. The National Scenic Riverways are too important of a resource to "improve" it by dumping more structure and people into it. Without stepping too much on the locals, we need to preserve what we have. Developing something, making it easier to access, doesn't improve the resource, it degrades it. The development mentality has got to stop.						
140	Question 1. Yes, I favor alternative B. This seems to be the best plan to carry on the work I once did to promote the establishment of the Ozark Scenic Riverways National Park back in the late to mid-1950s. I was editor at that time of a state-wide, agriculturally-related magazine, circulation over 200,000. I wrote and photographed images for a continuing series of articles in support of the NPS plans to manage Jack's Fork and Current Rivers. Those plans have proven to be satisfactorily put into effect. I approve.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63122
141	Option C is totally unacceptable. I believe there are some areas that should be free of commercialism and this is definitely one of them.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63044
142	1)A. Anything that can be done to preserve a "wild" experience for visitors. If you want development and evidence of human encroachment, go to a water park. Not our national riverways. 2)n/a 3)C 4)n/a 5)Prohibit alcohol consumption, but relax restrictions on things such as cliff diving etc. Clear minded people should be free to make their own recreational decisions in the area. However, alcohol consumption endangers everyone.	6/23/2009	No			IL	62301
143	NO ACTION	6/23/2009	No			MO	63050
144	1) I believe the answer comes from your purpose and significance statements, the first of which is to preserve and protect the land and riverways. If this list of purposes is prioritized then the first statement should be the driving principle that decisions are based on. First we protect what we have, then and only then should we consider other activities, plans, etc. Meaning that plan A would be my choice; I however would be willing to argue that even this plan does not do enough to protect the park. 2) I feel very strongly that something should be done about motor boats on the rivers. We can't bring dirt bikes or four wheelers down to run through the woods on, so why should people be aloud to run up and down the river on the water going equivalent? 3) I found one of the examples in "Alternative A" to be quite confusing. "For example, the park would close roads and trails that have been illegally developed." Why is it that we must go through years of planning and public hearings and most likely legal hearings, as well, to stop something that the NPS admits is already illegal? The agency does not need to pass Alternative A in order to close illegally developed roads, it need only live up to its responsibilities, and enforce its laws. 4) Sound scientific information and logical reasoning should be used to manage the entirety of the park. 5) I find the parks tolerance of exotic species (i.e. feral horses and trout) completely unacceptable. Again, the primary purpose of the park is to protect and preserve NATURAL communities. The fact that the NPS allows exotic species to be maintained on these lands is irresponsible, both biologically and fiscally speaking. Furthermore the agency has taken this even further by actually promoting these exotic species, and in doing so sends a message to the public that this is ok. Why not allow feral hogs and cats, as well as a healthy population of Asian carp, zebra mussels, and kudzu to make their home at ONSR as well? By allowing exotic species to exist on park lands the NPS is promoting the degradation of natural communities, not the protection of them.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65203
145	1)NO ACTION!	6/23/2009	No			MO	63640
146	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ozark Scenic Riverways plan. Alternative A is my choice; however, in the lower Current/Jacks Fork region, I would vote for motor limits of 25 HP.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65201
147	I believe that the 40 horsepower limit from big springs boat ramp should be lifted. This would allow those of us that use the river in boats could access van buren where we would spend dollars in the local economy. Also I believe the 40 horse limit should not even be a consideration to limit it upon the lower riverways. I have owned one and if a person has over 2 people in his boat it will not even plane which causes much more damage to the environment than a boat that will get on top quickly and handle right. If a person has an opprotunity to take his family he is out of luck if he has grown kids or grandkids. I have spent hours picking up trash from the river bottom and at times rescuing tubers and canoers from rootwads and brush. I mention that not to hammer them but to say that I am more of an asset than a liability to those folks. Alternatives in my mind should be to leave things alone with the exception of possible more water patrol or park rangers visible on the river. I believe the visibility would do more to deter rowdy behavior than all the rules and regs you could possibly pass. thank you for your time,	6/23/2009	No			MO	63901
148	1. I am in favor of alternative A. However, I would like to see more restrictions on the Current river. I would like to see an absolute ban of all motors, including trolling motors on the Current River. It should be a peaceful river free from noise and pollutants. 2. Again I feel strongly that all motorized vessels be eliminated from the Current River. Horse numbers should be limited and restricted to certain areas limiting their contact with waterways and flood plains. I feel that road access should be limited to one access point every 7 or 8 miles. This includes four wheel drive roads and ATV trails. 3. I feel that any alternatives that would weaken current restrictions should not even be considered. 4. The upper section of the Current river between Akers and Montauk state park is an area I hold dear to me. I wish that vehicle access would be eliminated from Libbs hole,	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466

	pothole, and flying w. 5. I think visitors should be informed by signs and literature that vehicles and motors bring poison and pollutants to our public lands. To ensure tranquility for future generations we must preserve the resources. I wish it was like it used to be, 150 years ago. Cut access roads by 85%, eliminate motors, and therefore increase numbers of visitors that want preserve nature rather than destroy it.						
149	No action or reduce the number of canoes on the river	6/23/2009	No			MO	65438
150	The only comment of concern to me is the modification of existing horsepower zones on the rivers (#1). I do not want any changes as this would devastate the local economy. It would eliminate the enjoyable boating and fishing that many of us enjoy and respect. Life would change drastically for all business owners in Van Buren and Eminence. These areas are already economically depressed. Thousands of boat owners would go to different rivers. There would also be many boats rendered useless by this change. Few people can afford to toss out their motors and purchase 25 hp motors. Please to not change the hp regulations! Missouri has no mountains or beaches so our rivers are the only means to recreate in water without going to big lakes. Let them be!	6/23/2009	No			MO	63141
151	1) Preliminary alternative A is my choice for the best way to manage ONSR. I believe this is consistant approach that balances the traditional view of stream/park management while providing a place for people with varied intesets to enjoy the park. There are no rights that are without limitation. Those who oppose the horsepower limit on sections of the steams are failing to consider the implications they are having on the health of the stream and the scenic experience other people. Please protect this area for everyone to enjoy by limiting the horsepower of vehicles allowed on the stream!	6/23/2009	No		Missouri State University	MO	65897
152	Dear Sirs, I am a local land owner (although not a Missouri resident yet) of an 80 acre property 1 mile south of Robert's Field. We bought the property a few years ago for retirement. 37° 6'34.75"N 91°10'25.36"W Being a former resident of Minnesota and having fond memories of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, my wife and I immediately started exploring by hiking and canoeing the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. We've visited all the easily accessible springs, a few camp grounds and Montauk. Everyplace we visited was a delight. Our explorations were not without a few negative experiences (not many, but a few). First is the trash. For us it's amazing that people would so wantonly and deliberately deface the this beautiful place. Being from the city, the mentality of these individuals seems akin to taggers and graffiti sprayers; almost a right of defiance. It appears to us that a large amount of the trash is spread by the local residents. The short 5 mile stretch of NN and CR-522 leading to Rogers Field is full of beer cans and plastic bottles. Every day of 2008 visit, we stopped to collect fresh empties on NN (no not in the grass shoulder). Upon leaving, we collected a large garbage bag full of trash on the narrow dirt stretch of CR-522 leading to Rogers Field without ever stepping into the woods. That's a bag in just 200 yards! Second is motor noise. We purchased our property thinking that being nestled in MDC and ONSR lands would bring an element of peace and quiet. We bought the property in the off season, at which time it was very serene. However, our warm season visits have not been so pleasant. Our chief complaint is with the jet boats. It's truly astounding how the engine noise echoes through the hollers. Even a mile away from Robert's Field the noise is loud and clear, easily drowning out the not too quiet frogs and insects of our clearings and pond. We've also had a few encounters with the boats on the water. Nothing overtly threatening, as we always paddle towards the shallows at the first sound of an advancing boat. Again the noise is our main objection. I would like to strongly suggest noise limits and enforcement. I am also concerned about the damage potential boaters pose to fish nests. While canoeing we saw many fish nests (bowls in the sand) in the back-washes. Although it's not all that likely that a jet boat will be operating in a backwash, a brisk jet stream would surely destroy a nest. Third is drunk and obnoxious boaters and campers. It's sad, but the visitors to the ONSR just seem to have a different attitude when compared to those that visit Arches or Zion National Park. In summary, our complaints are noise, trash, and a general lack of respect by the visitors. We prefer and support Alternative A. We believe that reducing motorized access will go a long way towards reducing noise and reducing drunkenness (transport of beer and ice), and limiting access will help preserve the park. We understand the motivation behind Alternative B and like the idea of helping visitors discover the "more hidden but special things about the park", but find it hard to support due to the development and the large increase in "Resource-based recreation". We are highly opposed to Alternative C. Thank you for the opportunity to comment Sincerely, Brian and Petra Rasche Orlando, FL www.petrabrian.com	6/23/2009	No			FL	32803
153	subject: The proposed ideas for the lower current around big spring. I am not aware what the ideas are exactly for the area with that being said. I do not believe their is a problem with the current rules and regulations in this area. I believe that the River above roundspring has been a tourist trap for many decades now And, that you should leave what little we locals have left alone so that we can enjoy our way of life. At the least let it not be forgotten that you took alot of our families farms in the 60s granted. You paid But, To many like my grandfather that land was priceless and you have been taking away from us ever since for mere commerce while claiming preservation. I believe you want to eventually chase us out completely So, you can all stand back and say look at how great we are we beat a bunch of rednecks out of their heritage.On the upper current river you have already restricted the way we travel to and from the river by blocking roads and writing tickets for commerce. You have restricted the way we can fish by creating special areas for commerce. You have let one canoe company own three of only six permits so he can pad his pockets (Thats called commerce). Why not just close it down put a fence around and only let your paying customers in. With every passing year it seems more and more apparant that what my grandfather told me many times in one form or another. Dont get used to it son one day you proly wont be allowed here anymore because they think its pretty.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65560

154	<p>1) Preliminary Alternative A is the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I think limiting traffic to the river to canoes and johnboats. Motorboats are loud and noisy. Oftentimes the operators of the motorboats behave in an irresponsible manner toward other individuals. Therefore I think it would be best to limit motorboat access on the ONSR. I love the idea of proposing that Big Spring be put on wilderness designation. 2) I agree entirely with Preliminary Alternative A, but I also like parts of Alternative B. I think it would invaluable to open a few areas where there is still an old Ozark homestead or cemetery and offer interpretative programs or displays to help educate visitors about the Ozark's unique heritage and culture. I do not, however, trust that the public would respect other sites, such as a unique water habitat or cave site without NPS personnel watching over it. Roads and pathways that have been made illegal should be shut down and anyone caught using them should be fined. Overall, the parts of the alternatives that I think should be included are: limiting motorboat usage; set up interpretive displays or programs that educate the public regarding Ozarks culture and heritage; keep rowdy behavior down on the river; limit the number of commercial operations and facilities to keep down infringement upon the park's resources; shut down illegal trails and roads. 3) The parts of the alternatives that should not be included are primarily listed in alternative C. The ONSR should not become a mecca for family reunions or community gatherings. Commercial businesses and facilities should be severely limited and kept in check to prevent sprawl and growth that would hurt the OSNR. The park should not become a natural Disneyland. It should be kept as close to what it originally was decades, if not centuries, ago. 4) I love the ONSR. 5) Hire more NPS law enforcement personnel to deal with the rowdies and keep the public in check. I would advise that the officers always attempt to establish a rapport with the public instead of taking a heavy handed approach if given the opportunity, but if left no other option, fine the folks who violate the rules and regulations. Make the river a safe place for everyone: single individuals, couples, families. Thanks for giving the public a chance to provide input. Best of luck.</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	64850
155	<p>Can't one stream (nationally known, locally enjoyed) be reserved for non-motorized use? For one of the premier floating streams in the country, can't we keep horse use and feces out of this one stretch? As quiet in nature is becoming more rare, it becomes more essential, valuable and desired. It is in the economic interest of that area, and the state, not to further tarnish this jewel and eventually lose the reputation it has enjoyed as a wonderful floating and fishing experience. Let's bring back the original intent (which should have been long enforced so we need not have gotten to this point) of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
156	<p>1) I would prefer Option A, returning the rivers back to quieter natural state. 2) Option A, any development will just be a stepping stone for future encroaching of the natural state. 3) Option C, this should be discarded completely. Any development will further degrade the natural state until these rivers are no more than man made water ways where people will sit in a mechanically moved boat watching the entertainment along the banks. 4) I have not been on the river is several years and the names of the places are very vague if remembered at all. But, places I remember with fondness are Akers ferry - a very old still working ferry, the cave, the old mill I had the pleasure of following a couple park rangers and listening as they discribed the area while they inspected the site, and an area where the current split, leaving a fair size island where my then fiance and I stopped for a small noon picnic we have since been and will soon celebrate 16 years of marrage. If Option A is used Yes, I believe it will address these site, any development in Options B or C will most likly impact these sites with more and larger motor boats, the need for more trails or more roads and areas for vehicles to get around to like parking while they unload the bigger boats, walk to a concession stand that has been built next to a historic site like the Old Mill. 5) I can only think of rule pamphlets to let people know what is expected of them while on these rivers, stiffer fines to deter and also fund or Subsidize the pamphlets as well as the rangers that may be needed to police the area. In all the times I have floated the rivers I may have seen park rangers twice, possibly three times. I wish I could give a few more suggestions but at this time I draw a blank.</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	65202
157	<p>1) On the whole, I favor Alternative A because it seems to emphasize restoration of the Riverways to its original integrity. 2) Again, favoring Alternative A, I feel strongly that parts of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be designated as wilderness area. Realizing that we have already destroyed or at least damaged the habitat of millions of other species, we need to set aside a substantial amount of land and river for their use. The areas open to humans should be for low-impact activities. The educational component could be very valuable, teaching people about the bioregion, the various ecosystems, the many species, and the human as part of the whole. 3) I would favor no motorized vehicles at all (no ORVs, ATVs, or motor boats). 4) No specific area 5) Basically and generally, the first principle is "Do no harm." And secondly, restore and respect.</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	63139
158	<p>Clearly, I favor alternative A. The motor boaters have turned the river into a drunken speed way. A matter that also greatly concerns me is the amount of time motor homes are allowed to park on a gravel bar and many times no one is staying in the home. Commonly we see homes parked at spots just to reserve the spot for a weekend coming up. Most my camping is done spring/fall during the week and an area like across from Blue Spring a motorhome can be there on a Tuesday all the way through a Friday when I head back home. Thank you for listening.</p>	6/24/2009	No		Missouri Camper	MO	63020
159	<p>I believe you should take no action other than monitoring for problems caused by people that have no respect for public property or public behavior. This area is crowded because it is a wonderful area. Anyone who wants to restrict its use to only a few people who will hike in are being selfish and are not being considering the majority of people who use it. I am not someone who swims or canoes often but I love to travel the roads and trails. I am always surprised to find how many people are out in the area. I think more facilites should be provided ie. campsites and picnic areas. I also think all cemeteries should have a road kept open, especially for extended family.</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	65248
160	<p>1) No-Action There are already so many rules and regulations it is ridiculous. We camp every year and every year there are more rules to follow. Needless to say my family will not be going this year. We mind our business keep our camp clean and forbid that we have more than two campers at a site. We do not destroy things and we leave the site better than when we arrived. It seems to me it is becoming a communist type management system. I was born and raised here and have never seen the likes of the changes that have happened over the years. Some were good but several not so good. Things need to be left alone. 5) Quit being such jerks and don't judge the whole area because of some that don't</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	65548

	follow the rules. It isn't right to pass judgement on all. We pay taxes and support the community and you are trying to take away any kind of rights that we have with the rivers. If these plans that you have proposed are going to deter some of these people that have used these rivers all of their lives I think you are mistaken. I have come across some of your NPS employees and let me tell you they are a bunch of arrogant, know-it-all jerks. It is their way regardless of what the situation is. Like I said my family will not be at the river this summer and if things don't change will never use the river again. Last summer we was woke up at 3am because they was looking for someone. They was looking for a red canoe that had done something up river from us and since we had a red canoe at our camp they woke us to ask us questions. The problem with the situation was that the canoe they were looking for belonged to a canoe rental that is clearly marked and our canoe has nothing on it because we bought it new. There was never an apology from them or I made a mistake etc. from them. So I have to say LEAVE THINGS ALONE. This world is bad enough the way it is without more crap from the govt.					
161	1) I favor Alternative B because it emphasized traditional activities, and allows for an expansion of the visitors experience by offering land based interpretive services, and disallows motorized vehicle activities that diminish the natural and recreational value of resources. 2)Alternative A I like the emphasis on traditional, family-oriented recreation and de-emphasis on motorized forms of recreation would be de-emphasized. I grew up floating the Current on my family vacation every year, and would like to do the same with my children but have not done so because I am unwilling to expose them to the lewd and rowdy behavior so prevalent on the rivers now. Alternate B - I like the way Interpretation and Education would be expanded for, particularly self-guided trails to remote sites and ranger-led tours of special features. 3)I feel Alternative C is not acceptable. Additional facilities to accommodate more visitors would detract from the inherent attraction of the rivers as natural destination. In my opinion, higher horse power boats and personal water craft should not be present on Ozark rivers because these activity impinges on others' use of the river. These activities are best conducted on a reservoir where there is more room for all, and where the other waterway users are engaged in the same activities. On a river, those who are canoeing or floating on a tube are negatively affected by those noise and wake from each passing jet ski or ski boat. The presence of high horse power boats and personal watercraft is detrimental to the floater's experience, and the floater should be given priority because that activity is the traditional Ozark River mode of recreation. Large trail ride events provide "fun" for a limited group of people at the expense of water quality, which is not appropriate when so many recreational users are in the water and plant and animal resources in and around the river need to be protected. Large trail rides should not be held in proximity to protected rivers. 4) No opinion 5)Please allow adequate resources for the additional enforcement staff and equipment that will be needed.	6/24/2009	No		MO	65101
162	1) I would like to see alternative A as the method of management. I have been on many rivers throughout the US with a wild and scenic designation, such as the St Croix in Minnesota, or the Smith River in California, and comparatively the Jacks fork and Current River seem rather "unmanaged". The river should be diverted as closely to its natural state as possible, which may include limiting access, permits, etc. I had to aquire a permit for the boundary water canoe area wilderness in Minnesota, does that mean it is more valuable than our river, that they provide that much more protection? 2)Returning the river to its natural state by limiting access and restrictions. 3)More development. For obvious reasons. 4). The idea for a wilderness tract in the Big springs should be strongly considered, and no motor access along the upper stretches where the river is not as wide. 5) The St. Croix in Minnesota has PROHIBITED alcohol on the river. This is a wild and scenic river managed by the NPS just like our ozark scenic riverways, but you sure wouldn't know it if you used the river on a summer weekend. Drinking and getting drunk on the river is NOT a cultural tradition, and if people can not enjoy the river without being drunk, then they are most likely not there to enjoy the benefits the river has to offer. Furthermore, NPS sites around the country have limited and restricted access through enforcement and or permits. Why are our rivers so different?	6/24/2009	No		MO	65202
163	1. Keeping the current system or the no-action alternative is the better plan. It has worked out so far and everyone has made a finacial and personal use adjustments accordingly. If action needs to be taken to clean up the improper conduct do so but I dont think boaters are the main culprits limiting tubes might do the trick. Making more wilderness area and imposing more restriction will only bring more hell, hate, and discontent from the majority of the local public the same ones who help take care of the river. 2. None of the alternative to the no-action are really necessary for the Park Service. I haven't heard enough evidence of gross resource damage or enviromental concerns to warrent the actions suggested in a,b,c plans. Making the Park only for enviromentalist and biological experts is not whats best for the public or the river. 3.Alternatives A.B.C are not needed for the park making the river and surrounding woodland offlimits for the most part is contrary to your mission of providing access to ALL the public and their needs	6/24/2009	No		MO	63965
164	Question 1) I believe that No-Action is the best action. Tubers, canoers and boaters need to share the river. The people who live here 12 months out of the year need to be the ones decide how they prefer for the rules to be not those hundreds of miles away.	6/24/2009	No		MO	63965
165	1. Alternative A most closely matches my ideal of how the park should be managed. I think that when the park was initially established 40 years ago because of its incredible scenic beauty it was meant to be preserved in the way stated in this proposal. The Ozarks Scenic Riverways is a National Park and not an amusement park and therefore management should cater to nonmechanized recreation. Not allowing motorized boats above Round Spring is a very legitimate way to allow floaters to gain a natural experience without the noise pollution of motor boats. The 25 HP limit below Round Spring is more than sufficient considering that other National Parks such as the Buffalo National River only allows a maximum of 10 HP motors on the river. 2. The most important parts of the Alternative A that must be included in the management of the park are the motorboat restrictions, the road closers and the designation of Big Spring as a wilderness area. 3. All aspects of Alternative A should be included in the future management of the park. 4. The area of the park near the Cross Country Trail Rides is a particular concern of mine. Because of the extremely high volume of horses and people in this area at one time the natural resources inevitably suffer during the trail rides. Because the	6/24/2009	No		MO	63965

	horses do not cross at the designated fords in the river and fecal waste is often deposited in the river in large quantities. Fecal coliform bacteria are higher in this area and jeopardize the recreational activities of others who also want to enjoy the river. Planning needs to be done now, as one can only expect the numbers to increase in the future. A permit system in order to limit the numbers of horses on the trails should be in place as well as enforcement of crossing the river at the designated fords and staying on the trail should all be provided by the Park Service. 5. I think that an important strategy in managing the resources of the park are to ensure the people of the local communities that they will always have access to this land and the importance in preserving the area for future generations.						
166	1) Alternative A is closest to my ideal. I specifically would prohibit motorized vehicles or boats, especially ATVs and outboard motors which contribute to invasive species ie zebra mussels. 2) Wilderness designations, and Close roads and trails illegally developed. 3) Most of Alternative C. Prohibit motorized vehicles, boats, further development 4) Blue Springs, all the springs. Alternative A best addresses my concerns 5) declare the entire river a wild river Thank you for your attention to my concerns.	6/24/2009	No			MO	63017
167	1) All of the alternatives have merit. C requiring more money and staff might not be economically feasible and continuing or increasing the usage rate over what it is now would be a burden on the resource. But the implied greater control proposed in alternative C sounds good. 2) Limiting the number of floaters on the rivers especially on the weekends would help to preserve the rivers. Too many canoes lead to increased litter and damage. Limiting the horsepower of the boats and size would be of value to reduce damage to the riverbeds especially in the shallow areas. It seems like everywhere the size of the boats are increasing beyond what is needed to what is more thrilling and dangerous. 3) None 4) I am a canoe floater and fly fisherman. I would like to see the trophy trout and the trout management areas have greater restrictions on the amount of canoes and limiting the use of power boats in these areas. 5) I do not envy you the job of managing this valuable resource. You don't have to be a radical "treehugger" to see that what we are allowing on our rivers now is not good. How do you teach people respect for the environment and nature? It breaks my heart to see some of the destructive activities that go on on the rivers. Some are very obvious and easier to eliminate such as the use of off road vehicles of any kind in the river. Others are more difficult, I have seen canoers being vulgar, littering and disrespecting the resource and motor boaters causing damage also. How do you regulate the public when disrespect for the environment is seen everywhere? I don't know but one of the areas we could start is to limit the number of floaters allowed on the river per day. Also, finding a way to decrease the amount of trash in the river by having a cooler sount or check in when you start your float. The canoe outfitter would check the plastic and aluminum items in your canoe when you start your float and you would be responsible for the same number of items when you end your float. I am sure this would be impossible to regulate and the outfitters would say they don't have the resources to do it but it would make the floater more conscious of the fact that they leave a "footprint" on the river when they use it and if we can decrease that footprint the river may be around in usable shape when their kids want to use it. The last suggestion that may be more enforceable would be to limit the amount of alcohol per canoe or floater. Jello shots, pot, vodka watermelons etc. may be difficult to regulate but beer and liquor could be monitored??? Anyway, those of us who value the unique resource we have are saddened by the abuses that occur and would like to see some way to control the abuse. But again, how do you teach respect for nature? Thanks	6/24/2009	No			MO	63303
168	1. No-Action The ONSR has already done more than enough to "manage" the Jack for & Current Rivers! ONSR took land away from owners whos families had cared for the land for many years to "turn it back to nature" so it would be better preserved. Now that they have control of it, the ONSR once again wants to change things. I say no thank you. 2. No-Action Less management on the behalf of the ONSR is the only thing that would be better for the area. 3. A, B, and C should not be included 4. Jack Fork River. Leave it alone and let the local people have the access they have had for over 100 years and deserve as part of their heritage. 5. Explain to the tourist that the local people settled this area and are intitled to some respect when it comes to using their access area. Stop wasting our tax dollars on attempts to "manage" and area that was doing just wonderful prior to the ONSR became part of the picture!	6/25/2009	No			MO	65020
169	1 I am strongly in favor of alternative A. 2 To me the most important thing is to bring the upper Current and Jacks Fork back to a more natural, primitive state, the way it was 40 or so years ago. Maintain these sections (above Two Rivers on the Current, and above Alley Springs on the Jacks) as non-motor areas. No ATV's, no motor boats. Preserve the wilderness experience for floaters, hikers, and campers. 3 What should NOT be allowed is for the rivers to continue to degrade through neglect, overuse, non-regulation, pollution. You MUST regulate horses the way you regulate canoes - as concessions with permits and daily fees. Set a maximum number of canoes. Right now, if a canoe still fits on the water, it can float. That's NOT the way they do it in the Boundary Waters!!!! You don't have to allow every boat that floats on the river every day. I like the zoning idea. Below Alley and below Two Rivers, the regulations can allow motor boats. But the ATV's MUST be banned from the rivers. The horses must be regulated. Has ONSR just given up on the trail rides? 4 My main concerns are for the upper stretches of the rivers. I admit to being very adamant about the pristine nature of our ever-shrinking areas of "wilderness". We have to hang on to what's left or there won't be any at all. There really is no alternative to caring for these beautiful areas. If ONSR doesn't protect them now, your legacy will be of shame and neglect. Once it's gone, it's gone. 5 I mentioned the permits and fees for horse rides. I also think the horse trails should be moved to the ridges and keep the horses out of the water. ATV's in the park should be confiscated. I'm shocked that there isn't more concern about them in your brochure. They are a No. 1 problem in the park. The noise pollution is a huge concern. Confiscate them. There are plenty of other places for them to ride. Leave the river for the hikers, campers, canoers. Make campgrounds like Blue Spring on the Jacks a fee area. I see that at the Buffalo in Arkansas (like Kyles Landing) and it works, it's gorgeous, it's clean, it's pretty quite. It might make it easier for the rangers, too. They need to protect the river, not spend all their time arresting drunks. Get the outfitters to remind people of the rules and regulations. They should have a vested interest in keeping the river clean and regulated. If the river continues to degrade, their profits will eventually suffer. Thanks, Justin Mutrux - long-time Stream Team member.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65793

170	1. I would rather see Alternative A adopted as far as not allowing motorized boating north of Akers. However, I believe there is a large difference between gas engines and electric trolling motors. I would be in favor of using electric trolling motors anywhere north of Akers up the Montauk Park Boundary. I also like the statement about closing roads and trails that have been illegally developed. Last summer we floated from Cedar Grove to the baptist camp to Akers. Just above the spring at the old Hospital, across the river from the spring we found a dispersed campsite but apparently had illegal access by motorized vehicles. This type of access needs to be eliminated. We also encountered horse and riders crossing the river in front of us which was a surprise but not an unwelcome occurrence. 5. I have heard talk from groups like the Missouri Coalition for the Environment who want to limit canoe density or horse density or access on the Current River. I don't think we are there yet where we need to issue permits for canoeing the river and limit access due to overuse. I do not believe we are loving our river to death and still enjoy a canoe float down the river whenever I chose to go and wherever I chose to put in and take out. This should not be taken away from us at any time in the future.	6/25/2009	No		Karkaghnae Club	MO	65560
171	1) No-Action. 2)No-Action. 3)Alternatives A,B and C 4) Cotoreva, Log Yard, Owl's Bend. No-Action 5) There should be not motor hp restrictions for jet motors. They are self-regulating. The motorboatists know that we don't need to run 200 hp motors on the Current River! There are only three rivers in the United States that have motor regulations and Current River is one of them.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
172	1. Alternative A is the one I most closely agree with. The ONSR should be kept in(or in some cases brought back to)the most natural and primitive state possible while still giving people a reasonably easy way to experience it. I believe more development of the area would be detrimental to the areas unique natural setting. 2. Closing unauthorized roads and access points, and restoring these places to their natural state is very important as well as strictly enforcing rules against using ATV's and other destructive modes of transportation in the ONSR. Access should be kept limited to most areas of the park, many should only be accessible by canoe or other motorless watercraft or by hiking on designated trails. 3. The higher tolerance for resource impacts mentioned is option C sounds very vague and scary, and not in tune with what the ONSR should be. Every effort should be made to preserve the natural state of the ONSR. 4.Keeping access limited as outlined in Alt A would be the best way to keep the places protected. Features such as Jam Up Cave for example are impacted less simply because they are more difficult to access. 5. I believe this is simply a case of less is more. The less traffic and pollution is brought in to ONSR, the more of it there will be for generations of people to enjoy. While it may be slightly more difficult to reach certain places to enjoy them, those that wish to will find a way within the regulations that are in place to protect the park. This will assure that these scenic riverways will be able to be enjoyed as well as survive for many more years in the future and they will be able to be enjoyed my many more people.	6/25/2009	No			MO	64735
173	1. No Actions, No change, Leave as is! 2. Open fields, improve and maintain boat access. 3. no closing of roads 4. all boats should have access to the river! at lease 40-hp at the pump.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63857
174	My dad used to take 5 day trips on the Current River 60+ years ago. The whole family floated down the river on inner tubes. The river is a breath of sunshine in an over-crowded and hectic world. I think of it often with fond memories. Please keep it as it always has been. A refuge for the weary, a bright spot in many other kid's memories, and a sweet spot in the ugliness of urban sprawl. I would humbly suggest that limits be put on the number of people allowed on the river at any given time. Overcrowding is bad for the wildlife, and for the waterway.	6/25/2009	No			OH	44883
175	1) No-Action: The Rivers must be left as they are. There is not a problem and, therefore, does not need to be any changes. I cannot believe that government would be trying to take more control over an issue that simply does not need any changing. 2) None of them, the rivers are great as they are. People have been enjoying them for many years, and if you stay in the right part of the river, you shouldnt have any problems. 3) See above. 4) ... 5) Poll the people that live in the areas of these rivers and I think you'll find that your answer is No-Action.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
176	1. No Action or Alternative One comes closest. 2/3 I have been floating the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers for over 45 years. I don't feel the need to desinate the area at Big Spring as wilerness. Nor do I feel that all of the "illegally developed" rodes and trails need to be closed, but some do. A few more legal accesses would permit people to plan shorter floats. I do like the idea of eliminating or limiting the horsepower of motorboats. Prior to the advent of the jet motors, motor boaters were natually restricted by the props to deeper water. More importantly outlawing any sort of motorized vehicle in the stream bed is extremely important. While I understand the allure of horseback riding, it was next to impossible to find a gravelbar that didn't reek of horse manure the last time we tried to do an overnight float. Although I enjoy a drink or two while floating, eliminaing alcohol on the river would go a long ways to maintaining an atmosphere that is suitable for families. 5--Wish I knew of a way to keep the status quo,, Seems anytime you put human beings anywhere they make a mess of it!	6/25/2009	No			MO	65279
177	1.-5. I am for the no action taken. I understand that we need to conserve our resources and keep the land beautiful like God made it, but don't punish the locals that have a different means of recreation for all the problems that are existing. In reality there are only 20% of the people causing 80% of the problem. Last Saturday I went to Alley Springs to swim and let my kids play in the water before it got to hot out. There were so many canoes that my kids couldn't even swim. Then a bunch of canoes pulled in on top of our stuff and got out drinking, cussing, and exposing themselves. I had to leave after only an hour of trying to swim. I find this a problem. These drunks are by no means taking a QUIET canoe trip down the beautiful Ozark waters. As for the erosion problem I don't see that being a problem. The river banks are constantly changing due to floods, beavers are cutting down the trees, and animals use paths to get water at the river. I feel this is a part of nature. We have beautiful water ways and therefore we need to keep them that way. I enjoy taking a relaxing motor boat ride with my kids. I find this quiet and relaxing. The problem I see is having all the drunks on the rivers causing problem such as littering, having sex on the river banks in front of everyone, and being loud. I don't want to hear about how they have bags to keep their trash in. When I took a motor boat ride the other day I seen the bags on the river banks with trash in them. The canoers didn't bother picking up their trash. I do want to address a positive. I feel that Power Mill/Owls Bend is a	6/25/2009	No			MO	65438

	beautiful campground and I would like for it to be taken care of. I would also like for the Grubs camping area be increased. I use to love to go down there but it is always full and can never be in there. I would also like to see more locals hired to tell about the history of the Ozarks. As a History Major I get really frustrated when I go to NPS places in Missouri and all the people working there are from out of state. People from out of state don't truly know how people in the Ozarks live or where we come from. They have know idea how great of a place we have and are very proud of it. Thank you for allowing me to comment on this matter. Paula Neal jamespan@centurytel.net+					
178	1) Alternative A is close to my idea of the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. If I could improve it, I would eliminate all motorized vehicles on the North Fork (other than emergency) and reduce the speed on the sections of the Current proposed for motorized vehicles. 2) I floated on these rivers a lot in the 70's and then when my children were young in the early '80's but later found it distasteful. I feel that human behavior deteriorated the quality of the visitor experience as well as the park. I think that public drunkenness and large parties should be eliminated. I think that the environmental degradation would be reduced by eliminating or slowing the speed limit for boats and removing horses and cattle from the stream bed and edges. Big Spring should be a wilderness area. 3) I do not want to see horse back riding near or through the rivers - especially any primitive area. I want to see as little motorized boating as possible. No horse trails or boat ramps. No semi-developed or developed campsites. 4) I'm most familiar with the Current but think that all of its awesome. This area was so beautiful. It should be restored as much as possible to its original state and left in a healthy, quiet condition for future generations. 5) I would love to see an interpretation of the original Ozark life as the high point of visiting the area, in addition to the opportunity for experiencing wilderness in solitude. I've been to other states where this was done and it leaves such a remarkable impression of the people that settled the area. Thank you for all of your hard work on the ONSR. I'm hoping for the best.	6/25/2009	No		MO	65202
179	Thank your for taking my comments on the OSNR master plan. Though I now live in the St. Louis area, my Ozark roots run deep. I cannot remember a time when Current River was not part of my life. My family owns property in Dent County near Baptist access and in Carter County near Van Buren. We float and fish the Current River for trout and smallmouth bass, swim and picnic at Big Spring, and sometimes hike the trail to Blue Spring. Just last week I enjoyed smallmouth bass fly fishing on the Jack's Fork near Rhymers. My children are small, and I am looking forward to many good days with them in the OSNR. It is a special place worth preserving for all people. Two principles guide my comments. First, everyone should have the opportunity to be connected to the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. The OSNR belongs to all of us. Changes in population, demographics, the economy, and culture leads one to predict the future political and economic support of the OSNR and the communities near it will come from outside Carter, Shannon, and Dent counties. If in the process of implementing master plan changes the OSNR becomes seemingly "off limits", then the OSNR will not be appreciated, and over generations, we potentially will lose that which we seek to preserve. Second, the activities of all visitors should be protective of the OSNR's environment. The OSNR is special to me because of its unique water quality. The rivers' purity, geology, and the diversity of life that lives in and around them help define the special place the OSNR is. If the park is "opened up" to all uses in all areas, it will surely result in the failure of the commons. The NPS should have strong authority and sufficient resources to protect the park's natural resources and to provide for visitors who enjoy it as their Creator intended. My remaining comments are focused on answering the five questions. Question: Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Answer: I generally support alternative B. I would add an extensive hiking trail, with several remote designated camp sites, along the rivers valleys. In many of the other "natural" national parks, there are hiking trails along the entire corridor of a stream. I would love the opportunity to backpack and fish the public land portions of the Jack's Fork and upper Current. I think this would be a significant attraction to many groups: hikers, birdwatchers, fishermen, hunters, scouts, etc. This would also be an attraction for other stakeholders who don't feel comfortable or experienced in boating. I would design and regulate this "valley" trail for hikers only. In return, as discussed below, I would improve some significantly long trails where horses could be used and impact to the environment managed. Question: Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Answer: An effort needs to be made to update the OSNR so that everyone can have the opportunity for a positive experience. For example, the playground equipment at Big Spring and Alley Spring needs to be modernized and made safer. Activities like interpretive trails are needed to help educate people as to why OSNR is special. Also, many aging baby boomers are not going to want to sit in a canoe all day, but they would enjoy taking a boat ride or fishing for a few hours. Environmentally sensitive development that helps the OSNR connect with a diversity of visitors is critical to long term viability. Question: Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Answer: Motor boating is an important part of modern "river culture" and should be allowed to continue on most reaches. Completely eliminating motorized boats on the entire Jack's Fork for all seasons of the year is a mistake. I'm also not clear as to what will be gained from reducing the horsepower limit from 40 hp to 25 hp from Two Rivers to the Northern Edge of Van Buren Gap. Question: Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Answer: I am concerned about the damage that horse traffic is doing at Eminence and also near Parker Hollow. I didn't feel there was enough information to determine if the alternatives would improve these situations. Question: Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Answer: If the purpose of motorboat restrictions on certain sections is primarily to "enhance" the experience of river goers, equal or more value would also be obtained by limiting the number of allowed canoes and tubes (and restricting the amount of alcohol an individual is allowed to take in a canoe or tube). Also, I would consider "clustering" as an approach for managing the water quality problems resulting from horse activities. It would be acceptable to develop more of the OSNR immediately around Eminence and Van Buren to accommodate the larger groups and more "intense" uses like horse riding, motor boating, and canoeing. In return, greater restrictions on activities in remote areas would be provided. In other words,	6/25/2009	No		MO	63025

	the impacts of the motor boat, canoe/tube, and trail ride "parties" would be "concentrated" to certain areas. In those concentrated areas, the NPS should do what is necessary to build and maintain facilities that can accommodate these users and protect the watershed.						
180	a	6/26/2009	No			VA	22408
181	The "No Action" Plan is pretty close to what I would like to see. However, Alt. A or B would also be a consideration. I want to see reductions of horse and ATV use, though. My belief is that water quality suffers from the huge amount of equestrian use. I'd like to see a curtailing of horse trail useage. The restriction of motorized watercraft is also high on my list. The upper Jack's Fork, especially, should be protected from any horse/ORv use. I appreciate the thought of bringing other interesting areas/features to visitor's attention, how ever, the current system allows for "exploration" of these areas/features by anyone that has enough interest to find them. I am against more roads or trails, or even boat access points.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63114
182	1.no action 2.no action,no further control over rivers, 3 all of them,we are constantly harassed the way it is. 4. y bridge in howell county to 2 rivers, 5.what we need is somone who wont treat the locals like criminals for fishing with your children, I was born and raised in shannon county,our roots go back to the1800,s if antbody has a right or say it should be the people who tamed and have paid taxes,100,s of years,and our grandpas fought in every war to keep this country free,no so people from other states and countries, could come here and make thousands of rules, the park service should leave the locals alone,we live here and belong here,we have ask for help when the tourist were harrasing us and exposing thereselves in front of our families, they are more concerned about our4 wheelers being legal,your,like prison gaurds or nazi dictators,think about it,you come into a area steal the land from the locals,then try to run us of so you can use our are for your gain,	6/26/2009	No			MO	65548
183	I am a private canoe owner that has been using the facilities on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) every year for over 30 years. Question 1) I have been happy with the way that the park service has been operating. Question 5) I would like to see less motorboat traffic or at least require that boats have four cycle boat engines. The oil slick that the two cycle engines leave on the water and in the air is quite offensive. Also there will be no river rage against "slower" river traffic (canoes and tubes) if there is no "faster" river traffic. This goes for the park rangers as well. Rangers do not HAVE to go so fast, they CHOOSE to go fast and thereby alienate the other boaters and put swimmers at risk. Question 2&3: I think plan A is tainted by sentimentality of the good old days that never really existed. Let's remember that the trees were cleared, cars were junked on the river banks for erosion control, unlimited hunting and fishing and individual home based junk piles were all the rage in the "good old days". I suspect that the persons concerned about excessive canoe traffic and lewd behavior of the people on the river were once young them selves and were once guilty of shocking behavior. The hard partying young people of today will be complaining in 20 years about the behavior of the youth of the future. The important thing is that if the youth of today are locked out of the activities that are currently attractive to them, then they will not be coming back in 20 years looking for less explosive entertainment. If we close down the canoe and tube traffic we will loose an entire generation of future solitude seekers. It has been my experience that peace and quiet are readily available to those that seek them out. One example is the Jacks Fork. If Alley Spring is too loud and crowded, then try Blue Springs if that is still too much go up to the Prongs. Or better yet camp on the river or hike into a camp site. To say that there is no solitude available means that solitude has not been actively pursued. Along those lines the river is already segregated to a large degree. The upper reaches are for kayakers and fishermen. The middle ranges are for canoes tubes and john boats and the lower reaches are more exclusively for boat traffic. Although this is not a fixed and permanent situation, perhaps it could be. Plan A could pe put into place from the prongs to Alley Springs for the Jacks Fork and from Baptist Camp to Welch Spring for the Current River. No action taken for Akers to Round Spring and Alley Spring to Eminence and then some combination of B or C for the lower reaches of each river.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63014
184	a	6/26/2009	No			VA	22408
185	Thanks you for this information. I personally like plan A as I think quiet places should be preserved, but I realize that many people and families might prefer plan C which allows for more action. It is nice to have family picnics and more people wold use the park. Horse use should be limited in any plan, with strict rules about cleaning up after them, and not allowing them to get off the trail and ruin the terrain; probably impossible to stop water pollution. They're all good plans, but I think the cost of operation should enter into the decision. Plan A seem to be more affordable. I vote for Plan A, then C and then B. they're all an improvement.	6/26/2009	No		MCE	MO	63124-1923
186	I would opt for A - returning the park to its origins, so that it will remain available for future generations. There is to much floater traffic and too much horse back traffic.	6/26/2009	No		Switch	MO	63119
187	1) Alternative C most closely matches my idea of the best way to manage the ONSR. My recreational need is for access to public equestrian trails, and Alternative C presents the most opportunity for continuing to have horse trails, as well preserve habitat and natural features. I also feel more of a 'mixed-use' designation on the river would be beneficial to both the locals and the visitors to the river, providing something for everyone. 2) I feel strongly that there continue to be public equestrian trails included in the future management of national riverways. Horseback riding is a popular and economically significant activity in Missouri, and is an important reflection of our cultural heritage in settling Missouri. 3) I feel strongly	6/26/2009	No			MO	63050

	that any action to drastically reduce usage of the national riverways - whether hiking, boating, horseback riding, or any other activity - should not be included in the management plan. As urbanization of our state (and country) continues, our need to have areas to escape to and participate in these sorts of activities becomes greater. It is important to maintain recreational opportunities for everyone. 4) I am particularly fond of the Blue Spring and Jerk Tail Landing areas of the ONSR. I do feel Alternative C addresses these areas adequately. 5) I understand trail user conflicts between horseback riders and other trail users can be an issue. Dedicated equestrian camping and parking areas can help address this problem. Equestrian-only trails would also be a possibility to eliminate trail controversy - after all, there are many bike paths throughout the state and several hiking-only trails designated as well. I would not be in favor of limiting equestrian access to trails that already allow equestrian use. Also, equestrians frequently cannot access trails that go to some of the more interesting natural features. Providing durable trails that would permit equestrians to experience interesting natural features would be beneficial to all. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I planned on attending one of the meetings being held this week (June 22 - 26), but had other obligations interfere.						
188	1) No-Action is the closest to my idea of the best way to manage ONSR. However, I believe that educational programs would greatly enhance the preservation of this area. Education on how to keep the area in take and education areas to teach about Ozarkian history. 2) Native people of the area choose to remain in this location because of the natural resources. The economic status in the region is not very high, but people choose to live here for the quality of life. For some that means a trip up the river on a Sunday afternoon in a motor boat and for "big brother" to take that away is not a good thing. For others its cutting out a couple of weeks of the summer to camp along the river and get away from it all. As it currently is, there is room for all, and all respect each other. But I do believe that some educational opportunities would be valuable. I do appreciate areas such as Alley Springs that show some preservation of times past. For example, I remember my second grade teacher taking me in the summer to have class in the old one room school house. We might have been exploited for the visitors sake, but we still learned and had fun. 3) I like some of the suggestions in all 3 alternates, except further control of motorized boating. This is a freedom that you cannot find anywhere else in the world, it is in many cases a family event. 4) I choose the no-action plan, but I would like better access to places such as blue springs, the areas around Round Springs is run down, the log yard would be cool to bring back the historical portion, including the ferry that used to be there. I like many parts of the a,b, and c; except the infringement upon motorized boating. This is a part of the local modern culture and it would have a negative impact upon the local sociological aspects if it is taken away. 5) As I previously mentioned, I appreciate many of the things that the NPS is trying to achieve with providing these four options. I also want to preserve the Ozark way of life. Although I do not currently live there, I grew up in this region and it is dear to my heart. I do not want the area to be destroyed but neither do the local people who have made their life in this area. I really like the learning centers, the educational programs, and other aspects suggested. However, I also believe that native residents have a right to this river as well and motorized boating is part of the culture and recreation. The only suggestion that I would leave you with is to not take this privilege of motorized boating away or regulating it (choking it out)but it may be tolerable to create a quiet day, i.e. Wednesdays are quiet days on the river and designated to non motorized boating. This might be a win/win.	6/26/2009	No			AR	72501
189	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would lean more toward option A. I have enjoyed canoeing the Current and Jack's Fork on numerous occasions. I do not like horse poop in the river, and they really tear up trails. I am not a fan of ATVs, and their noise, smell, and tracks are not something I want to see more of. From what I have read, it appears option A is more in tune to my liking. Thanks again. Mark Schutte	6/26/2009	No			MO	65203
190	I prefer A except I would like to have access to the hidden treasures such as cabins. I would prefer to access these by hiking rather than driving. That way only those who have a strong desire to see these areas could access them. guided tours would be great. only very low horse power motors should be allowed. We have several large lakes in Missouri for those activities. Streams are more for quiet boating, fishing and camping. Please allow those of us who want a quiet area to enjoy nature and learn history. Speed and party time should go to the Lake.	6/26/2009	No			MO	65274
191	1. In my opinion preliminary alternative A best fulfills the original concept behind the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Public access to all Park Service managed areas is a priority but some activities have the potential to denigrate the visitor experience for the majority. Those activities need to be regulated and limited. 2. Well defined limitations on the use of motorized vehicles, both on land and in the water, should be included in the management plan. There are many other recreational sites in the state that accomodate ATV's and high powered jet boats so limiting their use in the ONSR poses no handicap to anyone. 3. There should be no allowance of ATV use in, or within 400 yards distance of, waterways in the area. Jet boats or any other motorized watercraft, other than official and emergency craft, should not be allowed on either the Current or Jacks Fork Rivers within the national scenic riverways. 5. Land use on adjacent properties has an impact on the environment within the ONSR. It is very important to attempt to educate the owners of these properties as to how activities on their land can have an effect. They are stakeholders and their cooperation is essential to the preseervation of the area.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63026
192	(1)No Action. The river and surrounding areas are there for everybody to enjoy.	6/27/2009	No			MO	65257
193	I think all motors on boats should be ban from the ONSR. I canoe and camp on the river once a year for the past 30 years. I can see no reason for the motorboats there. Last month a friend and I camped on a gravel bar for two nights on the Current River. Our peaceful time there was marred by the motorboats racing up and down. They even parked in front of our campsite and raced their engines. I've had enough of these inconsiderate boaters. They are not fishing, just polluting and making noise.	6/27/2009	No			IL	62002

194	1. plan B I personally think we need to keep the riverways as primitive as possible, but could use some additional access to allow those who may not have the background to handle it alone, still have the opportunity to experience that type of natural resource. I am a bit concerned about any additional motorized access that is not already allowed. Certainly maintaining a clean, hassle free riverway, and a retreat from over polulated and commercialized areas, for generations to come. cjd	6/27/2009	No			MO	65804
195	Dear Management Team, My family, parents and I spent 4 days in and on the Jacks Fork River in mid-June this year and I have some comments to submit. We were in a 17' canoe and a 20' river john boat with electric trolling motor. We floated on a Sunday and Tuesday from Alley Spring to Eminence. Firstly, ban all gas motorized boating on both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers regardless of their size! This type of boating should be kept on the lakes and large rivers where they belong. These boats are dangerous to the people floating, let alone what it does to the wildlife in the river, and distroys the peaceful feeling one gets while floating the river. I realize that these boats have been on the rivers for a long time but they should be banned. Everything has it's place but those boats do not have a place on these rivers. The "locals" with their motorized boats exude a feeling that "this is my river, what are you doing here?" This feeling was especially at the public park loading ramp in Eminence. I feel that these boaters will eventually ruin the very thing that draws people to the area. Much in the way the ATV's have ruined the riding area at Chadwick, MO. By altering the river so much that anyone in any size boat with any size motor can "float" the Current or Jacks Fork. I also think that the accesses on the river should be limited and that there should be a reduction in the number of companies that provide floating servies on the rivers. This would limit the impact from people that don't truly care about the river. They are typically the ones that come in and rent boats for floating. Other than the motorized boats and there drivers, we had a great time and plan to float the rivers again.	6/28/2009	No			OK	74014
196	Having grown up in south eastern Missouri and using the National scenic riverways since before their inception I feel we must try to restore them to their original beauty. Very strong restictions should be made and use of the rivers should be kept to a minimum and closely monitored, perhaps by some sort of reservation method to limit numbers of individuals on the river at one time. I have seen the change to a carnival atmosphere and regret not being more involved to stop it. Plan A is probably the closest to my phylosophy but limiting the number of acces points should be mandated and strictly controled. Strict guidelines for equestrian activities must protect the prestine waters and not allow them to be contaminated by animal waste. Motors should not be allowed on the upper part of the river and limited to below Big Springs. Please enforce the guidelines that were originally developed for tranferal of properties and new building. The upper part of the river was my most favorite and allowing limit access to Babtist Camp all the way down to Big Springs should be kept as natural as possible. Also The Jack's Fork river should have the same guidelines and restrictions. I know businesses flourish with these new activities but these magnificent waters and hill sides of Missouri must be kept for the future. respectfully yours, Bradley Franklin	6/28/2009	No			CA	92374
197	1) No-Action, the river is fine the way it is. 2) I feel there needs to be better education for both motorized and non-motorized boaters. Specifically the requirements of motor boats to run in shallow water, as well as the consequences of stopping in shallow water. 3) I do not feel that there needs to be any further restrictions to motorized boats, or the methods of restricting them. A 40HP jet motor is something unique to this area, that holds deep roots in the local community. And while it is important to preserve the area for visitors, however it it more important to preserve the traditions of the local citizens who were born and raised on the river. 4)The river below the mouth of Big Creek is my primary concern. I thoroughly enjoy everything about the river the way it is. There is no need to change anything about it. 5) As I mentioned above I feel that there should be a better way to educate tourist on the workings of a motorized jon-boat. Both on how the boats run and the investment involved, as well as areas on the upper-current river where jon-boats are not as popular, in order to keep canoes and kyakas away from jon-boats if they don't wish to be around them.	6/28/2009	No			MO	63629
198	1. No action and Alternative C are closest to my preference. I recommend additional restriction on jet boats above Van Buren and prohibition on the Jacks Fork. Jet boats should be treated more strictly than propeller driven boats becasue they are noisier. My main ojection to motorized boat traffic is noise. Road access needs to be improved. I oppose large wilderness designations because they are roadless. We have to be able to access the areas to enjoy them. 2. No large wilderness designations, maybe only 2000 acres around Big Spring. 3. Much of no action as stated in Item 1 above. The current efforts to control parties and rowdy behavoir have been very successful. 4. The Jacks Fork is more primitive and pristine, this can be recognized in a plan. 5. Roads are important, don't increase roadless areas. I am for presrvation, but we have to have river access. Wilderness hikers are a small minority of users. Some minor restrictions on horses is needed to address the known water quality issues; close some horse trial river crossings except for the big annual event.	6/28/2009	No			MO	63169
199	#1. Plan A comes close to what I would like to see. I would not allow any ATV, jet boats or motors over 25 h.p. on any of the riverway and I would restrict trail rides as much as you can without starting a firestorm. #2. Big Springs should be made a wilderness area. There should be restrictions on jet boats, ATV, and motor size. #3. I believe any increase in commercial services might lead to more special interest groups motivated by profit and not in the best interest of this precious resource. Any moves in this direction should be taken only after a thorough review of any detrimental effects it might have. #4. Although all 134 miles are national treasures I believe the upper half has different problems and should have some restrictions that the lower half does not. #5. Considering all the different special interest groups you have to contend with I think the NPS is doing a good job. I like the idea of special tours, for select groups as long as they are handled correctly. I think you need to continue to plan for the best interest of all America and not let local interest groups and their political allies unduly influence you.	6/28/2009	No			MO	65248
200	I feel that there should be no changes in the plan. A problem that I have with plan A,B, and C are that while you would be trying to promote the history and public use of the area you will be limiting my ability to do the same with my daughter. I don't need a ranger to guide me down the river so that I can go on an over night float trip. I feel that it is my right as a native to this area to at least not be limited any more than I am already. I personally feel that there are already plenty of laws and rules on the books to protect the wonderful rivers that I call home. Unfortunately Mr. Mark Miller our local park ranger can not possibly patrol and enforce these laws that would help control the problems that we have. In my mind, making	6/28/2009	No			MO	65548

	more rules would be silly when we could give this man more help to do what has already been proven impossible to enforce with out help.						
201	The lack of action is the best approach. Any action you may take will require additional action. Any action willhave undesired and unexpected consequences. Please leave it as you found it. Thank you Greg Hines	6/29/2009	No			TX	77064
202	A	6/29/2009	No			VA	22408
203	I believe the "No Action" alternative is the best course of action. Additional restrictions on the use of these areas is not what is needed. More importantly the enforcement of existing laws and regulations is what needs to be enforced. More patrols by uniformed agents and stricter punishment for violation of the existing laws and regulations will be a greater benefit to the public. Restricting the use by the lawabiding public is not the correct means to protect resources, stricter enforcement on those not abiding to the rules is the correct way.	6/29/2009	No			MO	63368
204	1) Alternative A -- Minimum horsepower limit similar to the Eleven Point River 2)Closing of roads and trails that have been illegally developed 3) Anything included in and related to Alternative C. We don't need anymore developed campsites, government growth, or resources thrown at entertainment (that is what Branson is for). Equine activities should be patterned after those in the Buffalo National River or Yellowstone National Park, these are proven, successful strategies that meet both the environmental and recreational balance. 4)As one of the largest springs in the country, Big spring should be designated wilderness status and protected as such. The Jacks Fork still holds some desirable "wild" aspects and should be managed in such a way as to protect it from further degradation. 5)Do what is best for the river. The users of today will pass, but the river will remain. Say NO to detrimental activities and enforce the management strategies developed. Learn from other successful stories in the country.	6/29/2009	No			MO	65619
205	I feel that there should be no change in the horsepower limits on the riverways. Being born and raised in Ellington Mo. I have spent a good deal of time on the riverways and have seen what takes place there. I feel where the attetion of the Park Service needs to be directed to the tourists and visitors of the area and not at the local residents. Many local residents are on the riverways year round and nerly every weekend through the summer months and take extremly good care of the area. While many non-local people, who only visit two or three days a year, arrive and do not have the same respect for land and water. They leave their trash on the gravelbars, campsites, and roads while the locals keep the trash contained and usually return home to despose of it because they want a clean and safe area for them, their familys and friends to camp the following weekend. I feel that this is where the focus of the Park Service should be directed at. Step back and take a good look at the people on the river, their actions, and where they come from and the insights on what actions need to be taken might astound you. Thank you for your time. John Dea Rayfield Proud Southern Missouri Resident	6/29/2009	No			MO	63631
206	I feel that there should be no change in the horsepower limits on the riverways. Being born and raised in Ellington Mo. I have spent a good deal of time on the riverways and have seen what takes place there. I feel where the attetion of the Park Service needs to be directed to the tourists and visitors of the area and not at the local residents. Many local residents are on the riverways year round and nerly every weekend through the summer months and take extremly good care of the area. While many non-local people, who only visit two or three days a year, arrive and do not have the same respect for land and water. They leave their trash on the gravelbars, campsites, and roads while the locals keep the trash contained and usually return home to despose of it because they want a clean and safe area for them, their familys and friends to camp the following weekend. I feel that this is where the focus of the Park Service should be directed at. Step back and take a good look at the people on the river, their actions, and where they come from and the insights on what actions need to be taken might astound you. Thank you for your time. John Dea Rayfield Proud Southern Missouri Resident	6/29/2009	No			MO	63631
207	1) The No Action Alternative is my choice, with this modification added: I believe that the HP limit should be lifted from the Southern Edge of the Van Buren Gap to Big Springs. The short area involved causes those with over 40 HP several disadvantages, foremost being inaccessibility of the Van Buren Ramp for trips downstream. This also leads to congestion at the Big Springs Ramp. The reasoning of keeping the unlimited HP below Big Springs to control boat vs. tube/ canoe encounters is invalid, as any HP can be used in the Gap itself. So anyone wishing to use this section of river (Van Buren Gap) with over 40 HP can already do so. 2) Only the No Action Alternative 3) Any sections of Alternatives A, B or C 4) The river between the Van Buren Gap and Big Springs is the area of concern that is not addressed by any of the Management Plan Alternatives. 5) A current, daily updated Internet listing of tickets written in the 134 mile Ozark National Scenic Riverways. (Similar to the Missouri State Highway Patrol website for accidents/tickets on Missouri highways) This tracking of issues by law enforcement concerning the river usage would highlight which demographic of river users is most problematic, what those issues are and provide the necessary data to everyone to determine the best approach to effectively manage the river.	6/29/2009	No			MO	63957
208	I think that every thing runs really well the way it is. The only thing that would be good to work on,is helping people to understand that it only takes a few seconds to yield to some one in a canoe or a tube.Overall the plan you have in place works really well and I don't see the need in messing with something that is not broke. thank you for your time.	6/29/2009	No			MO	64048

209	1) I prefer Alternative A, specifically the elimination, as much as possible, of high-powered motorized vehicles. One possible exception would be to allow primitive trails leading to historic or natural features as described in Alternative B. 2) Future management should include maximizing non-mechanized forms of recreation--there are plenty of places in Missouri for power boats and ATVs. Also, a wilderness designation for Big Spring. 3) I would favor avoiding the building of more boat ramps, picnic areas, etc. The appeal of the Ozark NSR in the early 70's (when I was first exposed to it) was that it was so quiet and relatively primitive. 4 & 5) I'm not enough of an expert on the area to comment on either of these questions.	6/29/2009	No			MO	65203
210	1.Alternative A best fits my preference for the management of the Riverways. ONSR has unique characteristics (topography and natural springs) that shouldn't be squandered by the development of recreational facilities that could be placed elsewhere. 2. Wilderness designation for the Big Spring area should definitely be included. The allowable uses under Wilderness designation fit it perfectly and allow a wide range of people to have an experience unavailable in more developed parks. 3. The great expanses of resource-based recreation zoning in Plan C would be a terrible mistake. There is some danger of this great natural resource becoming just another crowded waterpark with little opportunity to observe the natural habitat. 4. I haven't a clear opinion on this. 5. If, as I hope, something like Alternative A is chosen, I hope that as a refinement of the plan, the park service will consider how best to manage horseback riding areas so that bacterial pollution to the rivers is minimized.	6/29/2009	No			MO	65203
211	we spend most of our free time on the current river between round springs and twin rocks. the last couple years the power boats have been very aggravating. there should definitely be some kind of speed limit. I feel the boats have seriously damaged the river. the gravel on the shore at twin rocks built up 3 inches in one day from the waves from the boats speeding by with no concern for people swimming or fishing. going on float trips past big creek the boats seem to try to make you turn over. with the loud music and excessive drunks in the area I do not feel safe floating by there with my children. it seems to be mostly the people across from the bluff rather than the group at the mouth of big creek. I realize this is where the local people hang out, but the local people seem to be the ones destroying the riverways. not all of them some always slow down for floaters and swimmers. but some speed up when they see them. I realize there is nothing you can do about the loud music you can hear from a mile upstream and downstream but it takes all the fun out of a quiet float down the river. something needs to be done. even if it is just a enforced speed limit. a few tickets should slow them down eventually. thanks for your time.	6/29/2009	No			MO	63051
212	Greetings-- I've been canoeing the Current & Jacks Fork rivers since 1973, but for the last 20 years I never go there in summer or on warm-weather weekends because of severe overuse by loud-mouth, mostly drunken individuals whose manners largely disappear under the influence of alcohol. They spoil it for me and I suspect many other would-be patrons of these marvelous waterways. I'd like to restrict power boats, off-road vehicles and other noise producers to the Current River below Two Rivers and place significant limits on canoe rentals on the upper stretches of both river in order to lower the density and impact of use in those places with mostly shallow and faster waters. Alcohol possession (and consumption) should be severely restricted too. I'm even wondering if a permit system is on the horizon--with many slots reserved for those who paddle their own canoes and kayaks. I like horses, but their presence in large numbers simply ruins water quality for everyone. They too should be limited to that area of the river below Two Rivers. In short, I prefer Alternative A. Sincerely, Dave Redmon	6/29/2009	No		OWWC-KC	KS	66502
213	(1) I support No-Action. I share a cabin in the park with my family at Ratliff (Mountain View Health and Recreation Club) and I like things just the way they are. I'm disappointed there is no public meeting for this end of the park.	6/29/2009	No			MO	65548
214	Question 1) Yes, alternative A best suits my family's choice for managing the Ozark NSR. However, no motorized boats such as jet boats (electric trolling motors are okay) should be allowed above Two Rivers on either the Jacks Fork or the Current Rivers. Jet boats are a far cry from the old quieter low horsepower boats that used to be on the river. The NPS must also become more aggressive about eliminating illegal ATV access to the rivers. Furthermore, large trail rides have impaired the Jacks Fork river and must be limited in size, and both horse and human waste should be treated in the future to reduce this source of pollution. Question 2) A maximum of primitive and natural zones. These management zones are particularly critical above Two Rivers. Restoration of overused areas and closure (must be enforced which includes the need for more NPS staff!) of illegally developed roads and ATV trails. Question 3) No increase in commercial services which will clearly lead to additional adverse impacts on river water quality, aquatic and riparian biota and certainly. Jet boat traffic must be decreased or eliminated as suggested in "question 1" because there are scientific reports showing damage to root mats and associated biota, and increase turbidity. The proposal to develop methods to mitigate damage by too many jet boats, people, and horses to the natural and scenic qualities of the rivers mentioned in alternative C is not possible in many cases or cost prohibitive in others! Question 4) The Jacks Fork from Alley Springs upstream and the Current river from Two Rivers upstream are extremely scenic and special to my family. Take away the power boats above Two Rivers and enforce illegal activities and then alternative A does a reasonable job. Question 5) Some managers of the Ozark NSR seem to place far too much emphasis on making local commercial and private interest happy at the risk of impairment of many of the factors that lead to its designation as a NATIONAL Scenic Riverway. Parts of the rivers are already impaired under the Clean Water Act and illegal roads, trails and activities are not being closed or stopped with the current management plan. The concept of "Mixed-Use Zones" are not realistic. How can you have people fishing when jet boats come by every minute in some cases. Furthermore, how can you have drunk canoeists, tubers and jet boats mixed together without serious accidents (we understand there is only one ranger per river which further complicates matters). In reality, you can't and NPS managers must separate some of these activities. We know that the Ozark NSR has a very limited budget and can only hope that it will be increased. Finally the Missouri Ozark NSR management team might do well to look at the Buffalo NSR (Arkansas) management plan as I had never seen party boaters or jet boater there. Thanks for your consideration.	6/29/2009	No			MO	65203

215	<p>#1 I am infavor of no-action. I have seen many incidents where a boat has saved a life or two. Since I have been a baby I have spent every summer enjoying the life on Current River. I have seen boats help canoers that have tipped over get all there belongings back. I have seen boats give rides to floaters, who have forgotten their keys, back to their vehicles. My most recent memory was just this past Friday, July 26. Me and my husband were on the river and had pasted the same floaters a few times that day. We first met them at Blue Springs and they said they were headed to the Log Yard, which was a way to go. Anyway, we had rode back down river when it started lightening and raining. We thought about the floaters we had met yearlier. We decided to go back up river to check on them. They had a 1 year old baby and a 5 year old child. The 5 year old was getting scared so we helped them get over to the bank until the storm calmed down. After the thunder and lightening had stopped we went ahead and gave them a ride to the log yard. Glad we did, because shortly after it started all over again. Anybody and everybody that steps foot on Current River has a pretty good chance of helping someone out, and everyone that I have came in contact with already has a list of things they have done to help someone out. I would understand this if the motorized boats on the river were causing harm or hazards to everyone, but in my eyes I see that they are helping in so many little big ways. Taking our boat to the river and boat riding for the day is the cheapest way we can have a good time and enjoy one of our favorite past times. I sure hope there is no actions taken so I can share my favorite hobby with my children, from spring/summer time boat riding to the fall/winter gigging season. We live here 12 months a year and we use the river 12 months around. From boat riding, gigging, to just taking a picnic over, WE use this river. I don't feel that people who only use it 3 months out of the year should be able to make the decision of taking the fun and enjoyment from the residents who do use it 12 months a year!</p>	6/29/2009	No			MO	63638
216	<p>#1 I am infavor of no-action. I have seen many incidents where a boat has saved a life or two. Since I have been a baby I have spent every summer enjoying the life on Current River. I have seen boats help canoers that have tipped over get all there belongings back. I have seen boats give rides to floaters, who have forgotten their keys, back to their vehicles. My most recent memory was just this past Friday, July 26. Me and my husband were on the river and had pasted the same floaters a few times that day. We first met them at Blue Springs and they said they were headed to the Log Yard, which was a way to go. Anyway, we had rode back down river when it started lightening and raining. We thought about the floaters we had met yearlier. We decided to go back up river to check on them. They had a 1 year old baby and a 5 year old child. The 5 year old was getting scared so we helped them get over to the bank until the storm calmed down. After the thunder and lightening had stopped we went ahead and gave them a ride to the log yard. Glad we did, because shortly after it started all over again. Anybody and everybody that steps foot on Current River has a pretty good chance of helping someone out, and everyone that I have came in contact with already has a list of things they have done to help someone out. I would understand this if the motorized boats on the river were causing harm or hazards to everyone, but in my eyes I see that they are helping in so many little big ways. Taking our boat to the river and boat riding for the day is the cheapest way we can have a good time and enjoy one of our favorite past times. I sure hope there is no actions taken so I can share my favorite hobby with my children, from spring/summer time boat riding to the fall/winter gigging season. We live here 12 months a year and we use the river 12 months around. From boat riding, gigging, to just taking a picnic over, WE use this river. I don't feel that people who only use it 3 months out of the year should be able to make the decision of taking the fun and enjoyment from the residents who do use it 12 months a year!</p>	6/29/2009	No			MO	63638
217	a	6/30/2009	No			VA	22408
218	<p>1. Alternative A 2. Rowdy behavior has driven my family from the rivers. Motors can be allowed but only to the extent that they don't endanger others. I suggest a two HP limit. Two trail riding horses would be fine, two hundred are not. Close the crossings. 3. 0 4. The further upstream the more restrictive. 5. ENFORCEMENT. I have never visited the rivers without observing ATV's, even automobiles, violating the rules. Local officials are unconcerned as long as the rivers produce revenue.</p>	6/30/2009	No			MO	65233
219	<p>these are the points that i feel should be considered when planning for the management of the national wild and scenic rivers in missouri and elsewhere: 1. these rivers should be thought of as "aquatic wilderness areas". there are plenty of locations where people who desire to do so can use motorboats, jet-boats, jet-skis, four-wheelers, etc. the wild and scenic rivers should be special sanctuaries that are set aside to insure their continued pristine character and natural beauty. they should be free from the many disturbances and nuisances that characterize so many of our recreational areas today. 2. we have several land wilderness areas in missouri where access is granted only to hikers or riders on horseback. there are no motorized vehicles or bicycles allowed. these areas are great places to go for a quiet wilderness experience, either a day hike or backpack trip or a horseback ride. the scenic rivers should be thought of in the same way. 3. any roads along the banks of the rivers as four-wheeler or horseback trails should not be allowed due to bank erosion and sedimentation of the river. our rivers are filling with silt and gravel fast enough due to the continued development of rural areas without encouragement from stream-side roads. 4. the rivers should be restricted to paddleboats only. jet-boats and other high-powered motorcraft damage the stream banks with their wakes, leading to more erosion, and also damage the bottom of the river. they also kill many organisms in the river, both vertebrates and invertebrates, during their operation. the species that inhabit these environments already have enough pressure being placed on them due to man's activities and lower water quality levels. they don't need the actions of the jet-boats and other power crafts to add to it. 5. as stewards of the lands and rivers of missouri and other states, we can make the kinds of intelligent decisions that will allow APPROPRIATE use of the resources and insure their pristine availability to future generations, or we can allow a "free-for-all" mentality to prevail and observe their demise. i hope that your decisions reflect a desire to take the first choice. 6. thank you for your consideration of these ideas. larry davis</p>	6/30/2009	No			MO	65804

220	<p>1. I'm in favor of the "No Action" alternative for the future management of ONSR. The only areas I would suggest need to be improved is park presence on the rivers. This doesn't mean more rangers, just uniformed park officials floating or motor boating up and down the rivers throughout the day during the heaviest floating season. This used to be a common sight, but in recent years is almost non-existent. Visitors will try to control their behavior much more under supervision than if left to their own devices. I don't feel that motor boats are any more invasive now than they were 20 years ago. Floaters don't want to share the riverway, but in essence the rivers are multi-use. Perhaps boaters should begin to report the many grievances they have regarding floater behavior in a formal written report. There are always two sides to every situation and the park only gets to hear one in a complaint form. 3. I feel very strongly that there should be no changes in the horse power limits below Round Spring. At the current time I don't believe there are any motor boats traveling above Round Spring so lowering that to 25 hp is going to have no impact either way, other than giving the government a foot in the door to make more limitations. If there are problems between floaters & motor boats then uniformed park presence will take care of that issue. The majority of motor boat enthusiasts try to be friendly while boating; I can't say the same for most floaters. Perhaps you might put out a publication to floaters regarding river etiquette; include in this pamphlet 1.)the fact that motor boats cause a larger wake when they drop speed quickly than if they stay on top of the water to pass by canoes, 2.) motor boats cannot stop in the middle of a shoal as the motor will sink into the water and suck up rocks & gravel thus damaging the motor. If floaters knew a few facts regarding motor boats and the reasons behind the boats not stopping all of the time perhaps they would be a little less angry when a boat passes them on the river. 4. There are several fields within ONSR which used to be working farms when the government took them over. Many of these fields provide a feeding ground for the wild horse herds in Shannon County. There has, over the past 5 years or so, become a problem with a band of these horses living in Round Spring park. The fields they used to forage in for food have become so overgrown that no food is available there for them anymore, thus they go where food is easy to find. I feel it would be beneficial to the park and to the wild horse herds to clear these fields of underbrush to make it possible for grass to grow there again. This would alleviate a safety issue on Hwy. 19 and make park visitors happier that the horses are not in the campground. 5. Take into consideration the opinions of all park users, not just those that want to see no one while they're visiting the area. In the past the NPS has most often chosen to ignore the viewpoint of local citizens and business people in favor of a few environmentalists from St. Louis. Local residents live here year round, not just a few days out of the year. We have a lot more at stake in protecting this area than anyone else in the country. The majority of local residents are not interested in harming the streams, although you always have a few rogues in every group their presence should not reflect on the area as a whole. Let the local people have a voice, invite them to help in projects, ask them for advice, ask seasonal employees not to be rude to them. You will find that we are fairly easy to get along with and that we can be very helpful to you in many ways.</p>	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
221	<p>5. According to signs at Round Spring;and bridge plates which pertain to all except 1 bridge from Salem Missouri to Winona Missouri; All of these bridges were constructed around 1921. on State hiway 19. This is a very dangerous situation. If a major incident of Natural or manmade terrorist act were to occur on any of those old bridges this part of Missouri would be completely cut off for long periods of time. Hiway 19 is very crooked and dangerous. Allot of lives have been lost on this very outdated road. A road can be senic and still be safe. Much of 19 crosses farms and level land. The rebuilding of this dangerous road would have little impact on the cattle and horse farms near 19 for many miles just south of Salem. Although it would take time to rebuild 19 and replace the outdated old bridges another alternative would be the better choice for a major short term improvement. M0 State K hiway is maintained from Mo hiway 19; 5 miles south of Salem to Akers Ferry and another Mo.State K hiway is maintained on the opposite "south side of Current River" to hiway 106. Both of these roads dead end at the river. Allot of money has been spent on both of the State K hiways in reserfacing and maintainence. The road benefits very few citizens. This could change if a new safe bridge was constructed in the area just up or down from the Akers Ferry. It would be a very long and time consuming drive to use 2 alternate routes one would lead you to nearly Ellington Mo. the other would lead one to Houston or Raymondsville Mo. both of these routes are more than 50 extra miles. Some of the objections in the past have been concerning certain fish that might be impacted. These fish are widespread throughtout Missouri and a bridge could be constructed in such a way as to pose little or no interfearence with them or Current River. After all those 1921 bridges forever changed Current River that were built on hiway 19 to start with. Not long ago a man drowned when a vehicle attempted to cross at Akers Ferry. This is a human life that was lost. Most of the time the Ferry is unmanned and the last time I was in the area the fee was \$4 to cross and no one was there; this was in the afternoon. What a rip off to the tourists and tax payers that have paid for 2 roads that leads to a dead end. I have viewed photos of the Cedar Grove bridge that was present in the 1950's and I have been across the newer Cedar Grove bridge in the past week. This bridge is used as alternative to travel South; This bridge is very low water and very dangerous at any rise on the river. Please take this into consideratin. We need a safe bridge for the sake of everyone who travels Mo State 19.</p>	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
222	<p>i am a horseback rider. i ride primarily along the upper current river from baptist camp to akers ferry. i would not like any changes to this area. it is fine the way it is. if anything, i would like more horseback trails to be made from akers ferry going south along the river.</p>	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
223	<p>1) Preliminary alternative B would come closest to how I believe the National Ozark Scenic Riverways should be managed however I would restrict horse access and their waste from the rivers along with motorized vehicles. 2) I strongly believe that the access of horses should be restricted from Montauk to Akers Ferry on the Current River and all of the Jacks Fork. The few gravel bars on the Current River are unusable due to horse manure and the insects they attract. I also believe motorized watercraft should not be allowed above Pultite at the least but preferably much lower. 3) As these areas become more popular I believe all of it should be managed for a healthier, cleaner river and family oriented float streams. 4) I frequently use and enjoy the Jacks Fork mainly from Alley Springs to Emminence and the Current from Montauk to Akers Ferry. The Jacks Fork has become an out of control party place on the weekends. The river is full of foul mouthed drunken kids and it is no place for a young</p>	6/30/2009	No			MO	63088

	family. (My sleeping infant was once drenched by a drunk with a water cannon) I have not been back on a weekend. The last time I floated the Current River between Baptist Camp and Akers Ferry every gravel bar (the few there are) were covered in horse manure and stinging insects swarming the manure. It's a beautiful float if you don't stop. I am concerned the horse issue will not be addressed because of pressure from horse enthusiasts at the expense of the public's health. 5) There are very complex issues to be addressed and not everyone will be happy. The public health and safety is paramount. Good luck and keep up the good work.						
224	1. alt A 2. no atvs, motor boats, or horseback riding	6/30/2009	No			MO	63119
225	Alternative A	6/30/2009	No			MO	63109
226	These could be 2 or 5 Limit recreation impact. Keep the wilderness status of these rivers by a STRONG permit system that should regulate the use with permits. Similar to BWCA Stop the increase in housing.. freeze further development in a zone along the river until an agreement can be reached on what rights a landowner can claim as well what are the easement/access rights. Stop the growth of horses in the river and along the banks, Keep them out of the river. Control access by motorized vehicles. Increase enforcement and fines.	6/30/2009	No		Open Space Council	MO	63304
227	1: Agreed, further limit ATVs on streams. Also limit equestrian crossing of streams.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63117
228	1. I find things in each of the Alternatives, but neither of them seems better than the others. Having management zones is a great idea. I fear that Alternative C would not be cohesive with protecting the resource for future generations, but if implemented with ample educational focus such as Leave no Trace, it could be successful. 2. I like the managed zone areas. Every camp has a quiet area, why not have a quiet area of the river? 3. Reducing or eliminating non-motorized boat use: What is your data for this decision? Is there scientific evidence or documented injuries? I would not implement these measures just for the sake of floaters. I think efforts should be made to encourage the two groups to coexist. Proper education at the outfitters and visitor centers, etc. Horseback Riding: I know there is data showing increased bacteria levels from horses. Are the levels high enough to harm human health? Are the levels within the allowable levels for whole body contact? Is it possible to manage this issue from the bottom up rather than the top down?? Possible to install permanent water quality monitors that keep track of bacteria levels and manage daily activities based on real-time data? USGS has many water quality stations in MO, they may be willing to place water quality monitors on their existing water level gauges. That data is available online real-time for everyone to use. 4. Glad to see that you are interested in protecting the historical structures. 5. Consider working with locals to manage resources from the bottom up instead of top down. Consider educational programs for children - they are the next generation and absorb ideas like a sponge. It is hard to change adults. Institute rewards for bringing in trash from the river. Promote active trash pick-ups through stream teams. I am a caver and a floater.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65559
229	I am writing to support those who use the rivers in Missouri and wish to maintain the pristine quiet and lack of fuel pollution. I strongly urge that the future of these waters means no motorboats. The closest option I see is A. Riverways should be left to non-motorized vehicles such as floats, canoes, and inner tubes. Missouri has sufficient lakes that can be used for motorized boats whose fuel and noise pollution is not ecological to natural life and the riverway. Noise pollution has become a huge problem and has significant and disastrous effects. Boaters interrupt other activities on the river such as floating and canoeing through their dominance. Please do not let the community of boaters who only care about their own selfish interest in larger motors dictate the future of these waterways. We must preserve them and do minimal harm.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65804
230	#1. I like Alternative C the best with some possible modifications. Given the alternative provides management with the tools it already has...I would include impact triggers that would allow for closures to certain areas of the river that present with excessive resource impact. Example, overused sections would be closed for the necessary periods to allow relief to these areas. Of course, all of the management goals will only be accomplished with the support of the political and judicial entities. The protection staff must have the support of the courts and management to implement these efforts. The judicial support has been very weak and limited to allow the park to effectively execute certain actions that protect the visitors and the resources. #2. I think the alternative of having some non-motorized use on sections of the river that really does not provide anyone with a clear and safe passage with a boat and motor. These areas can be phased in on a trial and tested basis, but sound management studies should be provided to back up exactly what traffic if any these certain sections now have during the high visitor use periods. Giggling season may be a period when certain sections of the river which is closed to motorized use, may be allowed, but that too could be argued both ways..keep closed, seasonal use. When I was in management, I often spoke of getting away from horse power management and trying to go to speed and proximity management of motorboats. That was too confusing, but would allow the protection rangers clearer tools to manage vessels that exceeded speeds in areas designated to travel at slower speeds. The size of the motor will always be confusing to both the protection personnel and the courts, hopefully, the rangers staff will never have to testify in court about their knowledge of horsepower on motors and where it comes from, because they will not be mechanical engineers. #3. I don't feel that adding wilderness status to any of the properties proposed will change or enhance the resources that are already in these identified areas. Having once managed several million acres of wilderness, it is both confusing to the general public and really opens to many conflicting ideas as to how wilderness is to be managed. The park service already has all of the legal language and tools to keep these identified areas as they were when the park was established. #4. Having started here as a seasonal State Park	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965

	<p>person and eventually worked up through the National Park Service to end as one of the management team members here in this park, I have several special places that I think should be provided with the best services and facilities available, and that is the old state park areas. These were the only open areas for locals to bring their families to picnic and have family reunions and allow camping along the river to those who did have land or know someone who did, before the ONSR was established. Therefore, I recommend that the continued effort to upgrade the amenities in the campgrounds for RV's and campers who want electricity and or other services as well. You attract the camper who can pay for the services and thus the park gets a better return on the campground fees to keep the cycle going. Excessive horseback riding impact and out of control ATV use will always need to be addressed along the Jacks Fork and upper Current River sections. Having the continued effort of establishing trails and closing those that are not designated should continue. I think continuing to upgrade and establish information sites, exhibits and other information to the visitor is vital to the preservation and education efforts this park faces. The trails illustrated map is a good beginning and a someday a park book like the ones we had in most of the western parks would be nice as well. Another issue that is sensitive to me and several of those of us who grew up here is that when they re-engineered the Big Springs walkway some three years ago, the park built a stone wall that was never before seen by anyone, near the Spring itself. The wall is now is one of the biggest obstructions to the overall view and historic view of the spring when you visit. The job was done well, but overdone where it gets closer to the Spring. It could be lowered a couple of feet to blend more in to the historical and natural setting that was there since the park was a State Park and for the past 45 years. #5. I know having this proposed plan and document developed to provide all interested parties an opportunity to comment took lots of time and money to get to this point. As I was leaving and beginning my retirement, I saw where the General Management Plan was about to go through its revision. When I got my copy of the proposed alternatives, my first thought was how confusing this all must be to the general person who has to sift through the pie, graft and line charts; the maps were well done, but hard to read when you were looking for a particular color of the river that was hard to find. I think making it more simple of clear text would be necessary in the future so as reach a broader and maybe less educated audience that is using this river equally or maybe more often than most. I still believe that having a "Visitor Center" would still be one of this park's finest accomplishments to assist the visitors, provide displays, educate, and allow visitors that do not own a boat, have an ATV, hunt, camp, horseback ride or hike get a sense of what this area is all about. It still stuns me to find that this park with all of its resources and development could not get a proposal and or support to get at top of the line visitor center. Along that same theme, I still would like to see a park managed boat operation for those visitors who are not able to rent a boat and or float a tube or raft, but want to see this great resource. Everyone remembers the boat tours from Big Springs, but those days of having someone provide that service is over and the park should explore the possibilities and service. I tried, but too many shifting issues and conflicts to get everything done as I would have liked to. Finally, on this round of comments, I should not leave out that the concessions program is complex, it provides front line services to the visitors, and this park needs to fold them more closely into the main theme of protection, preservation, education and providing the best service possible. Please begin, as we tried, by finding a way of improving the Akers Ferry store and facilities, the dangerous location of the Rounds Springs store and keep the Lodge and cabins on a "forever needing attention" list in every fiscal request of funding and support for all of the aging facilities this park inherited. Good Luck</p>						
231	No Action Any other action will hurt the local economy and the property values.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63881
232	I support ALTERNATIVE A	7/1/2009	No			MO	63011
233	<p>1) Preliminary alternative A would be my choice for protection of our Ozark Riverways. I just floated the Eleven Point this past weekend and was horribly disappointed by the noise pollution of motor boats on the river, as well as noise pollution by rowdy college kids the night before at Greer Springs campground. We saw a patrol boat, with two "officials," but they contributed to the noise in their motor boat, as well as ungracefully giving me a tidal wave of water when they sped past us. The whole situation sickened me and angered me. How are motor boats allowed in a protected riverway?? So I would opt for stricter regulations on parts of the river, disallowing the motor boats. Let them get in a canoe! 2) My biggest concern is noise pollution, at this time, on the riverways. In a world FILLED with traffic and blaring music, there should be at least a few quiet places left for the soul to recoup. The riverways are sacred, and should be treated as such. 3) I didn't like alternative C at all. There is already TOO much access, and not enough respect. I've been to lots of National Parks, where behavior I regularly see on the riverways of Missouri would not be allowed. 4) The Eleven Point was not mentioned in the report. It is purportedly the purest river in the system, and it seems it's protection should be at the top of the list. 5) I like closing some of the illegal access roads. My main concern, as stated, is the noise pollution on the river. I don't want to feel like I'm on a highway when I'm canoeing. I think the motor boats should be regulated to certain sections of the riverways (and perhaps taxed extra!!) The barrage of boats was unpleasant at best. We have agreed (my husband and I) that floating on weekends in the summer is just not fun any more. What a shame. The nearest place of beauty is being ruined by noise and crowds.</p>	7/2/2009	No			MO	63116
234	a	7/2/2009	No			VA	22408

235	test	7/2/2009	No			IL	60647
236	alt. c is the best plan i think, the horse problem needs to be a priority. no more than 20 horses (per area) allowed at one time, permitted with registration numbers visible, atv's the same way. we need responsible riders, not like what the cross country ride is doing to the trails and the water quality. the rivers should be protected from this type of over use as well as the hell raising jet boaters above 2 rivers on summer weekends. it is a beautiful park and we need your help to keep it that way.	7/2/2009	No			MO	65466
237	I believe that any more changes are unnecessary. When my family try to use our beloved river we have to come to grips with the overuse , no camping spots available and bank to bank people who get angry when we have to use our motor on shoals, the "city" people do not have a clue on the longtivity of the river nor do they appear to care! we all should be able to use the rivers together with respect for others and the river but on week ends and holidays it keeps most local people away. The last time my family of three boats and one canoe went on a four day float trip from Round Spring to Big Spring it was the most disastorous time I have ever spent on the river, We wound up at Waymeyers a couple days before July 4. There were so many people on tubes and canoes, we could not travel and we pulled to the bank. My husband has run Current for over 50 years , we were all near tears , we could not get through! We had people holding on to our boats, Holding liquor in one hand and using the most foul language ever heard (there were 5 children in our group ranging in age from 3 years to 15 Years). When we finally arrived in Van Buren we made the decision to motor to Big Spring, where our vehicles were and come home,instead of camping for two more days. Again this makes the point of no respect, Judy Roberts Dunn	7/2/2009	No			MO	65560
238	Please do the following: 1) substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails 2) limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs 3) reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats 4) enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations 5) limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination 6) designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area 7) monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat 8) reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations Thanks for your consideration of these comments.	7/2/2009	No			MO	64081
239	substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. Why we must save the Current River, again. from Eric Matthew Wilkinson on Vimeo. To learn more, you can view and share a new Missouri Parks Association and Friends of Ozark Riverways documentary entitled Why We Must Save the Current River, Again. It tells the conservationist story, reminding us of those who went before, why they saved these Ozark rivers, and why we must save them again. The Jacks Fork and Current Rivers are a national treasure that include 134 miles of clear cool water fed by beautiful springs, numerous caves, huge bluffs, diverse wildlife and a variety of recreational opportunities. The natural, scenic, primitive and cultural values of this area have earned a place in the hearts of fisherman, canoeists, and conservationists. These rivers have suffered degradation from overuse and violations of restrictions since Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) was established in 1964. The National Park Service will now take written comments until July 31st to decide on the new management plan. Friends of the Ozark Riverways are alarmed by the losses to the health	7/2/2009	No			CA	92117
240	Dear Dept. Of Interior I don't prefer one type of alternative over the other. I can't say which plan would be better than the other on designated areas. I do believe there should be a horsepower restriction on the entire river system. 25 hp should be plenty of power for any craft on these two riverways. I would also like to say, LEAVE FISHING ALONE! Anglers and other outdoorsmen are the type of people the park system should actively attract. These are the true public stewards of the great outdoors. For the most part these are the people that respect size and bag limits, and the conservation laws in general. You can hardly say the same for the young adults and other large groups that flood the riverways over a three day weekend. The anglers and outdoorsmen are the ones that enjoy these areas year round, not just over a long weekend. I hope whatever action the Dept. decides it won't hamper the fishing and hunting in some of the best country on earth. -Scott Ayers	7/3/2009	No			MO	65201
241	1. NO ACTION PLEASE. IT SEEMS AS IF WE LOSE MORE OF OUR FREEDOMS EVERYDAY. PLEASE HELP KEEP THIS COUNTRY FREE BY NOT RESTRICTING PEOPLE FROM LIFE ON CURRENT RIVER. THANKS!	7/3/2009	No			MO	63965
242	General Management Plan Comments Bill O'Donnell Route 1, Box 1750 Winona, MO 65588 I favor Alternative A. One early spring day while hiking in the proposed Wilderness area near Big Spring, I heard a most distressing sound: a low whine that grew louder and louder. I recognized this as the sound of a jetboat on the Current River a couple of miles away. I know that completely banning jetboats would never be politically feasible, but people who think they do not affect either others' enjoyment of the park or the riparian ecosystem are badly mistaken. That loud whine definitely degraded my experience that day. More importantly, the exhaust, which is mixed with the water by jet power units pollutes the water, as does the inevitable sheen of oil coming off of those motors. Unless you are on the very upper stretches of the river, there is no escaping the sound. The wildlife that had the misfortune of being born on the Lower Current have no choice. The aquatic organisms, the fish the anglers	7/3/2009	No			MO	65588

	<p>seek, as well as the macro–invertebrates and microorganisms their food chains are based on are also adversely affected by the sound, pollution and wave action of the boats. Similar arguments could be made regarding horses, which create 60 pounds of waste per day, ATVs, and unnecessary backcountry roads. These uses, and others, are all having a degrading impact on Ozark Riverways' resources right now. The National Park Service is charged with preserving its areas "unimpaired for future generations" and only allowing uses that leave the resources unimpaired. The Redwood Act was very clear about which comes first, and it's the unimpaired preservation of resources. Uses such as jetboats, allowing motor vehicles to cross the river, tolerating huge numbers of horses and the like are a clear violation of the charge the NPS was given when it was given stewardship over the rivers in 1964. The park needs to "man up" and take its responsibilities seriously, without regard to the inevitable negative public feedback. Comedian Bill Cosby once said: "the key to failure is trying to please everybody." The park should be guided by one simple rule: do right. Our mission, as laid out in the Organic Act, the Redwoods Act and the park's Enabling Legislation is quite clear: to preserve these rivers and their environs unimpaired for future generations. If we keep going down the same road we have been going, future generations will only inherit a muddy creek amid eroded and stripped hills. As the younger folk say, "let's not go there."</p>						
243	<p>1-4. Definitely A. Agreed that there are too many large crowds, lewd and rude behavior emanating from these large crowds, motor boats who have no consideration for non-motorized craft. 5. The laws concerning glass, cooler latches, "koozies", and trash bags are all good, but do not go far enough. With the increased numbers of overnight gravel bar campers on the river, it is paramount that we manage the amount of human waste that we are seeing on gravel bars, sandy draws, and tree lines. The "cat hole" scenario is not doing enough. Not enough people are even digging cat holes, much less 200' from any water source. The toilet paper blooms are increasingly numerous, obvious, and certainly detract from the Current/Jacks Fork's natural beauty. Especially in the busy summer months when the water levels are low, the crowds are many, and there is not much chance of flooding to help cleanse. Just after the busy season and before the fall rains, I worry that I may contract hepatitis just by camping on a gravel bar. I can only imagine the impact on aquatic life that the fall rains must have when they are carrying all of this combined bacteria, etc. into the water after a busy summer season. Quite frankly, this is disgusting and to me inexcusable. Especially for America's National Scenic Riverways. There are just too many good ways to deal with this ever increasing problem and I worry that if we don't, what we will be seeing in the 15-20 years that this management plan is supposed to span. I don't want to see these National Treasures turning into a cesspool. Requirements to "carry it out" should be implemented. Pett systems, wag bags, tank type groovers are available and the first two solutions are especially simple, clean, environmentally and user friendly, and cost effective. This should be enforced as strongly as the no glass requirements. Wag bags are also a good tool for backpackers/hikers and are increasingly being required in more places. Mt. Whitney being one of them. In all of the other National Treasures I have paddled, including the Middle Fork of the Salmon, The Green, the San Juan, Salt, Deso Gray, the Colorado, to name a few, toilets are required and expected. If you don't have one, you don't put in. It's that simple. It is also advised that urination be done in the river instead of on the bank. This prevents build up of bacteria and odor on the land. The ppm count is such that the effect of this procedure is nominal and it is not a big impact all at once when the rains come. Friends of mine who come here to paddle the National Scenics from other areas of the country simply cannot believe there are no groover requirements in place for these rivers. Then once they see the results of this, they don't want to come back. I have been enjoying these water sheds since long before they became National Scenic Riverways. Some of the local residents would run shuttle for a \$5 bill and keep your vehicle on their property for a week to keep it safe if you were going to be out that long. Back in the day one could go weeks at a time camping without seeing another soul. Obviously this is no longer the case and we should manage these precious resources accordingly. It would be a shame to "love these Rivers to death".</p>	7/3/2009	No			MO	65802
244	<p>1. I support alternative A. 2. Reduction/elimination of motor activities. Big Springs Wilderness designation. Native plant/habitat restoration. 3. Inclusion/increase of motor activities Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Judith Sarah Myers</p>	7/4/2009	No			MO	65201
245	<p>1. Preliminary alternative A best fits my idea of the best way to manage the ONSR. 2. Limit mixed use in areas. 3. Alternative C. 4. There are many areas, and preliminary A addresses them. 5.I would like to see more emphasis on Leave No Trace implementation. Also more enforcement of drunks in rentals on the river.</p>	7/4/2009	No			TX	75765
246	<p>1.Aternative A is the most desirable because it specifically addresses the closure of illegal roads and trails on the ONSR. 2.I think the closure of illegal roads and trails is the most critical element of any proposed alternative. Vehicular access should be restricted to designated sites and significantly reduced from the current situation. Almost every gravelbar currently has vehicular access. I also believe that there should be restrictions on the number of people allowed on the river during the peak season and there should be limits on the number of horses allowed on the equestrian trails. I am concerned about the overuse of equestrian trails at Eminence as well as water quality issues. 3.I do not believe any additional development is needed on the ONSR except perhaps additional restroom facilities or a campground at Akers Ferry. 5.Perhaps NPS should establish a permitting system for use of the riverways to keep user numbers under control and thus reducing the impact to the resource. This is not a new concept, many poplar trails require permits as do both state and federal hunting areas. The enforcement of a permitting system may require some additional manpower and noncompliance would need to be backed by significant penalties.</p>	7/4/2009	No			MO	65063
247	<p>* substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails * limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs * reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats * enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations * limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination * designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations.</p>	7/4/2009	No			KS	66204

248	1) Alternative A is the choice I favor for the ONSR. I'd modify the hp limits somewhat higher downstream around Doniphan and below. My family is from Poplar Bluff and I have been on this river all my life. Separate the types of river uses, do not allow mixed. I own a 40 HP jet boat and several kayaks. When I am recreating with one form of watercraft, I don't want to interact with the other. It is very dangerous to mix boating types, especially when there are so many "one-timers" in canoes that don't know the rules of the river and don't understand how to go through bottlenecks and rapids. Also, eliminate all illegal roads and enforce the law. Don't be weenies to the locals. 2) See above 3) Do not include motorized uses along the Jack's Fork River. Leave one river pristine if you can't separate out the motorized uses in the upper Current. Also, ban all illegal roads and enforce the rules. 4) Jack's Fork River. See 3. 5) No.	7/4/2009	No			MO	65109
249	1) No-Action OR alternative A is close to my vision of management for the Scenic Riverways (one of the most special places on Earth). I live near JAM UP cave on the JACKS FORK and spend a great deal of time on the Current as well. Over the years public practices have DECLINED. Campers leave lots of TRASH and FECAL MATTER!!! I often think that education would be of service. How can WE help visitors TAKE CARE OF THE NATURAL GIFTS THAT LIE WITHIN THE SCENIC RIVERWAYS??? My ideal would be to TAKE CARE OF AND PRESERVE WHAT IS ALREADY HERE. More visitors and recreations would only multiply this already GROWING PROBLEM. 2) Maintaining what is already available is key. Also, being able to access these amazing places important. Alternative A would best preserve our wilderness and not allow an influx of population who would misuse it. 3) I feel STRONGLY that Plans B and C would take the OSR in the WRONG direction and even serve to ENDANGER the magnifiscent gift that we are trying to preserve and manage. Inviting MORE DEVELOPMENT would only do MORE DAMAGE. Instead, people need to learn how to take care of what is already available. 4) Thay are ALL SPECIAL to me (ALL 134 MILES). I am so thankful for the PROTECTION DESIGNATION and efforts given to the OSR! We have something VERY SPECIAL and we need to help the public TAKE BETTER CARE OF WHAT IS ALREADY THERE! 5) Visitors need to know how to maintain an area during their use of it. RESPECTING and PROTECTING the OSR needs to be the major FOCUS of park usage. Education efforts and information need to be dilligent and highly visible/available to visitors who are reckless and end up trasThing the place because they just don't know any better or don't care. Visitors need to be shown/taught THE BASICS so that we all have nice places to enjoy! THANK YOU SO VERY MUCH FOR ALL OF YOUR WORK AND FOR LISTENING AND CONSIDERING OUR IDEAS!	7/5/2009	No			MO	65548
250	My major concern is that the National Scenic Riverways have turned into an area that are not used for "recreation" as much as they are used for a place to "party". Alcohol & drug use is rampant.Those using alcohol "to excess", and drugs are responsible for the majority of the trashing of the river. They are also responsible for the majority of the noise, the fights that occur, and the majority of the obscene & obnoxious behavior. Jon boats are seldom used for fishing; instead they are used to "go no place fast". They are typically operated by people who are in varied degrees of intoxication. In many areas, the motors on the boats are more powerful than they need to be for recreational use, such as fishing. I don't view overpowered boats "going no place fast" as recreation. Large groups of jon boaters congregating on gravel bars for the purpose of "partying" typically result in trashed out gravel bars. A friend recently reported finding & picking up an assortment of 58 beer cans, and glass bottles used for alcoholic beverages on one gravel bars used as a jon boat party area. Boom boxes, operated at excessive volume are necessary for recreation on the National Scenic Riverways? NO! All they do is create noise pollution, and ruin other's outdoor experience. I'm not sure that alcohol & drug use, operating over powered jon boats, boom box noise pollution, aggressive, obscene & obnoxious behavior qualify as recreation. Nor do I believe that is the best use, or in the best interest of the National Scenic Riverway. People who are on the river for the "party" need to stay home & go to a bar. It is NOT necessary to be drunk or stoned to enjoy outdoor recreation. The National Scenic Riverway should not be used like a bar in St. Louis, Kansas City, Columbia, Rolla, or any bar, from any location for that matter. When people show up with video cameras with the express purpose of filming "show us your tits" sequences, that is indicative of other problems. The same problems that occur on the river infect the campgrounds. I don't think we need more campgrounds; I think we need to focus on getting the drunks, dopers, fools & buffoons to stay home. Even though I like to enjoy a few beers at the end of a long, paddling day, I would "welcome" the outlawing of alcoholic beverages on the riverways. It is nobody's right to be drunk, or stoned, on the National Scenic Riverways, or "anywhere" for that matter. Robert C. Gitchell Camdenton, Missouri P.S. I was born & raised in Missouri. I have been using the riverways of Missouri for over 50 years. I have a Master's Degree in Criminal Justice; so I have a "general" idea of what is illegal, obscence, obnoxious, dangerous, and antisocial behavior.	7/5/2009	No			MO	65020
251	1. Alternative A is my idea of how the Riverways. 2 & 3 I believe no motor boats should be allowed and natural resources should be restored to more pristine conditions.	7/5/2009	No			MO	63105
252	1) I like Alternative A. I especially like the idea of closing down some of the illegal roads that have been developed, as well as more restrictions on motorboats. I would like to see added restrictions on the use of 4-wheelers/ATV's. 2) I am in favor of increased restrictions on motoboats on our NSRs. There are far too may boats going way too fast, disrupting the peace along with the serious safety concerns. I have nothing against motorized boats, but there are plenty of opportunities ELSEWHERE in the state for their use: Lake of the Ozarks, Table Rock, Bull Shoals, or any number of lakes. I also like the idea of allowing the rivers to return to their more natural state, and if this means closing some roads and restricting access, than so be it. 3) Under Alternative B, I do not like the suggestion of "additional trails". Under Alternative C, - I do not like ANY of the proposals, especially more boat ramps, more trails for horseback riding, and "higher tolerance for resource impacts". 4) The Parker Hollow and Tan Vat accesses on the upper Current River needs to be posted as a "no camping" areas. I have seen both of these accesses abused so badly w/ trash everywhere. I have even seen large camp trailers set up and occupied for what appears to be long-term use. Also, on the Jacks Fork river, I would like to see Rhymers and Blue Springs access more actively patrolled and cleaned up. Too many times I have seen trash cans there overflowing, and these accesses are generally unattractive as they seem to be nighttime party spots. I would like to see fines given to campers	7/6/2009	No			MO	63021

	that don't leave their campsites left in good condition. That includes smoldering fires, litter, throwing cigarette butts in water, etc. I like Alternative A, but I don't think it spells out exactly how these areas would be protected from abuse. Restoration is great, but how to minimize abuse in the 1st place is the real problem at certain areas within the NSR. 5) Increased patrols and visible presence, fines/tickets given out to litterers.						
253	substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations.	7/6/2009	No			MO	64113
254	I favor a plan that will allow river-based businesses to attract customers and make a profit to support their families while still protecting the river and surrounding land. It is important to protect the water quality to entice fisherman and paddlers to enjoy the Current and Jacks Fork River in years to come. I do not ride horses but it is a beautiful area for this recreation. It needs to be restricted in such a way that the river is not polluted. I am totally opposed to ATV use and support the enforcement of no foul language, nudity, beer bong and loud music on the river. It sure takes away from enjoying being out in nature. I am an avid canoeist but took my first jet boat ride up the Current last fall. It was so much fun and another way to enjoy the river. I imagine there are quite a few ways to get to the rivers that have been used by the locals and their ancestors for quite a few years. I do not believe these should be closed - after all, we are only visitors.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63052
255	Natural is the closest to my thoughts for the Jacks Fork River area. I have grown up on the Jacks Fork, swimming boating and fishing for 52 years from North of Mountain View to the connection with the Current River. What I would like to see is the permission of gravel removal in certain areas by local companies. This would put the river back bank to bank in certain areas and eliminate too many large deep pools. I would also like to see no motorized boats at all above the bridge at Eminence. No construction of buildings within sight of the river, with present ones grandfathered into this rule. Thank you	7/6/2009	No			MO	65101
256	1) I prefer Alternative A which seeks to return the river to a river dominated by canoes and other non-motorized boats. My primary concerns with the existing management of the river include the excessive use of large motorized boats; lack of enforcement of ATV and horse entry into the rivers; and lack of sanitary facilities to needed to minimize e. coli contamination of the waterways. Specifically: -no gasoline-powered outboards above Two Rivers on either the Jacks Fork or the Current or, in the alternative, only motors of 10 hp or less above Two Rivers. Boats with smaller (and quieter) motors would create less of a threat to the safety and solitude of users of human-powered vessels. -Limits of 25 hp motors from Two Rivers downstream to the Arkansas border. However, only boats equipped with pollution-control-devices and only ones that emit sounds up to 60 decibels would be permitted on the ONSR. -No gasoline powered outboards above the Danny Staples (Rte. 19) Bridge in Eminence on the Jacks Fork. -No-gasoline powered outboards above Akers Ferry on the Current. -Boat ramps only at key access points (approximately every 10 miles). Other boat ramps should be removed and roads to these ramps obliterated. -Restriction of all access of horses and ATVs from the stream bed. -Closures of illegal roads and crossings. -No gravel mining in the OSNR or major tributaries. 2)No gasoline powered outboards above the Danny Staples (Rte. 19) Bridge in Eminence on the Jacks Fork. -No-gasoline powered outboards above Akers Ferry on the Current. -Boat ramps only at key access points (approximately every 10 miles). Other boat ramps should be removed and roads to these ramps obliterated. -Restriction of all access of horses and ATVs from the stream bed. -Closures of illegal roads and crossings. 3)Allowance of large boat motors, horse access, ATV use, and continued tolerance of illegal trails and roads. 4)My concerns are the entire Jacks Fork River and above Akers Ferry on the Current River. Only Alternative A will protect these areas. 5)Assessment of a user fee (e.g. \$5/person per day) to provide revenue for enforcement and managment action.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65201
257	1) NO ACTION 2) NONE 3) NONE 4) 5) NO	7/6/2009	No			MO	65453
258	As a longtime friend of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I am in favor of a management plan for OSNR that achieves the following: * substantially decreases the number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails * limits motorized vehicles to official roads and bans ATVs * reduces motorboat horsepower size and limits usage areas for motorboats * enforces scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest-clearing violations * limits numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and restriction of swimming due to E. Coli contamination * designates the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * monitors and restores ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * reaffirms priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.	7/6/2009	No			MO	64114
259	KEEP OUR MISSOURI OZARK STREAMS CLEAN AND USABLE FOR RECREATION PURPOSES. PRESEVE OUR OZARK STREAMS BEAUTIFUL. EVEN THOUGH SOME STREAMS ARE SHOWING POLLUTION AND OTHER SIGNS OF "CIVILIZATION" WE NEED TO KEEP MISSOURI STREAMS AS PRITINE AS POSSIBLE, FOR NOW FOR US AND IN THE G=FUTURE FOR OUR CHILDREN AND THEIR CHILDREN TO ENJOY IN THE YEARS AHEAD.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63701

260	While I don't know all the details for the options I believe A or B would be closest to my idea of how to best manage the park. I certainly think the area should be kept as natural as possible but I also believe people should be able to enjoy the area. That would include canoes, kayaks, horseback riding and bicycles. I think horses and bicycles should be restricted to trails and potentially roads. I believe motorboats should certainly be limited by horsepower (electric motors only, no gas engines) in most, if not all areas. Camping areas and hiking trails should be maintained. I don't think additional areas should be planned. It's a beautiful area and should be enjoyed as it is. I would hate for the quiet serenity of the area to be anymore disturbed.	7/6/2009	No			MO	64118
261	Comment Period: 06/01/2009 - 07/31/2009 Topic Questions Instructions: Please number your response to match the number of the question you are answering. Thank you! Topic Questions: 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Response: Based on the idea that there are other water recreation areas, I would choose A. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Response: Elimination of illegal trails and activities, development of self interpretive opportunities, restriction of powered boats, careful monitoring of activities that are damaging to the surroundings 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Most items under Alternative C. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Response: All areas. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Response: A goal to keep the riverway experience as pristine and non-invasive as possible so that the area itself is the focus of those visiting rather than the activities that can be done.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65201
262	1. I think option B would be the most ideal management plan. I think returning the riverways to their natural state and educating people about the environment and the unique features of the area is important. 2. I think it is important that there is an emphasis on nonmotorized activities and recreational opportunities. 3. Exclusion of motorized activities is important. 4. My family and I have floated on the Current River and have been impressed by its beauty. I would like to see it maintained, and, even better, restored to its natural state. 5. I think canoeing is a great way to see the area. I would make sure that alcoholic beverages are banned while floating so that people can behave responsively and safely on the rivers. I think naturalist programs are good because they offer people a chance to learn about the area and learn how to protect it. I suggest coordinating with schools so that many more children have an opportunity to experience the area. At the same time, it is also very important that recreational activities do not disturb the natural state of the area too greatly. Human recreation should be limited if it is damaging the area. Strategies such as charging more for campsites or imposing higher taxes on canoe rentals may generate funds for conservation as well as reduce the impact on the natural environment.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65203
263	I was unable to attend the public comment forum on June 26 in St. Louis but wanted to voice my strong support for changes to the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have visited the park very infrequently in recent years due to the pervasive influence of motorboats, ATVs and development along the rivers, but I cherish fond memories of spending almost every summer vacation as a child along the upper parts of the Current River. My family would camp for at least 2 weeks every summer and took numerous float trips during our stay (this was in the 1960s-70s). We bought watermelons in Eminence - before it was a B&B capital - and floated them in Pulltite Spring to chill them for eating. If we heard a motorized boat on the river any time during those 2 weeks, it was a Park Service official going through. We visited all the springs along the river every summer. My recollection was that they changed very little from year to year - a testament to good park management, because the campgrounds were always full to capacity and the river was filled with floaters. My preference would be to see the ONSR return to the narrow use restrictions of the past so that the unique nature of the ONSR can be restored - and preserved for future generations. Alternative A as described seems like a way to restore the park to the way I remember it. I would like my own children to have the experience of enjoying the river as its earliest human visitors did, in the peace and quiet of nature. Missouri is a very diverse state and offers many other opportunities within the state and even within the southern region of the Ozarks and St. Francois mountains for ATV use, horseback riding, etc. There is no other place on Earth like the stretch of rivers in the ONSR.	7/6/2009	No		Sierra Club - Eastern Missouri Chapter	MO	63119
264	5) Please ensure that any new management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers must help restore the park to a healthy, natural state. NO to bigger motors, ATVs and horses.	7/6/2009	No		Certified Safety Consulting	MO	63116
265	I canoed the Current River before it was a National Scenic Riverway and our children cut their canoeing teeth there. I knew and respected Leonard Hall, whose book "Stars Upstream" was instrumental in getting the river designated. It would be tragic if the Current and Jacks Fork were opened to development, larger motors and all the intrusions that would forever change its charm. There simply is no justification for "development." I am strongly in favor of the most limited options for the rivers--it is the equivalent of the Boundary Waters Canoe area and must be preserved in its most scenic and natural state, even if that means curbing the insatiable desires of developers to turn it into a theme park. All the Ozark rivers are treasures, but too many of them have been damaged by commercial intrusions and over use. Let's keep these two rivers, already pretty well protected by federal law, as near to their historic beauty as possible.	7/6/2009	No		Outdoor Writers Assn. of America	MO	65074
266	keep as is with "No Action" or with less tubes allowed.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63965

267	It is unique in the world (and we have travelled extensively). We have spent many happy hours on the Jack's Fork and Current and treasure it. The change I would like to see is to keep horses away from the river.	7/6/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63016
268	The riverways should be open for people to enjoy but in as natural as setting and causing the least disturbance to nature as possible. In other words, I am in favor if severely limiting the use of motors both on the river and on land (no ATV's)	7/6/2009	No			MO	63019
269	First of all, I think horses have no business in the river. There is plenty of opportunity for horseback riding in the national forest lands within 50 miles of the ONSR. The Big Piney River has been completely taken over with horses. I floated there last fall on a weekday and saw over two hundred horses in a two day trip. I was never out of sight of someone in the riparian zone on a horse. Keep them out of the Current and Jacks Fork! Something needs to be done about all the accesses. Is there no law enforcement anymore? I cannot find a single gravel bar to camp on that does not have either a horse trail running through it or a road leading into it. What kind of outdoor adventure is that? I have to worry that some drunken crew may 4wheel into my camp in the middle of the night or have a bunch of cowboys ride right through my camp. That has happened to me several times. Of your alternatives I most agree with A. I think as much of the river as possible should be declared wilderness. The primitive areas should include all of the river as far as I am concerned. I think that all the river that is owned by NPS should be left as undeveloped as possible. I can understand the developed campgrounds. Most people use them and they create a buffer for those of us who prefer to camp in solitude along the river. They are also necessary for sanitation purposes. There are way too many people crapping along the river now. I feel that the number of floaters should be restricted to lessen the effect on the riparian zone. It is pretty bad when the water quality is unfit for swimming because the Nation Park Service lets too many people and animals in the river. Speaking of animals, I also think dogs should be banned from the river. There should be a limit to the number of people allowed on any given weekend. This could be controlled by limiting the number of boats allowed to be rented by the outfitters. I would hate to see a permit system though that my be necessary. I do think that trapping and limited hunting should be allowed. These activities usually take place in the fall and winter and do not really effect most of the urban users who may be offended by them. These activities are part of the Ozark Culture and should be allowed as they have in the past. I am OK with some jetboats below Big Spring. I would even support limited use further upstream. I live close to the Current and float it a lot in the fall and winter. I would use it more in the summer if the number of people were more limited. I am a floater and I like to hike and camp in the park. I have been enjoying these two rivers since 1971. I have seen many changes through the years. I used to camp at Akers Ferry in the big field before the developed campground was built and then closed. I remember the sense of wonder when I first saw Fire Hydrant Spring, Cave Spring and Pulltite Spring. I have been in most of the cave along the river before they were gated. Almost fell into the underground lake at Cave Spring. I have many fond memories of the river and hope that it can preserved for future generations I strongly urge you to preserve the river as best as you can by banning horses, and limiting access.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65
270	1)Alternative A more closely matches my wishes for the management of these besieged rivers. The closing of illegal roads and trails is essential to their protection and restoration. I would modify it to restrict motorized vehicles to only a very few accesses and campground locations. I would like to see motorized boats completely banned on the Jack's Fork and on the Current from Cedar Grove to Two Rivers. (except law enforcement) 2)I believe closing most of the roads and trails to the river to motorized vehicles, banning motor boats from most of the river sections and reducing the amount of horse trails and horses in the Park are crucial to the protection and restoration of the flora, fauna and geology of this unique area. I live on a farm and have atv's, horses, 4 wheel drive trucks and a speed boat. There are plenty of places to use all of these but the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should not be one of them. It is the place to float, hike, camp, fish and hunt in a wilderness setting, free of modern machinery, water polution and the overcrowding that over access brings. I have been, floating, hiking, hunting and fishing along the Current and Jack's Fork rivers for over 25 years and have been alarmed and disgusted by the increase in illegal roads, trails, private cabins, vehicles driving through the rivers and land disturbances. The Park was created to protect and preserve the unique flora, fauna, geology and free flowing nature of these rivers, not to provide unrestricted access developement and the degradation of the landscape and water quality. I strongly support a wilderness designation for the Big Spring area and other areas. 3) I do not believe additional access, facilities, motorized vehicles and consessioneress should be allowed. 4) The upper Jack's Fork and the upper Current are the areas I have visited most. I avoid the middle and lower Current and the lower Jack's Fork because of the increase of motor boats and development in these areas. 5) Enforcement of the restrictions I have described above is the most important strategy to protect and restore this priceless gem in the Ozarks. People who advocate more motorized access, more facilities and services will always clamor for more until the very nature that draws them to this place is completely destroyed. They must be ignored and a firm resolve must be adopted to to protect these riverways for future generations in a natural state. As I stated before, I drive a 4 wheel drive, have atv's, horses and motor boats. There are vast areas of public and private land and water to use them. Let's preserve this natural gem and keep them out of the Scenic Riverways.	7/6/2009	No			MO	64755
271	When my daughter was about 4 mos pregnant with our granddaughter, we went to the black river to spend a day snorkling and playing in the beautiful, clear water. She was in the water, snorkling, and i was standing about 30 feet away, when i heard an ATV coming closer. They had been running thru the water downstream, and all of a sudden, the ATV & rider came bursting thru the underbrush and was headed directly for my daughter, who was unaware. It was like a nightmare trying to run thru the water towards them, waving my arms at the driver and shouting her name... He missed her by about 4 feet, when she stood up... I hate any noisy, gas-guzzling, pollution machine that goes too fast to be safe. We have heard of too many children being killed or brain-dead from enjoying ATVs, or being victims of their parent's wreckless, ignorant use of ATVs. They have no place in our parks. Period. Sincerely, Sensible Citizen	7/6/2009	No			MO	63103

272	a	7/7/2009	No			VA	22408
273	No action, keep riverways as they are and increase access roads. The town depends on all aspects of this entertainment and I enjoy both canoeing and boating.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63028
274	Dear Sir or Madam: As a longtime friend of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I am in favor of a management plan for OSNR that achieves the following: * substantially decreases the number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails * limits motorized vehicles to official roads and bans ATVs * reduces motorboat horsepower size and limits usage areas for motorboats * enforces scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest-clearing violations * limits numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and restriction of swimming due to E. Coli contamination * designates the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * monitors and restores ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * reaffirms priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. I am strongly against any decision that contradicts or hinders achievement of the above statements. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Janice Carrell	7/7/2009	No			MO	63368
275	PLEASE PLEASE GET RID OF THE HORSES! I think that running in to horses and piles of horse manure along the river ruin the outdoor experience. I believe that most of the river should be kept as wild as possible.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65301
276	July 7, 2009 Dear National Park Service, I have read about this issue in the local paper, but have not reviewed the choices in question #1 above. My daughter kayaked on the Current River with her high school biology club in May 2007, and had a perfect trip, in part because it was early enough that the parties were not out yet. I went for a day hike along part of it last late December with my family and relatives. I hope to canoe on it next spring. We saw the illegal roads and the beach along the edge was full of car tracks. You should allow people to have some fun, but they should not be able to drive along the edge of the river, use off road vehicle near the river, use motors, or at least large motors, on it. In other words, take it back towards more what it was like 40 years ago when it first became a national river. Limit development, including your own, close to the river. I suggest you not get carried away with restricting horses unless the problems are significant compared to the other issues. Christopher C. Sorlien	7/7/2009	No			MO	65203
277	We have camped, floated and enjoyed the Current/Jacks Fork Rivers for more than 45 years. Our children grew up and now travel from Colorado and North Carolina to enjoy the beauty of this area. Alternative A seems to be the most beneficial option for the preservation of this area. We have visited other National Parks and the commercialization and density of visitors is a detriment not only to the Park itself, but to those who have journeyed to that particular destination. Motors on the river are any abomination. When we first started to visit Pulltite when it was owned by the Searcys and Rearys, the only motors were an occasional frog gigging expedition carried out at night. The motors were quiet. When the NPS took over, the additional motors were those of the Rangers either responding to an emergency or doing a routine patrol. We spent 11 nights at Pulltite from June 18 to June 29. Daily, we heard motor boats zipping up and down that stretch of river - not the experience that we came to enjoy. For the first time ever, a camper ran a generator. That, too, was a disturbance. I am surprised that Big Springs is not already designated as a Wilderness Area. It is the second largest spring in the world, and most people don't even know about it. Even Missouri describes it only as the largest spring in Missouri. We recently spoke to an 'old ranger', and he did not know its place in the listing of worldwide springs. Limiting the horse crossings at Eminence would be a plus, also, just as keeping 4-wheelers out of other rivers in Missouri. Do make every effort to keep the spirit of the original designation initiated when the park was established. Olga S. Smith	7/7/2009	No			MO	63034
278	1. Plan A most closely matches my idea of managing the Ozark NSR. It allows access for most of the population. Although it might be too late for the hellbender, it would help to protect plants and animals that live there now. I do not see how motors, on boats or ATV's, do anything favorable to any National Scenic Riverway. I feel the same way about livestock, to include horses. Roads and equestrian trails create unnecessary barriers to natural plants and animals, promote the growth of invasive plants along the "disturbed areas," and are subject to intense erosion. I know the area gets heavy use as several years ago I took my first and, believe me, my LAST, Saturday float on the Current River. I really think that that volume of use one day a week between Memorial Day and Labor Day is OK. I just choose other days. But, all those Saturday floaters do have a grand time!	7/7/2009	No			MO	63117
279	1) Very close, although I would prefer to see electric trolling motors as the only power alternative. The "kinds of things people did on the rivers in the 1950s or '60s" doesn't really resonate with me, it sounds somewhat contrived. 2)An absence of motorboats, tubing and ATVs! Also a more concerted effort to remove invasive plant species. 3) Only those parts that we cannot afford. 4) I like it all. 5) Better management of invasive plants, coordination with Missouri Department of Conservation.	7/7/2009	No		Missouri Master Naturalists	MO	63146
280	1. I strongly prefer ALTERNATIVE A. 2. I am most interested in getting motorized boats and atvs off the river. I like wilderness and primitive area designations. 3. promoting motorized use by building more ramps.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65203

281	<p>First, I must limit my comments to the sections of the Current above Round Spring and the Jacks Fork above Alley Spring because I haven't paddled the sections below those 2 points. Second, I speak only for myself and not the Master Naturalists or Ozark Fly Fishers in any way. 1. I prefer Alternative A because it does not permit powered boats in the upper sections of both streams. Besides the noise they bring I think they disturb the aquatic life in the shallow riffles when they pass over them. One of the things I have enjoyed very much over the years paddling and camping on these sections is the quiet and limited human presence. 2. I would like to see a plan that both keeps the upper streams largely undeveloped and increases the educational function of the park with emphasis on the natural community interaction. The lower portions, such as below Round Spring on the Current, are certainly more suitable for power boat use and those forms of recreational use. Managing drunken and threatening behaviors should be included as well. This park absolutely MUST be family friendly if we as a society are going to teach our children to value the natural world. If families feel threatened they won't come out and we will lose the opportunity to gain the support of the next generations. 3. I do not favor large scale development along these sections of the rivers. I believe that some facilities could be added if they were kept small in size to minimize their impact on the streams and wildlife. 4. The upper sections of both streams, and especially the Current, as noted in my introductory statement are very special places to me and the quality that makes them so is their wildness and peace. I love being able to paddle silently along and watch the wildlife and to camp on the gravel bars and enjoy the evening without the presence of another soul. I also love to be able to fly fish with minimal interruption from canoe herds. These are experiences that seem to be becoming very rare these days. I think Alternative A responds best to those issues. 5. I think that exhibits in the campgrounds or little nature stations that would grab the kids' attention and arouse their curiosity would be helpful for the reasons mentioned in #2 above. I also think that more displays illustrating the history of the Ozarks would be helpful in that they would illustrate what happened when the area was abused. By illustrating the before and after results over the last 50 years or so folks might begin to appreciate the need to manage the area more scientifically.</p>	7/7/2009	No		Missouri Master Naturalist; Ozark Fly Fishers	MO	63303
282	<p>question #1 alternative A is most like my idea of how the area should be managed. When I was little , we would go to these parks to float and camp with the family. Now I do not want to take my family because of the crowds and overuse of the areas. We have been going to the Buffalo River in Arkansas instead of the Missouri rivers because of this . Thanks for offering me the opportunity to voice my opinion.</p>	7/7/2009	No			MO	63131
283	<p>Plan A is close to my ideal way to protect the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. While I would prefer no motorized boats, I realize that gigging for Suckers is treasured sport passed down through generations. This sport is part of our Ozarks heritage. It is unreasonable to totally eliminate the motorized boats. Water quality is a major problem in this area, especially in the Jacks Fork River! Trail riding, live stock and humans, are the source. Horses being the major source. "BUN-BAG" is a manure bag that attaches to the horse. Requiring the use of this or similar product would reduce the fecal matter entering the streams. This is a possible way to keep the trail riders happy and our water cleaner! An over crowded summer weekend is unavoidable, enforcement of public intoxication is not! Periodic sobriety checkpoints along the river will possibly reduce this problem. Signs at all put-ins stating that the river is subject to sobriety check points may be a cost effective way to reduce the problem. ATV/off road riders need to be kept away from the rivers. Erosion does not need encouragement. Nor do we need the noise pollution! Wild horses could be controlled with roundups and public sales. Our western states are selling their wild horses in Arkansas. The Ozarks National Scenic Riverways was created to preserve our natural resources, not destroy them. Thank You for the opportunity to voice my opinions David Hutchison</p>	7/7/2009	No		Ozark Mtn Paddlers	MO	65807
284	<p>1) While there are elements in each of the alternative that I like, Alternative A is the closest to my ideal management approach. Unless the federal government is going to reintroduce the CCC programs, funding for park services will be tightened. The Department needs to utilize their resources wisely and require the commercial outfitters provide necessary educational information. 2) The following elements are very important to the Alternative A plan: Closing roads and trails that have been illegally developed; Floating without the sights, sounds and wakes of motorboats; Motorized forms of recreation would be de-emphasized; commercial services might be limited or modified along different portions of the river to achieve desired visitor experiences and resource conditions; and Restoring degraded biological communities and improving the overall natural setting. 3) In the overview it states that "Management would focus of creating visitor experiences and resource conditions that are reminiscent of those that occurred when the national riverway was established". Does this statement mean that the NPS will be reverting back to the levels of service and river usage in 1964? This needs to be clarified. 4) RECOMMENDATIONS: A) Horsepower Limits reduced to non-motorized from Round Spring to Two Rivers and 25 HP from Southern Edge of Van Buren Gap to Goose Neck; B) Limit overnight camping for the general public to designated public camp grounds. "Float Camps" authorized by permit only. Place greater responsibilities on permitted outfitters (link it to their license) to provide instructions to the NPS rules for health, safety, sanitation, alcohol consumption, noise limitations, glass restrictions, "Pack in / Pack out" concept, location of restrooms, aid stations, bar-b-que facilities, penalties for violations and a reward system for compliance (future use permitting preference); C) It was stated in the information provided that there is a limit to the number of outfitters and a limit to the number of canoes/rafts allowed on the river, but neither numbers were given. The NPS limits the number of vehicles in other park systems. what is the THRESHOLD FORMULA? I suggest that the number of persons on the river should be based on a graduated system on where the users are on the river (ie: less on narrower sections than wider sections, less impact to the natural resource, and the adage "Dilution is the Solution" applies; D) Trash Receptacle and Emergency Communication Equipment need to be provided at every NPS supported facility.</p>	7/7/2009	No		Arnold Stream Team 211	FL	34112
285	<p>1) I prefer option A. It is the most comprehensive method of preserving the natural heritage of the rivers and the watershed areas and cave systems that support them. Heavier use will only compromise the systems. There are numerous recreation opportunities for horseback riding, motorized boating and off road vehicles in other areas of the state besides the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. There is only one Current River and only one Jacks Fork River and they need restored and preserved. 3) Motorized boats. They should only be used by rescue or law enforcement or conservation agencies to protect park visitors or maintain the park. Recreational use of motor boats should not be allowed in the park. This is a unique area and there are numerous lakes and rivers throughout Missouri open to motor boats. There should be a few rivers, mainly</p>	7/7/2009	No			MO	65203

	unique environmentally sensitive areas, that should be restricted to non-motorized boat use.						
286	1) I rather like most things the way they are. 2) I feel strongly that lots of natural zones and primitive zones should be included. A quiet float, meeting each new year's crop of baby minks & ducklings is priceless. The Rivers need to be for activities that can only be done on/in the Rivers. If a recreational activity can be done someplace else, then we shouldn't allow it in the Riverways. 3) I strongly oppose whatever alternative includes loud power boats & vehicles. 4) From Montauk to Jerktail and all of the Jacks Fork are special. I spend the most time around Jam Up & McIntire Ford. I think y'all are doing a fine job of protecting these places. The one place that really grossed me out was the horse riding area. I do not see why horses have to be in the river. Can't they ride back away from the water? 5) Just keep drunks, horses, litterers and motorized vehicles out of the Rivers & off of the gravel bars & i'll be a happy camper. I think it would be all right to shoot some of the litterers.	7/7/2009	No		Greenwood Forest Association	MO	65548
287	1)NO ACTION, is the best way to manage the river ways! 2)NO Action should be included in the future! 3)A,b, and C should not be included, i prefer to have more access to the river and more facilities. 4)NO ACTION. 5)MORE river access, more restrooms and trash receptacles, less water patrol.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63028
288	1) no action 2) no action 3) A, B, and C should not be included and want more facilities and access to the river 4) None of the alernatives address the concerns adequately and no action should be taken 5) less water patrol, more access to the rivers and more facilities on river	7/8/2009	No			MO	63028
289	1) No Action	7/8/2009	No			MO	63841
290	1) I think alternative A is closest to what I would like to see happen to the land and waterways. I think it is important to preserve and protect lands, especially beautiful ones such as these, from excessive human development and destruction. Alternative A would hopefully do this to the greatest degree. 5) I think important strategies that should be included to manage these resources are: system of keeping waterways clean/unpolluted (acquiring stream team volunteers, or having some paid staff, or an new americorps program) Maintaining native plant populations, through planting natives and removing invasives (could use the resources i mentioned above?) Good luck! thanks a lot for your consideration, and i wish you the best as you work to preserve/conservse our fine public land and water.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63108
291	1) Plan A seems the most reasonable to me. This is a Scenic RIVERway... not a roadway, regular park, horse park or atv field. Its unique water qualities need to be protected from the increasing numbers of party hordes, erosion, trash, trampling, etc. The government should not be in the business of creating commercial recreation, but protecting precious resources they've been entrusted with. Not saying others don't have a right to be there...it is public land, but limiting the numbers and access points would go a long way to minimizing the impact on the water resource as well as the numerous unique springs and geologic features. I remember the first time I floated the Current in 1976, I thought it was America's best kept secret full of wonders unseen elsewhere. Please, recognize your stewardship for what it is. There are plenty of commercial operations to cater to other activities. But there are few charged with the guardianship of that, which, without your protection may disappear forever. That is what I believe my taxes go towards when it comes to the NPS. Thank you. Lean McKay	7/8/2009	No		Ozark Mtn. Paddlers	MO	65803
292	a	7/8/2009	No			VA	22408
293	NO Action	7/8/2009	No			MO	63109
294	1) I feel that Alternative A is the best option offered at this time. It is important for the NPS to protect the native flora and fauna of the area, more important it seems, than to provide an area for a bunch of folks to float and drink. Although I realize that recreational opportunities are an important part of the NPS mission, providing a diverse recreational opportunity should be of importance as well. Some park visitors will appreciate being able to float a section of the park and not have to hear jetboats all day whereas others prefer to bring their jetboat to the park. We should not limit either group's ability to enjoy the park, and Alternative A provides that. Further, there are very few times that it is feasible to run a jet boat on the streams above Alley Spring and Akers, therefore, Alternative A will not significantly affect those areas of the park. Finally, there are many rare and threatened species that reside in the ONSR, and their welfare should be a concern of the NPS as well. Continuous jet boating during the summer could have serious implications for many of the species such as hellbenders. Chronic stress associated with human activities could have detrimental effects on the reproductive activites of this amphibian since much of the activity on the river occurs immediately prior to the period of hellbender reproduction. 2) A diverse park experience is important as these parks become more popular. Having areas that people can use to "get away" from other boats and people is critical. Closing most roads into the park is an excellent idea. Most of these roads have been developed by locals, and they are some of the worst stewards of the park. I've witnessed more of them throwing trash out in the park than I ever have tourists. I am currently living in West Plains, but am a transplant from Iowa. The resources here amaze me, but the manner in which the locals treat the resource also amazes me. They have little to no respect for the resource that they have in their backyard. I'm sure their ignorance is	7/8/2009	No			MO	65775

	obvious when examining comments provided to park staff at the three public meetings held in the Ozarks. 3) I support further restricting access into the park unless by hiking or floating. No need for jetboats in certain parts of the park, and no need for ATVs or horses in the park. Both are extremely harmful to the landscape and horses are probably the number one water polluter in the park. 4) I have no special parts of the park- I enjoy them all and feel that it should be managed to provide a diverse NATURAL recreational opportunity. 5) Yes, as a transplant to the area, I think the one thing that really ruins a float is when you come up on a bunch of folks that have driven down to the river and parked on the sand bar to swim, etc. Limiting or eliminating access unless through a certified NPS access would improve the park experience. Too many people access the river on unapproved access roads. I would support a strategy of limiting access on the majority of the park, while improving educational displays, etc at the approved access areas. Best of luck with the task at hand!					
295	1) I believe that Alternative A is the best way to manage the Ozarks Scenic Riverways for the future, therefore, it is my recommendation. 2) I would terminate or at least greatly curb the use of high-powered motorboats on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, especially in those areas that are within the national park boundaries. These jet boats are extremely noisy, cause large wakes that can capsize canoes with novices in them, and they leave smelly oil/fume trails. I also believe that it is time to curb the amount of horse usage that already has had a negative impact on the beauty of the banks of the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers where horses are causing erosion along the trails, and the horses greatly reduce the water quality of the rivers by generating large quantities of feces (effectively polluting the scenic riverways). I also am in favor of designating the Big Spring area as a wilderness.	7/8/2009	No		MO	65807
296	1) Yes, Plan A is the best of the 3 plans. 4) It's all special, but the Jack's Fork and the Upper Current and their tributaries are the most special. 2&5?) I want to list several points that need to be included in future management of ONSR: * Substantially decrease number of access points and eliminate illegally developed roads/trails * Limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs * Reduce motorboat HP size limit and limit usage areas for motorboats -- there should be no motors on the Jack's Fork or Upper Current, other than for emergencies * Enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations * Limit number of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. coli contamination * Designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * Monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * Reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the NPS to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations * Hire and assign more Park Rangers who are capable of enforcing the laws * Educate people -- not only the tourists who come to the park, but also the locals who are there everyday and may have a completely different outlook than the tourist PLEASE, we must protect and preserve these rivers and surrounding wilderness -- they are the most beautiful thing in Missouri and have species found no where else in the world. (Doesn't the Endangered Species Act mandate that the area be protected?) My father was born near Eminence, MO. When I was a child, my whole family went to Current and Jack's Fork every summer to camp, canoe, and fish. I grew up on those rivers. We cannot let them be ruined. Thank you for considering my comments. Heidi Jackson	7/8/2009	No		KS	66203
297	Alternative "A" is my idea of the best plan. I'm 48 years old and grew up paddling the Current and Jack's Fork. I'm there, on average, 2-4 days a month in the winter and about 6-8 days a month April-October. I paddle a canoe, and some in my parties paddle kayaks. I used to occasionally use a trolling motor, but haven't in years now. I generally paddle Round Spring and above in summer to avoid the jet boats. I've noticed MANY more young boaters in the last decade doing nothing more than going fast up and down river in the summer. It's THEM, not the fishermen that are a problem. Back before jets, there wasn't such a problem. Would love to see a "No motor zone" except water patrol and NPS from Inman Hollow to Round Spring, and smaller motors above Two Rivers. I used to enjoy the Eminence to Two Rivers and Shawnee to Two Rivers trips for smallmouth fishing, but have deserted it since the Trail Rides have polluted the waters. I don't care what anybody SAYS, we all know the wealthy horseback riders will continue to get away with it because they bring money into the community. Now I notice more and more horses on the upper Current (above Akers) and fear the same pollution as I see more horse trails up there. I would love to see some kind of "Quota" on livery canoes per day also. I'm sure it won't happen, but it would be nice. Heck, I'd gladly pay a \$5 per trip fee to get pay for any lost revenue; maybe have a seasonal \$25 fee for frequent users. I would "Waive" that daily fee for residents in the surrounding counties. Motor boats would pay a higher fee than paddle craft as they do more damage. One last thing is maybe come up with some idea on scattered outdoor "Privies" like the USFS has in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. More and more people come from the "City" and haven't a clue about covering and disposing of their own waste. In the summer, it's getting pretty bad in some spots. I'm glad you have taken steps to stop some of the drunks and drug abusers on the river. I've been embarrassed quite a few times when introducing visitors to our river only to have them endure the lewd and sometimes criminal behavior. It seems it is not quite as bad this year, I hope it continues to improve. Thanks for allowing my comments. Terry Webb	7/9/2009	No		MO	63957
298	1. Based on what I have seen, I would prefer alt A. It fits my access to Jacks fork better. I only get down the river once a year but I do not like seeing or hearing the atv's crossing the river at will. I believe that all atv activity should be banned from river access period. I do like the current from the Baptist camp to akers in the early spring or when the jacks fork is to low but it does get a little carried away when the large engine boats get on the rivers. There should be no motorized boats on the upper jacks fork except for the rangers. 2. All trash should be removed as it is brought in. All neighboring property owners should be required to have their septic systems checked every two years for proper activity to reduce the e-coli problems. 3. Again the 40 hp motors should be restricted to the lower sections of the current river. No othing greater than 10 hp above akers or alley and only when needed by the park service. 4. no comment 5. no comment	7/9/2009	No		MO	63026
299	I have been frequenting the scenic riverways for 45 years. I believe it to be more beautiful today, than it was when I began going there. My family and friends are very kind to the area because we love it so much. We always leave the area looking better when we leave than it was when we arrived. I understand that this is not the case with everyone who visits, but I believe there are enough of us who care to offset the damage done by a few. More restrictions is not the answer. My group of family and friends is quite large. Our experience at the rivers is being ruined by access,	7/9/2009	No		MO	63052

	number restrictions, and restrictions on activities. Not only would I like to see no new restrictions, I would like to see some existing restrictions lifted. I do not believe it is necessary to limit the numbers of cars, tents,or people at our campsites. We are punishing everyone for the actions of a few. AS there are more of us who care than don't, the area will hold it's own. Please give our rivers back to us to enjoy. Thank You Bill dorsey						
300	1) I favor plan A. This ia an area of Mo. that should be kept in as pristine condition as possible. The quality of the water should be regularly monitored and human activities causing water pollution should be curtailed. The quality of the water should be of the highest priority. 2)the size and horsepower of motorboats should be restricted. Jet boats and jet skis should not be allowed. Horses and trails they and riders use should not be next to these rivers. 3) no comment 4)the mills on the rivers and pull-tite springs areas should receive special focus. 5)finest for violating regulations; limiting the no. of people during hi-peak use;requiring a permit. again, the water quality should be monitored and activities limited or curtailed til the water quality returns.	7/9/2009	No			MO	63012
301	Topic #1 My vote is for no action. I have been coming here for years, The parks and rules are great as they are. The few things that have irritated me were illegal anyway, I am sure. Once below Jam Up cave met a jeep coming up the river, and about three years a go some nut was floating down Jacks Fork with a VERY loud canoe. He had built some super amplified stereo, It took up the whole canoe. You could hear him coming from over a mile away. Other than those two incidences in many years of camping here, I have no complaint. Please do not regulate up the park and ruin it for the 99% of us who follow the rules and offend no one.	7/9/2009	No			IN	47528
302	I wanted to share my feelings about the Ozark National scenic riverways. I lived and raised my four children just outside Willow Springs,Mo over the past 25 years. We floated, hiked, and explored caves in the area as often as possible. I tell folks that i raised my babies wedged between my legs in my kayak on the jacks fork. (and that's the truth). They were all in the rivers as infants. We as a family have felt blessed to be near such beauty, wilderness (what's left of it) and nature. It had been difficult for us to really enjoy other vacations when we had such great rivers in our own back yard. Recently some friends Of my son's came back for a visit..(they had moved to oregon) and we were discussing floating the rogue, the sandy, also comparing rivers in north carolina..etc. The conversation returned to our own rivers here. They had returned to take a week-long float/camp down the current. Their comments were, "These rivers here are JEWELS, there just isn't any thing like them anywhere else." I think it is critical not only for the other species on the planet, to protect and respect habitat..but for our own human species to have places to reconnect to nature, to QUIET, to vista's and views unspoiled. It is here were we recharge, refill, regain lifeorce, chi, spirit, whatever you would want to call that essence of renewel, reconnection to LIFE/energy, creation and return to our lives better. I am sure there are pressures to develop for 4-wheelers, etc.. I want to express that I am very concerned about the damage and noise from these. I no longer float the black river because of all the constant, ridiculous noise from 4 wheelers running back and forth THROUGH the river. They have lost my business as a tourist/consumer of their cabins,canoes..etc. I lived on spring creek near the north fork for 8 years. I swam daily at big spring.. I have watched the entire area be desecrated by 4-wheelers. Not only is the riparian zone totally disrupted and water quality decreased, but the whole spirit of the place is drastically altered. I know that "spirit" sounds unscientific, and maybe to some unsubstantial, but there is a prescence to places, a reverence, holiness (and i'm not religous) to these places..they are my church, they are where i go to pray. I wish we erected shrines to the holiness of our springs, like they do in japan... I feel they are gifts from the earth and should be places of reverence, spirit and honor..not just looked at as part of the tourist industry, places where people go to get drunk in the summertime. I am asking you as guardians and stewards to please consider keeping places of wilderness, places where people can find peace, solitude, quiet, their pristine spirits inside themselves, and holiness in their environment. sincerely, cindy dawson	7/10/2009	No			MO	65706
303	#1 Generally, I like Alternative A because it best preserves/retains/restores the rivers to their status when the national riverways were established. I like the idea from Alternative B of offering guided and self-guided tours/activities to special areas in the park and to educating visitors that there is more to the park than just the rivers and springs. Many visitors are probably unaware of the cultural/historical sites. #2 Absolutely extend wilderness status to Big Spring. #3 I have to be honest and say that I AVOID the Current and Jack's Fork because of the seemingly unmanaged crowds. I love to float, hike and trail ride, and all those options should remain in the park, but all of them must be better managed so as not to damage natural resources or the serenity of this beautiful area. Hundreds/thousands of horseback riders at one time; the proliferation of ATVs, motorcycles and roads; and the sheer number of floaters make the park a place to be avoided by many like me. They have "loved the park to death." People should be able to camp on a gravel bar without fear of being run over or disturbed by ATVs and such. Frankly, I'd like to see motorized boats above a very small horsepower completely banned from the rivers. Alternative C would seem make all of these situations worse by expanding the resource-based recreation. Enforcement of existing laws and regulations regarding roads and access points need to be enforced. Something must be done to get rid of the "party" atmosphere that pervades the park. Just as party coves on lakes are being better monitored by law enforcement officials, so enforcement be stepped up in the park. Hire more people to get this done! #4 No comment. It's all special. #5 Look at other better-managed national riverways such as the Eleven Point and Buffalo Rivers and learn from them what works and doesn't. If necessary, perhaps we need to go back to Congress to tighten up the regulations governing the Current and Jack's Fork. Clearly, "locals" need to buy-in to the park's new plans. But they need to be educated about the possible consequences of new development, per Alternative C, or the consequences of the no action alternative. Ultimately, it seems to me, the rivers and park would be better served long term by Alternative A and possibly B, but the locals will have to understand why. Make sure the funding is there to hire more staff for education and enforcement.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65721-8120

304	I have enjoyed the Ozark National Scenic Riverway and would like to encourage access to the National Park so that others can appreciate its beauty and special wonders. Q. 1) My modified plan would allow hiking trails, horseback, camping, floating, boating in areas that are not considered sensitive and that would not be easily destroyed by erosion or cause contamination to the waters. Q. 2) I believe that the public has a right to visit all portions of the National Park with barriers in place to keep them from danger or destroying the natural beauty and quality. Q. 3) You should not have large areas that are restricted, only restrict areas that directly effect the integrity of the environment. Q. 4) Welch Spring and Blue Spring are hard to reach because of the steep gravel roads, plus there is a long walk to these springs. Because these springs are listed in the top 8 of flow, it would be nice to have them easier to access so that the public can see the special qualities each of these springs offers. Q. 5) Why are there no trout stocked in these cold-water streams? This would add to year-round enjoyment by fishermen and a boost to local businessmen.	7/10/2009	No			MO	63050
305	I prefer the no action plan. A few changes might be of benefit. An issue on the rivers is tubers/canoers versus power boats. All may enjoy the rivers, with a better understanding of the experiences of each. The most congested bit of the Current River can happen at Waymeyer. This occurs usually in the heart of the concessioners' season, mid June through mid August, or about those dates. Also, tubers tie together and float while at it, they crowd the river from bank to bank. I suggest that tubers be cited if they tie together. A parent with a child, that is different. An individual with a cooler tube that is different. More than two tubes tied together ought to be cited. This is a safety issue. We need to encourage power boaters to avoid the areas of Waymeyer to the gap during peak busy seasons. How do we do this? The traveling of the same powerboat up and down the river numerous times during this time, would be viewed as very disrespectful to others during these busy times. Putting in at an access and traveling to a destination, is practical. Power boaters are needed on the rivers for safety purposes. Many a power boater has come to the assistance of a canoer who has tipped. I hear of these rescues many times in a given summer. This is also a safety issue. With some education and understanding on behalf of the motor boats and of the floaters, maybe some harmony could begin. With appropriate funding, rangers could spend some time on the river educating both powerboaters and tubers/canoers. I could see a ranger out in a canoe. He/she would go along by tubers to discuss safety issues of tubing, such as, not tying together. How power boats operate in a way that it is actually to a floaters benefit if the motorboat does not slow. How power boats come to the rescue of many floaters, specifically tipped canoers. A ranger in a canoe would be a refreshing change, albeit, maybe not practical of paid manpower. How can we encourage powerboaters to put in at Waymeyer and go upriver, and put in at Big Spring and go downriver, on Saturdays in the summer? How can we really restrict the numbers of tubers in the river at one time during the summer busy busy Saturdays? Good luck.	7/11/2009	No			MO	63965
306	1. Either Alt. A or B. I believe they provide a good mix of strong resource management ideals. Especially Alt. B which seems to provide more avenues for human intervention in order to restore degraded habitats. 2. I believe there is less need for developed programs/structures and rather increased need for enforcement procedures. The people that are littering, showing no regard for the resource and just there for the "party", will generally speaking not be influenced through education. Rather, strong enforcement will give them a push to try alternative sites or methods to get drunk or do drugs. 3. As discussed in #2, I believe more emphasis is needed in enforcement. Unfortunately, people with low relationship values to nature and have the propensity to treat the outdoors poorly and little will persuade them otherwise except strong accountability. 4. I spend most of my time on the Upper Jacks Fork, but also have floated the Upper Current (Pulltite and on down). The biggest thing that I see is ignorance in terms of burying human waste and proper distance from the river for 'deposits'. Most of the folks that I see will probably receive the proper waste management message well. Also, instream management for those shallow wide areas should be considered, but I realize this would be a low priority for cost and logistics. 5. Certainly invasives should be monitored and controlled. This is one area that is simple to implement (not necessarily cheap however), but is important to maintain the natural community.	7/11/2009	No			MO	65706
307	please restore and protect this area from atvs and other destructive vehicles this area is very important to many endangered amphibians and other species Thank you Anne Henry	7/11/2009	No		sierra club	MO	63376
308	1) Alternative A is closer to my idea on management of OZNSR. Substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails. Ban ATVs! Reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats. Enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. Limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination. Monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks and native habitat. Reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the Natl. Park Serv to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generation. 2) Upholding the original mission of the OZNSR established in the 60's! 'Provide uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunity consistent with the preservation of the national river ways resources'. I have personally experienced the deterioration of this region over my life time and will not take my grand children on certain areas due to human waste, animal waste, noise, and the over crowding by canoes. The current condition on many stretches of the river way does not come close to fulfilling the original mission. 3) Allowing any more destruction of wilderness or more human access to already stressed regions. Continuing the status quo which will surely mean loss of this great treasure. 4) The Jacks Fork River upper and lower region. The upper is over used by canoes and horses. The lower (below Eminence) is polluted with human and animal waste. The areas that are outside the national park pollute the areas that are in the park. Private property and the city of Eminence pollute the river that flows into the OZNSR. I'm not sure this is adequately addressed in any alternative. 5) Limit commercial access, and reduce # of canoes, horses. Ban all motorized vehicles in most areas along all the river ways inside and out of OZNSR, ATVs, large motor boats. Monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat.	7/11/2009	No			KS	66061

309	1. I like A the best, but would like to see a 10hp limit like in C in the north boundry to round Spring. Not sure how that would work with the wilderness but it works on the Buffalo, actually see very few motors there but it is available. This would allow the traditional giging in the winter, (possibly seasonal) and the more physical limited folks the opportunity to use a motor rather than paddle, small motors make very little impact in erosion and noise. 2. Hp limits 25 is plenty on the river. Get the ATVs and Horses out of the river. 3. No action is not accepcable. 4.covered in 1 5. Close the illegal access, put the Shannon County Road district in jail if needed.	7/12/2009	No		MTFA	MO	65738
310	1. I think the No-Action alternative should be selected. 2. I really believe that the current motor restrictions on the rivers are adequate. 3. Not making any changes to the motor size limits on the river. My family and I have made numerous trips to the Current River in the last 3 years. 4. We spend all of our time on the river below the Big Springs park. Our boat has a bigger motor on it and that is where we put in. What we have observed is that the traffic on that part of the river is either people fishing or families enjoying the day on the river. We see many families with small children like ours going on boat rides, swimming, picnicking, camping and just enjoying themselves. You don't see many floaters on that stretch of the river, it is to far between pickup points for short floats. I know that a few years ago the park service increased monitoring of the river in response to the "parties" and I believe that this has worked wonderfully. You also don't see any trash along the river. Most of the boaters that I know will bring out more than their own trash if they find any. If there we observed any wild parties on the river, we would not take our 2 and 3 year old sons over to enjoy the river we would go somewhere else. I see a lot of boats with kids that age in them and I would suppose that there parents would do the same. We love the river just as it is. Our observations of the Big Springs park are that it is quiet and would be a great place to camp or picnic. 5. I thnk looking at the options periodically is a great thing to do, but believe that the current management strategy is working well. When something works, you should not change it. Thank you Jon Fitzgerald	7/12/2009	No			MO	63957
311	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal. Alternative A, there is misuse of the river by jetboats. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Limits on boats/tubes. Maybe even go to a permit system to limit overuse. Educational pamphlets should be handed out so that trees aren't cut down on gravel bars, and human waste isn't all over the gravel bars. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? The area above Two rivers should be open only to non-mechanized recreation. It is too small to allow both jetboats and tubes and Canoes. It is only a matter of time until someone gets killed. Jack's fork river should also be non-mechanized. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? More education about the resource would lead to better/safer and more family and enviromentally friendly use of the river. Lewd activity and drunken jetboaters are taking over the river on summer weekends, and it needs to be stopped.	7/12/2009	No			IL	62901
312	1) I think options A or B would be the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Recreation within nature is the most important consideration for managing the national riverways. 2) A large amount of natural and primitive land use zones, and non-motorized river use zones should be included in future management. 3) There should not be large amounts of developed land use zones and mixed-use or seasonal mixed-use river zones. Some resource-based recreation land use zones are OK. 4) Big Spring should be considered for wilderness designation. 5) Natural recreation (non-motorized boating, hiking, primitive camping) should be stressed over other forms of recreation (motorboating, lodging).	7/12/2009	No			MO	63303
313	1. Alternative A is the closest form to how I would like to see the river managed. I came of age when paddling the river was the primary focus. People were left behind and power boat fishermen were on the lower Current with craft that didn't deafen. When I camped on a gravel bar I could walk into the woods without sinking into a horse induced "quicksand" trail. I do like the idea of Alt B to increase some off river focus for visitors. 2. I feel the non-motorized portion of the river is a significant requirement of the plan. I would also like to see a reduction in the access to gravel bars by both horse and vehicle visitors. I shouldn't awaken with a horseman in my primitive campsite nor be forced to move (as I have) from my gravel bar seat so a 4 wheel drive truck can pass. 3. There is great pressure on this great resource, but Alternative C would greatly increase this in a way that would degrade the experience. I often avoid the river on the big holiday weekends. Alt C would further the revulsion. 4. I am particularly concerned about the commercial horse encroachment near Shawnee Camp. My concern includes the degradation of trails and bars mentioned above, but also raises fears of fecal contamination of the river and increased presence of insect pests associated with the potential number of animals concentrated in and near the park. Power boats above Two Rivers are a travesty! 5. Close the unauthorized accesses and enforce their closure. De-permit equestrian operations that accelerate gravel bar degradation. Require trail riders to travel in the higher country above the river except at designated crossings. Keep the motors small and downriver.	7/12/2009	No		Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club	MO	64118
314	Dear Sir, I have been paddling the Jack's Fork and the Current Rivers for about 10 years. I think these rivers are the most beautiful places on earth. I am appalled at the way the National Wild and Scenic rivers are being abused. They are turning into party rivers. We have a wonderful example of that in the Niangua river, which has become so bad that one couldn't take a family trip down it because of nudity, drugs and profanity. A year ago, I tried to find a gravel bar to camp on that didn't have a dirt road connecting it. I didn't succeed. These dirt roads give access to vehicles and people who abuse the river. I ran into a group of men who took pride in the size of tree they could knock over with their vehicle. They also drive in the river. (This is "wild and scenic?" The original agreement included easements that prohibited vehicular access. There is also a large problem with the horses. I think that this, in a way, is a larger problem because it involves thousands of people. If they could be located away from the river, it would save the water quality. I tried to hike from the river to several historic sites that were supposed to be accessible from the river. I couldn't walk to them because the horses had made the path into a quagmire. I believe that the purpose of the "Wild and Scenic" designation means that the river is supposed to be protected and I feel that these rivers, as they are not maintained, are a disgrace to the National Park Service. We really need to start enforcing the original tenants of the designation, "Wild and Scenic." Sincerely, Nancy B. Doucette	7/12/2009	No		OWWC	FL	33406

315	(1) NO-ACTION.	7/12/2009	No			MO	63965
316	4&5 Please protect our water, it is our future. And why are the showers in such bad shape?	7/12/2009	No		S.T.3419,OMP, Sierra Club	MO	65689
317	NO CHANGE should be made to the ways that these rivers are regulated. Current operations work just fine. These rivers are for the public, all citizens of missouri, and should not be controlled by the minority in a fashion that excludes the general public. These are OUR rivers, not to be controlled so heavily by the state. Leave them as they are.	7/12/2009	No			MO	63620
318	1) no action motors to remain 40 Hp at the Jet. NONE 4) NO no Hp restriction in the Gap between the bridge and Big Springs.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63877
319	1. Plan A 2. Maintianing the wilderness aspect of the territory. 3. Commercialization and exploitation of the natural resources for private gain. Elimination of those elements(off road vehicles, motorized power boats, RV camping that damage the eco system and imparrell the future of this planet. 4. No comment 5. Make a concern for preserving natural wilderness the primary motivation for action.and make decisions today based on the impact it will have for people 7 or more generations hense.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63104
320	1. Alternative A which calls for keeping the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and corridors in as natural a condition as possible, protecting the ecology, habitat and folk culture of the region, restricting access to a reasonable number of canoes, limiting ATV to very narrowly defined areas, limiting the number of horses that can congregate at any one time in or along the rivers, and maintaining the campgrounds for separate tent and RV camping is very important. Natural areas should be maintained as natural areas. Areas that are developed should be extremely limited. The reason the public has entrusted the Ozard NSR to the Park Service was in the belief that the Park Service could protect this beautiful area for our descendents to enjoy. 2. Big Spring tract should definitely be protected as wilderness area. If the idea of encouraging greater access to the outdoor recreation opportunities receives a lot of support, then I urge that any new developed sites, for education, for paved trails, or parking, etc., be limited to very few spots on the Current River. Leave the Jacks Fork River in a more primite state - with no power boats and with limited access points. Only the lower Current river, below Eminence should have power boating. Limit development at Alley Spring. 3. There are many rivers in Missouri, and most allow motorized boating. Let's have this one restricted to non-motorized activities... I do not want to see more developed areas or developed zones. there are nature centers run by Missouri Dept of Conservation that teach hunting, fishing etc., and that is appropriate place for such activities. Ranger programs can increase public "access" to outdoor recreation WITHOUT more buildings and/or parking lots in the park area. Ranger-led programs on native crafts, etc.,could also take place outside of the park boundaries. We do not need this in the park and in the natural areas. 4. The alternates are vague on specifics, but protecting large areas as wilderness, and limiting motorized vehilces to the lowest stretch of the Current is key. Also, no ATVs in the park. There are lots of other places where people can drive them. The park service needs to put a high priority on habitat protection and water quality protection. 5. Two key points: A. I urge the park service to consider adopting a "pack it out" plan for all canoe liveries - requiring boaters to carry out human waste, as is done on western rivers. We are blessed with a climate that will break down human waste relatively quickly, but with the numbers of boaters now using the river, we will be better served if people do not leave their waste and acompanying toilet paper on the river banks. This practice will also serve as a useful educational effort. B. I think a reservation system and a limit on the number of canoes (no power boats) on the river is also a good step. The river can handle a lot, but we can only expect that numbers of boaters will rise, and the park Service will be better served if it begins to add restrictions now, and not when the situation is worse. this can be managed by the outfitters, with those people who bring their own boats going through either an outfitter or the park service.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63119
321	a	7/13/2009	No			VA	22408
322	Hi, This is a test of the comment form. I will submit my full comments later. Thanks.	7/13/2009	No			VA	22205
323	1. no action 3. please limit motorized equipment. The noise, odor,and oil discharge have a strongly negative impact on those of us that wish to enjoy the waterway be canoe. Thanks	7/13/2009	No		boy scouts	MO	65809
324	Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best management for the park. Please preserve the quiet, natural, non-overdeveloped atmosphere, and even remove any present overdevelopment. Ban all off road motorized vehicles, eliminate sports bicycling that damages the land, eliminate motorized boating, or limit motorized boating with power and speed and noise limits. Eliminate loud partying.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63111- 1828

325	<p>1. Plan B is closest to the ideal situation, but plan A would also be a good choice for the future of the park. 2. The designation of the Big Spring area as wildreness, and the reduction in motor traffic are both very important. 3. Reducing the amount of developed zone to a minimum is extremely important. 5. There must be a part of the park where those interested in getting away from motorized vehicles are able to do so, and the environmental health of the park must take an extremely high priority.</p>	7/13/2009	No			MO	65201
326	<p>Topic Questions: 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Answer: I'm pleased for the most part with the way the park is managed now. So I prefer the No-Action preliminary alternative primarily because I do not want to see large scale sweeping changes implemented. There are some problems that exist today on the current river, but I believe most of the problems really exist on Saturdays and not during the rest of the week or the off-season. The following problems I see are as follows: a) People (usually on tubes, canoes, and rafts) throwing trash in the river. This is often caused by canoes that tip over. It would help if coolers were more secure so their contents would not spill into the river. b) Radios on boats, tubes, canoes, and rafts are a distraction and annoyance. Loud music has no place on the riverways in my opinion. I would like to see all radios/sterio systems banned. c) Drunkeness on the river is not something I enjoy and observe frequently. I would like to see all alcohol banned. It simply has gotten out of control. Unfortunately, however, rental agencies could just set up shop and operate completely in the Van Buren gap area and unless a ban on alcohol is worked out with the State of Missouri / Carter County, little could be done to stop the alcohol abuses in that area. Nevertheless, I believe steps must be taken now to stop the rowdy alcohol related behavior on the river and a total ban on alcohol seems to be the only possible solution in my view. d) Law enforcement is often not very visible. I believe a more visible law enforcement would be beneficial in deterring noise violations. I see that the park rangers often stay in the same spot just below mill creek on the lower current - often waiting with binoculars looking to catch violators. They should be out in the open most of the time as a deterrent to violations rather than simply reacting to violations as I commonly observe now. e) I have seen some louder than normal boat motors on the river. 99% of them are not too loud, but some of them either have glass packs or bored out mufflers that are intentionally louder than they need to be. I would like to see these unnecessarily loud motors elimated - and I'm not saying additional HP restrictions are needed or desired. Where are the park rangers with the decible readers? f) Rental agencies should be required to properly educate rafters, canoers, and tubers of the dangers of floating the current river. Rental agencies should be required to limit the alcohol - if not completely eliminate it. A flyer with tips and phone numbers to law enforcement provided to floaters by the rental agencies sounds like a good idea to me. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Answer: I do like the greater emphasis on education of the public found in the alternatives. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Answer: I'm saddened to hear that HP restrictions were part of the alternatives. There are some unruly boaters for sure, and they need to be dealt with individually. However, a 40 HP motor with a jet seems to be the perfect setup for boaters like me to see most of the river. I take my boat all the way up to Round Spring and down to Gooseneck with the 40 HP evinrude e-tec that I own, and I can't imagine having that freedom of accessibility taken away from me. I paid a lot of money for my boat because I adore the riverways. I usually do not run my boat up and down the river all day - usually, I will motor up to a section of the river I want to experience, shut my motor off, and I will float my boat down river with a big sasafrass paddle. I enjoy the peace and tranquility of the river, and boating the river is my primary way of accessing all of it (below round spring) year after year. Of the other alternatives, Alternative C seems closest to my view as it would not limit me personally. But I reject it due to the motor HP restrictions. Below are some of my reasons against further HP restrictions on Boat Motors. a) The gap at Van Buren poses a problem. Because there is no federal oversight for the 4 mile stretch above and below Van Buren, a 25 HP restriction in effect from Raft Yard / Waymeyer up to Round spring will force what I believe a lot of the boat owners who utilize that stretch of the river with 40 HP motors (nearly all of them) into the Van Buren gap area and below. I believe additional motor HP restrictions must take that into account. There are already more than enough boats on the river, and I don't want to see any more congestion in the Van Buren area. Many boat owners will not downgrade their motors or buy new boats for a 25 HP motor, so they will simply come to Van Buren. Any problems between tubers and boaters in my opinion will be magnified and make floating south of big spring a bigger deterrent for many because of the increase boating traffic in that area. Also, let's face the reality of the situation - there is very little floating activity between the Jacks Fork and Waymeyer. Why limit the HP restrictions in that area to accomodate the very few people who will ever visit the area? It should be known that boaters (with 40 HP motors) are the primary users of this area, so why should we place further restrictions on them? If a canoer wants to experience that area, they can have a wonderful time on a weekday when there is very little boat traffic. b) I've paid a lot of money for my boat and 40 HP Evinrude E-Tec motor. I love the riverways so much that I personally would want to continue to see most of the river below round spring, and I would have to buy a new boat and motor to be able to enjoy it. That is a lot of money and I don't think I'll be able to sell my current boat and motor for what I paid for it. I would be forced to save up and buy a new boat and motor. This is a financial hardship that I believe would be placed unfairly on me. The park service should have implemented a 25 HP restriction years ago when most were running 25 HP motors. Now most boat owners have upgraded to the legal maximum, and to force all of them down to 25 HP is a huge financial hardship to place on individual owners. If I am forced to a 25 HP motor, not only will I have to buy a new motor, but I will need a new boat because my current boat is too large for a 25 HP motor - OR - I will switch back to a prop with a motor lift. I guarantee you that many floaters will not like the idea of props on the current river. The wake from a 25 HP prop on my boat will be about the same as the wake on my 40 HP jet. c) I personally don't see a need for motors greater than 40 HP. HOWEVER, I don't see the harm in them and I don't want to see a restriction placed on motors below Big Spring. The river is deep and wide enough to support the bigger motors there. The problem with increasing motor hp restrictions in this area is that many of the boat owners with greater than 40 HP motors would move their area of operation into the gap I believe. This will cause further congestion in the Van Buren gap area in my opinion. I realize that this area is not under federal oversight, but I believe it should be taken into account (especially with Watercress park) when making</p>	7/14/2009	No			MO	63119

	these HP restriction decisions. Do we really want more boats with larger motors in the Van Buren gap area? If you eliminate motors above 40 HP below big spring, I believe you will find more boats with bigger motors in the gap area. Please do not do this! 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are						
327	1. I resent the "No-Action" terminology, as I feel there should be a strong ACTION of protecting the Riverways from vehicles and commercialization. Protect all 134 miles, if there is no more to be obtained. Motorized vehicles on the water or the land will forever damage it, and it can never be regained.	7/14/2009	No			AR	72628
328	1. Manage in such a way as to have no negative impact on riverways and environs. Do not increase access, no new roads, no deforestation, no ATV's. My wife and I have Kayak paddled and camped the Current (5 days), and visited the Springs and Jack's Fork, for a swim, Last Year. I was taken with the natural beauty, and wildlife of the place. The history of the area is interesting, and will continue to be reflected, in it's preservation (eg. PULLtight). We plan to return. Edward Tedtmann,MCP	7/14/2009	No		Sierra Club, Pack&Paddle	FL	33426
329	1) Option A. Motorized engines should not be allowed or only allowed in the off season (late Fall to early Spring). There is too much human-powered traffic for motorized use to be a compatable activity. 2) No motors. 3) No motors. 5) Limit the number of commercial canoe permits. Require outfitters to educate their customers in Leave No Trace principles and have their customers sign a Leave No Trace code of conduct. This will help cut down on the trash left behind by floaters and help people think about how their actions affect others around them trying to have a relaxing outdoor experience.	7/14/2009	No		Missouri Whitewater Association	MO	63118
330	1.) I think that option A is the best one for the Current River and the Jack's Fork. Access to each river should be limited more so than it currently is, litterers should be strictly fined and motorboats should not be allowed on the Jack's Fork at all and nowhere north of Eminence. That river system is the best in Missouri and should be managed in such a manner which resembles our feelings for it. I have never met anyone that says it is ugly or there should be more people on the river. It goes against everything the park system is trying to do to allow more access. Every other major river in the Ozarks allows almost full access for recreation so let the motorboaters visit elsewhere. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be cared for as if it where the only river of its kind left. 2.) I feel strongly about the horsepower restrictions on boat motors. I agree with Alternative A to limit the use of motorboats to the highest degree. Once again, let people go elsewhere to run their boats. Also, a paddle is all anyone needs north of Eminence and elsewhere. If they cannot handle that, maybe they should be on a lake somewhere. Motorboats harm the river's ecosystem far more than people realize who own them. They also harm the experience of the other visitors who want to fish quietly and/or camp and hike in the peace and quiet. That is why I go there, not to listen to a bunch of lazy people who cannot handle a boat and paddle tear through the channel all day and night, molesting my fishing! 3.) I think there should be no new development or new access points made into either river. There is plenty of that already. No new trails should be made to caves or any other natural areas. Let people find them on their own. If they cannot find them, then they do not deserve to see them. the education opportunities sound good on paper but I believe would result in ruining the natural spots. Guided fishing trips do sound like a good idea for people who need help catching fish, as long as they do it without a motor boat. 4.) The entire river is special and should be viewed as one giant natural area, all 134 miles of it. It showcases to the world what makes Missouri the greatest place on Earth; having more fresh, clean, cool water than we know what to do with! Our state is home to some of the largest amounts of ground water and springs anywhere in the world. We should be proud of that and seriously protect it. There are enough places to visit in the country that have been developed. This area should not ever be one of them. The accessibility currently to the park is more than adequate. The Current River and Jack's Fork River are prime candidates for maintaining Ozark ecosystems. Further development will only lead to even more development down the road. If we put a stop to it now, then our children will be able to see the same drop dead gorgeous scenery we all appreciate now. 5.) Maintain current access points and recreation sites, encourage people to visit and experience the rivers and do not allow any new development to take place. Regulate the drunken fools who pollute the river with their trash but do not punish those who have done nothing wrong and just want the river to be left alone so they can always come back knowing they do not have to see strip malls and Wal-Marts everywhere. I propose a blend of alternative A and business as usual. Keep doing what you are doing with the park as it is currently in great shape. Just do not change anything. No one will benefit from any new development, whether for education, recreation or whatever label they give it. Be sure to keep the water quality at the highest possible level and if that means restricting access for horseback riding, ATVs or whatever, then do it. Keep native fish populations strong and healthy. Focus on the natural parts of the park and not on the unnatural. Do your best to maintain a healthy watershed throughout the park. That is what funding should be spent on. Try your best to keep the park in a natural or wild state and make sure those who are using the park do so in a respectable manner. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my opinion and comments, it is greatly appreciated.	7/14/2009	No		Student	MO	65203
331	Topic Questions: 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Alternative A. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Increase availability of river stretches with no motorized boats. Decrease abuse of river by people riding horses in the river. Eliminate illegal roads and any abuse of river by motorized vehicles. Decrease pollution related to the boarding of 1000 horses in the river floodplain. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Nothing specific mentioned in summary. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? If continued use of the river by jet boats is necessary, they should be limited to certain wider stretches of river closer to towns. If continued use of	7/14/2009	No			MO	65274

	the river by horses is necessary, there should be stretches of river where they are prohibited.						
332	1. No Action 5. I do not feel that the horsepower of the boat engines should be decreased to 25 HP. Most of the boat traffic is on the Current River between round springs and Van Buren. The area between Round Springs and Two Rivers is not a common canoeing section of the river, therefore, the boats are not causing any conflict to the canoers. As a boater, we show the utmost respect for the canoers if and when we come upon them. Most of the boaters in this area are very courteous to the canoers.	7/14/2009	No			KS	66061
333	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? No action. Or better yet eliminate the use of any motorized boat within the Scenic Riverways. 134 Miles isnt that much compared to all of the other rivers that can be boated with a motor. Give the canoes and kayaks a break!	7/14/2009	No			MO	63146
334	Please: The Jacks Fork and Current Rivers are a national treasure that include 134 miles of clear cool water fed by beautiful springs, numerous caves, huge bluffs, diverse wildlife and a variety of recreational opportunities. The natural, scenic, primitive and cultural values of this area have earned a place in the hearts of fisherman, canoeists, and conservationists. These rivers have suffered degradation from overuse and violations of restrictions since Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) was established in 1964 Friends of the Ozark Riverways, tourists, environmentalists and others are alarmed by the losses to the health and quality of ONSR and the unique natural features that originally warranted protection. We need you to: 1,substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails 2 limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs 3 reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats 4 enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations 5 limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination 6designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area 7 monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat 8reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations.	7/14/2009	No			CA	92117
335	Topic Question 1 I strongly endorse Plan A. I have spent years canoeing and hiking streams and rivers throughout the eastern part of the US and the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers are something special. My family and I canoe the Jack's Fork River several times each year. There are many rivers, streams, and lakes throughout Missouri and the midwest where motorboats, ATVs and horses are permitted. People who are inspired by and appreciate a more natural setting where the environment is not totally disrupted deserve at least some protected places. There are few left, especially in the midwest, and the Jack's Fork remains a largely undisturbed jewel. Each time I bring someone there for the first time they are blown away by the natural beauty of the river. We have species of fishes, plants, and insects that are unique to this area. It would be criminal to reduce it to a haven for motorized vehicles, horse trails, and additional roads. The Scenic Rivers system is a national treasure. It does not belong exclusively to people in Missouri, or Illinois, or any other state; it belongs to every citizen of the United States. As a US citizen, I plead that you give it lasting protection.	7/14/2009	No			IL	61859
336	1) Alternative A is most favorable. 2) Important Details to Include: Horsepower limits for motorized boats, Minimal access to watershed by horses/trail rides, Eliminate riverbank access/crossings by ATVs and other motorized vehicles. No further structural development upstream of PowderMill. Strict limits on # of canoes rented in each zone (weekends could be a higher limit). Tubes only rented downstream of PowderMill - many of these folks are party drinkers. 3) converse of #2. No additional thoughts. 4) Concerned about vehicles driving up to riverbank campsites after dark. Those who have easy access are less likely to respect solitude, conservation, and privacy. Concerned about water pollution from horses and river erosion from ATVs and river fords. Concerned about any development that will not allow the riverways to remain pristine for multi-night canoe floating. The springfed portions upstream of PowderMill are incredibly rare - please maximize protection. 5) Appreciate the stepped up visibility of rangers and enforcement of "anti-rowdy-rules" initiated by Noel Poe several years ago. This seems to be helping. I know its hard and thankless work for your ranger team, but please keep it up ! Background - I grew up in St Louis and floated the river as a youth with my parents. Later as a Boy Scout in Afton, we enjoyed multi-night treks. Twenty years later, I was able to take my son on several 100+ mile floats with the river clean and welcoming - just as I had remembered it to be. Today (10 years later), I'm still driving up each summer from my home in Texas to fish, float, and gravel bar camp. This is an incredible resource. Please enact the plan elements that ensure maximum protection of the river. In a tight economy, aim your limited NPS resources at the simple effective controls, rather than increasing investments in wider scope, more access, or higher visitor density.	7/14/2009	No		Boy Scouts of America	TX	75080
337	As a frequent canoeist in the Ozark region of Missouri and Arkansas, I can readily see the rapid destruction of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers in the general vicinity south of Salem, MO. I'm sure there are many unpleasant causes for the deterioration of the two rivers and may not be a simple problem to fix without proper enforcement of current laws and regulations. 4) Even though the river is 134 miles long, it should not be impossible to control and contain unsavory practices on the river and shoreline. From what I have seen, there seems to be about 75 or more "illegal access points" along the full stretch of both the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. It seems to give open access to ATV and other "motorized vehicles" to enter the waterway and disrupt the river beds and banks. Not only is this killing the fish and other animals, but it is against the existing laws in effect that are not being enforced to any effective degree. 5) These illegal access point must be closed down for any hope of stabilizing the streams, riverbeds and riparian area along the rivers. 4) There has been, for some time, a problem with the horse population and equestrian traffic along and in the river, especially around the Eminence, MO area. Not only are the ferral horses contributing to the river polution, but organized trail rides throughout the Jack's Fork riverway adds a great deal of polutants to the stream area. This has been going on for many years,	7/14/2009	No		Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club	MO	64131

	<p>but still detracts from what could be a better healthier experience of swimming, paddling and fishing the riverways. This is senseless destruction of our natural resources, which will be more difficult to get corrected if we do not act quickly and forcefully. I am in total favor of sharing the river and its natural resources, but not when any one of the parties is damaging the resource I am also using. 5) It seems to me that including the owners of the horse camp in discussions to eliminate or contain the damage being done by the vast amount of riders using the rivers as a trailway. They must realize the damage that is being done to the waterways and conduct more organized trail rides on surfaces and avoid, as much as possible, the river area itself. I don't think much will be accomplished without the convincing and support of the horse camp owners. Being a frequent visitor to the Current and Jack's Fork area, I do not feel I have more of a right to these natural resources than anyone else using them. I do not, however, believe anyone has the right to knowingly contribute to the pollution and damage to the riverway and the area itself, leaving the area unsuitable for water activities such as swimming, paddling and fishing.</p>					
338	<p>1. Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? First and foremost, I would like to voice my appreciation for the opportunity to express my opinion on the river on which I was raised. The waters of the Current and Jacks Forks rivers reflect the heritage of a hard-working people. I hope that many of them will submit their views, but I must say that every one to whom I have spoken are in agreement that "No-action" is the preferred alternative. No modification is necessary. 2. Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? The general management plan in the Spring/Summer 2009 newsletter #3, page 2, describes four purposes of the national riverways. They include 1) preservation and protection...unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers..., 2) provide for and promote opportunities for...understanding of the natural and cultural resources, 3) offer opportunities for understanding and appreciation of the human experience..., 4) provide for uses of...outdoor recreational opportunities.... Attempting to balance and meet these four goals is a daunting and difficult task. Access to outdoor activities in the Ozark Mountains and the surrounding region is readily available. The Mark Twain National Forest covers 1.5 million acres in Missouri (www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/marktwain/about/) while the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest in Arkansas encompasses 1.2 million acres (www.fs.fed.us/oonf/ozark/). This creates access to large tracts of land for a variety of recreational activities. The Ozark Trail system in Missouri covers 140 miles (www.ozarktrail.com/trail.php). The Ozark Highlands Trail in Arkansas is 165 miles in length with 27 miles of spurs and loops (www.hikearkansas.com/ohr_map.html). The State of Missouri has 38 natural areas (one in conjunction with the L-A-D Foundation) protecting almost 20,000 acres (www.mostateparks.com/natareas.htm). The Missouri State Park system includes 85 state parks. They also administer the Roger Pryor Pioneer Backcountry. Total area is over 200,000 acres. They had 15,676,557 visitors in 2008 (www.mostateparks.com/resourcecenter/2008annlrpt.pdf). A review of the listings of historical societies at the State Historical Society of Missouri will reveal almost countless history resources (http://shs.umsystem.edu/directory/index.shtml). As shown in the preceding paragraph, many natural, historical, cultural and recreational resources are available in the Ozarks outside of the scenic riverways system. In other words: Purpose #2 (understanding of the natural and cultural resources) and Purpose #3 (appreciation of the human experience) can be easily met through a plethora of other sources. What should also be noted is that the resources described above typically do not include streams, certainly none of the quality and beauty of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. Purpose #4 of the general management plan is to provide for uses of outdoor recreational opportunities. Because the riverways are so truly unique, this consideration should be more heavily weighed than the three other stated purposes. Reducing access (by increasing restrictions) would reduce our ability to enjoy the elements of outdoor life in this truly unique way. Prohibitive restrictions runs counter to Purpose #4's objective. 3. Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? I feel very strongly that restricting access to the riverways will be a disservice not only to those in the area who routinely use the rivers for recreation but also to the many tourists who visit the area every year to experience the unique beauty and pristine water. Future restrictions will take away opportunities that cannot be replicated elsewhere. 4. Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? All portions of the river are important to me. I cannot say that one area is less important than another. Of course, the river increases in size as the river flows the 134 miles. This creates different recreational opportunities and, I'm sure, different challenges for the park service. When reading the GMP/Wilderness Study in Newsletter #3 (Spring/Summer 2009), I noticed a picture on Page 3. The picture shows approximately 25 canoes on a single stretch of upper Current River. The sheer number of canoes on the upper Current may be viewed as a problem by the park service. I understand. This is one area that can be addressed without causing too much of an economic burden to the local economy. However, the economy of the region should certainly be considered. The Current and Jacks Forks rivers (in the scenic riverways system) flow primarily through Shannon and Carter counties. Carter County and Shannon County have median household incomes of \$26,947 and \$25,322 (2007 data), respectively, while the state average is over \$45,000 (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/29/29035.html and http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/29/29203.html). Any reduction of canoeists would have an impact because of a decrease in tourism. However, the canoe rental services should not be severely impacted. If the park service were to demand a reduction in the number of canoes that the canoe rental services could provide, the laws of supply and demand would engage. Fewer canoes would allow the vendors to demand a higher price, while having fewer canoes to transport and handle. Alternatives A and B feature outboard motor restrictions that should not be considered for a variety of reasons. First, the present restrictions are adequate and reasonable. My experiences in the scenic riverways do not indicate that the jon boats are a significant problem. Second, the proposed restrictions to the Jacks Fork River are completely unnecessary and, therefore, should not be considered. The Jacks Fork River is self-regulating. The river is often so low that the sections above Alley Spring cannot even be canoed. My daughter and I enjoyed a beautiful weekend on Jacks Fork River in late May 2009. We floated from the Highway 17 access (Buck Hollow) to the Highway 106 Bridge (Alley Spring). During this two-day float (a weekend...I'll say that again), we encountered fewer than 20 canoes</p>	7/14/2009	No		MO	63935

	and saw only one jon boat, which did not even have an outboard attached, just a trolling motor. The restriction would do nothing as it is almost impossible to do more than what is currently allowed under the current outboard motor restrictions. Reduction of outboard horsepower on the Jacks Fork River is unnecessary. Third, the proposed outboard motor restrictions would deliver negative economic consequences to the residents around the rivers. As stated in earlier commentary, the economy of the region is much lower than the state average. The local economy is depressed. Everyone who has a boat for the river has purchased it based upon existing limits. More precisely, almost all have 40 hp motors and bank loans associated with their motor and boat. If the restrictions were to be reduced, their motors would have little resale value because they could no longer be used on the river, and they would have to purchase a new 25 hp motor if they are fiscally able. To put this into perspective, I purchased a new 40 hp motor in 2007 for \$7,000. As you can see by my own personal example, forcing every one who enjoys the river by jon boat to sell their outboard motor (for which no market will exist) to buy a smaller motor will be an extreme burden upon the households of the area surrounding the Ozark National Scenic Riverw						
339	The best alternative is A. Let the parties take place at the Lakes. Keep these places wild so we can look at them and remember what this plant used to look like.	7/14/2009	No		Ozark Angler	MO	65802
340	No action	7/15/2009	No			MO	63020
341	1) Plan A closely matches my idea of the best management plan. I've been canoeing in Missouri for over 40 years (since my parents took me, when I was a child), and am very sad about the way this river has become. I only want to bring my family to the Current River on weekdays--it is extremely unpleasant on weekends. There needs to be strong enforcement, and limits on the numbers of canoes allowed on the river. Motorboats and ATVs should receive heavy fines! Close all of the illegally built access points! Please return this river to a park-like setting; preserve the beauty and serenity. Use management policies that work on the Buffalo River! Enlist any other state & local agencies in enforcing rules on the river! Sincerely, Jennifer Thrutchley Helber 816 520 2689	7/15/2009	No		Ozarks Wilderness Waterways Club	MO	64064
342	I welcome this opportunity to comment on a new management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I support Alternative A as the best way to protect and restore these wonderful rivers. Alternative A would offer wilderness protection to the Big Spring tract and Missouri needs more wilderness areas. It would also deal with some of the abuses and over-use problems that are threatening the health and beauty of the rivers - too many boats out at once, too many unauthorized trails and access points, too many ATVs where there should be none, too many horses, too much tolerance of high-powered motor boats that ruin the river experience for those on traditional float trips. I think Alternative A has the best chance of reducing the pollution of the water and restoring our rivers to the pristine character we had hoped to protect when the park was established. Along with adoption of Alternative A, I hope that funding and staffing are increased for ONSR so that regulations and laws can be enforced appropriately.	7/15/2009	No			MO	65259
343	Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best use of and protection of this incredible Missouri resource. Polution from noise, animal waste, artificial light, and other forms of man-made polution should be a high priority for stopping. We can not recreat a place like this. It is all about effort. If we wanted to make it easy to get there we would build a highway right along the rivers and have a marina and boat ramp around every turn. Swimming and floating on these rivers is a privilege, and I treasure each time my family and friends have had the opportunity. Joe	7/15/2009	No			MO	65201
344	I wish to comment on the proposed management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. #1. Of the alternatives offered, I believe Plan A has the most going for it. It is critical that the NPS close the trails and roads that have been illegally developed. These roads seem to be used for gravel bar mining and ATV use both of which are degrading the water quality of these wonderful rivers. The ONSR was created to preserve the history of the Ozarks and should be maintained as a primitive, non-motorized experience. Last spring, while on a float on the Current River, boats with high horse powered motors passed our group and tried to swamp our canoes for fun. I understand that serious accidents have recently taken place from so-called "gravel bar hopping" by these high horse powered boat owners. Motor size needs to be seriously limited. #2 I would also like to see the Big Spring tract become a permanent wilderness as it's beauty and contribution to the riverway waters cannot be replaced. The small learning centers and research, monitoring and preservation programs (Alternative B) possibly like Missouri's Stream Teams could be an excellent way to insure water quality and maintain the history and culture of the Ozarks. #3 Alternative B seems to provide for increased motor boat traffic which I believe to be detrimental to the preservation of a natural experience on the Current and Jack's Fork rivers for the reasons stated above. It also seems to plan for the removal of primitive camping which is an integral part of the river experience. Last spring at my primitive camp site, I heard and saw a long list of migratory bird species like cerulean and hooded warblers which would be driven out by development. #4 My major areas of concern have to do with the increased ATV trails, legal and illegal, and the extreme overuse by horseback riding operations like the Cross Country Trailrides at Eminence which field thousands of horses at a time some weekends. The fecal matter from these horses creates increased organic levels in the river water which encourages green algae. Horse traffic also wears down trails which then erode into the river. Increased gravel and silt fills in the river bottom and destroys the breeding habitat of the hell bender salamander that is so endangered. This goes also for the gravel mining operations. The river corridor needs to be restored and land easement along the rivers strictly enforced. These rivers belong to all Americans not to just a few who are grabbing this resource for personal gain. Alternative C does nothing to address these issues and should not be adopted. "B" is slightly better but I would see plan A put into effect as the best management approach. #5 The ONSR seems to be chronically underfunded and understaffed which might be solved by the Obama administration appointing a permanent director of the NPS. This first National scenic River preserve has rules that were written before ATVs were a problem, before high horse powered motors became the norm and before the above mentioned horseback riding operations existed. Some basic revision seems to be in order. I also think that if you really	7/15/2009	No			MO	65656

	want the public's input, you should announce the community meetings on some more public outlet like National Public Radio or Public Broadcasting. Most of Missouri was left out of the few meetings the NPS held and I've heard that the meetings around Van Buren were basically taken over by a few that want to continue profiting where they shouldn't. Thank you for your time and attention.						
345	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Alternative A is the best way to manage this unique ecosystem. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Closing illegally developed access points and crossings, limiting horsepower on upper and middle stretches, limiting commercial services, restoring degraded biological communities and improving the overall natural setting, and focused program of resource monitoring, research, and preservation projects. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? In alternative C: including more boat ramps and trails for horseback riding. Horseback crossings should be limited and enforced. And there should be no motorized boating in the upper Current. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? There should be long stretches of river with no motorized boating and no horse crossings so that one could take 2-3 day floats without encountering motorized boats. This is especially important in the upper reaches from Two Rivers up. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? I think an ecosystem-based approach to managing this area could hold the most potential. By this, I mean managing the resource with stakeholder involvement. Although I feel Alternative A is the best approach, I also fear a backlash from the local community - either via land clearings, harassment, etc. There are many private holdings along the river as well as state, federal, and other private holdings. The local economy would likely suffer if commercial enterprises were limited too much. There must be additional alternatives that would give local businesses, landowners, and visitors responsibility and incentives to manage for a more intact ecosystem. Perhaps a conservation fee could be tacked on to local services such as outfitters, canoe rentals, etc. These fees would be paid by visitors and these funds could go to a general fund that is used for resource management and restoration. Businesses like canoe liveries that demonstrate responsible management (limiting users, recycling, encouraging responsible floating, adopting stretches of river for clean-up, etc.) towards the resources could be given representation on local resource management boards that could recommend policies to the NPS. Businesses could have the chance to increase revenue by adding more traditional services like guided floats, fishing, and catered camping trips. Increased interpretive and educational opportunities will allow visitors to understand the unique ecological importance of the region, rather than viewing it just as a party destination. For example, interpretive displays and programs (using local fauna and flora), onsite park naturalists or rangers at major access points could be an effective way to reach visitors, enhance their experience, and increase awareness.	7/15/2009	No			MO	65274
346	a	7/15/2009	No			VA	22408
347	I strongly suppose alternative A. The waterways of the Ozark National Scenic Rivers are a treasure to be enjoyed by non-motorized means. I have been enjoying these waters for the past 15 years by canoe and kayak. I have recently had the opportunity to introduce my children to canoeing on these rivers. I do not condone the floating frat party atmosphere of the rivers at time and applaud the recent increase in water patrol. However on almost every river trip, I get buzzed by jet boats driving fast and dangerously on the river, with apparently no interest from law enforcement. I would strongly support banning the use of motorized vehicles on the water. The oil and gas slick on the river spoil the pristine water. Thank you for the providing the opportunity to provide input. Patricia Schneider Gibson.	7/15/2009	No		MWA	MO	63116
348	a	7/16/2009	No			VA	22408
349	Suspendisse a hendrerit nulla. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Fusce vitae sagittis purus. Aliquam luctus, odio sed faucibus placerat, sem nisi laoreet diam, scelerisque rutrum diam elit non mi. Donec eu est nec velit sodales interdum. Aliquam sodales pellentesque felis, et suscipit est consequat nec. Pellentesque consectetur, nisl mattis malesuada vestibulum, nisi ipsum placerat magna, id tincidunt diam risus ac turpis. Quisque ut elit et dui ullamcorper tempor a in lacus. Etiam nec ligula at mauris sollicitudin dictum. Vivamus dignissim pulvinar augue eu placerat. Integer sodales, arcu in bibendum euismod, nibh metus tincidunt velit, nec accumsan nunc neque non nisl. Vivamus vitae purus vel neque cursus venenatis? Duis et consequat dui. Pellentesque faucibus vestibulum diam, a rhoncus lacus facilisis vel? Sed ac ipsum risus. Nunc varius adipiscing velit ut cursus.	7/16/2009	No			VA	22408
350	Suspendisse a hendrerit nulla. In hac habitasse platea dictumst.	7/16/2009	No			DC	20036
351	Suspendisse a hendrerit nulla. In hac habitasse platea dictumst.	7/16/2009	No			VA	22408

352	1- I am leaning towards the plan A or indeed minimial change 2-I am in favor of making the Big Springs tract wilderness. 3 - Do not let outboard motors futher up river than what is allowed now. 4- I see the damage the horses to to the river, both by them polluting the enviroment with thier urine and feces. The degridation of the trails and riverbanks should be controlled better.	7/16/2009	No			IL	62232
353	Alternative A Good points: Closing of roads and trails that have been illegally developed The emphasize on traditional non-mechanized experiences. Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks Restoring the river corridor The proposal for wilderness designation for the Big spring tract I have been on the river in a canoe when a motorboat has gone by. They thought that it would be fun to swamp the canoe. The HP needs to be restricted. Alternative B Good points: Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks The network of small learning centers with facilities the would include classrooms (I am concerned about the concept that you will have to have additional trails in order to do this) Restoring the river corridor and having a focused program for research, monitoring and preservation The proposal for wilderness designation for the Big spring tract. Concerns the increase in motorboat use the removal of primitive camping experience Alternative C Good points-Not many Concerns The Plan is very vague. It needs more information on how you plan to accomplish the goals. It doesn't deal with the ATV problems. Federal law supersecedes state law! ATV's shouldn't be allowed in a National park... let alone one that is statutorily required to preserve and protect the watersheds of the Jacks Fork and Current River. It doesn't define the expanding problem of horse trail ride businesses expanding along the Current and Jacks Fork. Increasing the trails for horses proposed in Alternative C just adds to the problem. The trail rides need to be controlled like the canoe concessionaires are. There needs to be strictly enforced limited river crossings and a method to identify the horse and rider. Easement land needs to be better enforced. Too many landowners with easements restrictions have violated the legal requirements and no enforcement has been done. The local people even say, "Do what you want because the Park never enforces the restrictions." This needs to stop!!! Better and swifter enforcement of counties/cities that violate the clean water act and who decide they can do as they please on Park Service land.	7/16/2009	No			AR	72666
354	1) I support alternative A 2)There should be less people on the river and less motor boats. The rivers need to be protected from over use and the land next to them needs to be restored to native habitat. 3)No effort should be made to increase traffic. ATVs need to be kept far away from the rivers and streams. 4)Alternative A will protect the areas I visit frequently and hopefully restore the areas I stay away from because they are no longer beautiful. 5)Stream team is an excellent program and should be expanded to work on native habitat restoration.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63119
355	1. Alternative A is my preference for the management of the Riverways. It would return the rivers to the way they were when the National Scenic Riverways were created in the 1960s, and retard the development of the "water theme park" atmosphere which has developed over the years and would continue to develop under the other alternatives. 2. The restrictive horsepower limits in Alternative A should be included, and any regulations which can limit the number of horses which are fouling the rivers. 3. The more liberal horsepower limits of all the other alternatives to Alternative A. 4. As a fly fisher I am most concerned about the very upper reaches of the Current River which are stocked with and managed for trout. Alternative A is the only alternative which comes close to addressing concerns in that area, but adequate enforcement may still be lacking in Alternative A. 5. Unfortunately, with the increasing use of the Riverways there needs to be increased enforcement. Enforcement needs to be strengthened in ALL of the alternatives.	7/16/2009	No		Ozark Fly Fishers	MO	63146
356	1) I prefer options B and A. I think illegal roads should be removed and those areas restored with native species. It would be OK to have some interpretive centers and more restroom facilities but not adjacent to the river. Remove invase non-native plants and animals. 2) No mechanized activities on or immediately adjacent to the rivers. No motor boats except for patrols and emergency. No off road vehicles within the waterway boundaries including none in the campgrounds. Limit the number of canoes on the river each day. Require outfitters to collect trash from all river access locations and facilitate this activity. Regulate fishing, hunting, and trapping. 3) I do not like option C and the no action option. No motorized recreation. No horses in or adjacent to the river. No domestic animals in or adjacent to the river. No diversion of water for other uses. 4) We regularly float rivers in Missouri. Our favorite multi-day float is the Eleven Point River. We have taken many young people on floats on this river. We float the Current River and Jack's Fork less often. 5) We applaud the recent improvements to the float camps. Build parking lots that do not drain directly into the river. Continue efforts to discourage drug activities along the rivers. Expand the Stream Team Program.	7/16/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63119
357	Please keep in natural state -no motors.Alt "A" George Bohigian	7/16/2009	No		ozark fly fishers	MO	63124
358	Lowering Horse power on any part of the river is going to have a major impact on local economy. Were will all the boats go to smaller rivers that already dont have limits is that safe? Or they may got to Doniphain were there is way to many boats already just had fatal accident there July 4th weekend. The fact is more people drown in current river by floaters than boaters. I can also say I have rescude a number people that were in trouble are you going to put more patrol on river to take care of rescueing floaters one or two patrol boast won't be enough. I think some kind of licensing for boaters and floaters. Put 16 year old kid in a canoe that barly knows how to drive let a lone paddle a canoe that is dangerous. Training to help floaters and boaters learn how to be safe and have common curtsy for each other would make more sense. Floaters do have the right of way but so does a pedstrain but you would no stand in the middle of the road on a blind corner and expect car to stop be for he ran over you. You would hear the car coming and move to shoulder right. If you were in car and someone was walking across road in front of you you would slow down. The river is the same thing people get on river and think they are the only one there. In my opion fron Big springs south inboad boats not jet ski should be legal to take pressure off Goose neck south. If goal is to make safer, boats keep it safer for rescue purpose. If goal is to reduce enviroment impact close river to every thing no boats no canoes no tubes no horses no ATV's and we will just look at pictures.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63701

359	1. The first one---NO-Action--We want NO more added government control of our lives! AND---LEAVE the motor limits as they are now! 2. NONE! 3. There should NOT be any added restrictions! 4. ALL areas are important to us local people! 5. We want NO added govenment control!	7/16/2009	No			MO	65466
360	1. NO Action--We want NO more added government control of our lives, AND LEAVE the motor limits as thet are now! 2. NONE! 3. There should NOT be any added restrictions! 4. All areas are important to us local people! 5. We want NO added gtovernment control!	7/16/2009	No			MO	65466
361	To add to my comments submitted last week, I fully support the proposal to officially designate the Big Spring back country area of approximately 3,400 acres as wilderness. This area has been protected from roads and development since the 1920s. It deserves the protection afforded by the official wilderness designation.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65721
362	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? -I feel that option "A" is by far the best one offered, with "B" a close second. "C" offers too much commerciality for the splendor of a primitive riverway park. There is already too much development along and access to the two rivers. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? -Wilderness and primitive characteristics of undisturbed landscapes and nature interpretation are what are primarily needed in this park. Motorized activities should be strictly limited or banned outright. Alcohol restriction should strongly be considered as well. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? -any large increase in commercial development beyond what presently existed should not be allowed to occur. Motorized activities should be quickly phased out. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? -on the Current, Cedargrove to Pulltight is the most magnificent stretch of any river anywhere and is the stretch which should be subject to the most restriction on activities that would impinge on the wilderness character of the river. On the Jacks Fork it would be from the Prongs to take out just above Alley Springs. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? -perhaps more emphasis on early Ozark culture and the changes that have occurred to the rivers due to logging.	7/16/2009	No		Open Space Council	MO	63303
363	i strongly agree with preliminary alternative A. As a native Missourian who has seen the Current River watershed as a major influence in my life, I strongly support its preservation by implementation of plan A	7/17/2009	No			MO	63332
364	I have 8 mm film of my dad on a guided Current River fishing trip circa '49 or '50, and I spent a decade living on the Current River. I watched it change from a natural wilderness area to the current mess. Although I'm a horse owner myself, I highly oppose the big rides which are now popular. I enjoy fishing and using jon boats, but power and number need to be limited. The unlimited motorized access is excess. I am somewhere between A and B proposals. Need to get rid of the "anything goes" party atmosphere. Need to get environmental degradation under control. Need to let local folks enjoy the traditional hunting, fishing, and other recreation in a responsible way.	7/17/2009	No			MO	63332
365	1) No action 2) No action 3) Changing the use of the river, limiting or eliminating boats with motors over 25hp 4) Van Buren area - I prefer no action 5) We have visitors from all over the country and the world that come to Van Buren to float in canoes and kayaks and take boat rides. They absolutely love it and love the atmosphere. Please do not change a thing. Respectfully submitted, Katherine Winick	7/17/2009	No			MO	63640
366	I have canoed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers since I was a teenager. I have also canoed most of the other floatable streams in Missouri including: the Eleven Point, North Fork of the White, Spring River, Niangua and Meramec Rivers. It is a shame the way these streams are treated today. The fatal boating accident on July 5, 2009 is the latest example of how out of control the river use is. Something must be done to restore these streams to a natural uncontaminated state. I prefer Option A in your report. I feel it is important to: Ban all motorboats except electric trolling motors. Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help restore and maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways--except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the Rivers' health comes first. Control the frequency and number of non-motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, tubes, etc.) on the rivers to alleviate crowding caused by large clusters of these watercraft closely spaced in time. Designate the Big Spring Natural Area as a wilderness region. The Big Spring Natural Area lies very near the legendary Big Spring and is the backcountry portion of the old Big Spring State Park that has been protected since the 1920's. Preserving this example of native Missouri untouched for future generations is an easy decision and all conservationists should support it. I hope you will be able to restore these streams to their natural beauty. Thanks	7/17/2009	No		Missouri Water Environment Association	MO	63129
367	1) no action 2) no action 3) changing anything 4) Van Buren area - prefer no action 5) no action	7/17/2009	No			MO	63640
368	1) no action 2) no action 3) changing anything 4) Van Buren area - prefer no action 5) no action	7/17/2009	No			MO	63640

369	1. I am a canoeist that visits Ozark Scenic Riverways at least once a year and often 3 or 4 times per year. I would prefer alternative A. 2. I am in favor of restricting power boat use and horsepower as much as possible. I have witnessed a jon boat enter cave spring while under power and still "on plane". Thank heavens no canoes or kayaks were in there at the time. 5. If you could ban alcohol use on the river, the park would be a much more family friendly and pleasant destination. It would eliminate all the lewd and rowdy behavior. Yes, it would be a blow to commercial outfitters, but the experience of floating the river would be greatly enhanced.	7/17/2009	No			IN	46017
370	1) I prefer Alternative A. I would like to see the rivers return to a better, slower paced, no-motor boats in many areas and no AV riding near or in them. 2) I feel strongly in the alternative A's desire to reduce AV and off-roading that can damage the water quality and beauty of the surrounding area. 3.) I don't think there needs to be any new facilities or boat ramps. 4.) I grew up floating the rivers and am just very hopeful that the water quality and beauty will remain or improve in the future, especially the 20 mile stretch of river around Alley Springs on both the Current and Jacks Fork. 5.)No	7/17/2009	No			MO	63116
371	Action "A". I just recently (two days ago) floated a stream with my wife. I rarely float anymore due to the unbelievable amount of floaters on our streams. I have been an active floater for 40 years and can remember much calmer, cleaner and enjoyable surroundings on Missouri streams. The intense numbers allowed upon these waters today is an insult to any environmentally aware citizen and a danger to the flora and fauna that these waters run through. Noise, pollution of all enormous proportions and the total disrespect for fragile areas should and in many instances is a crime. Those crimes should be enforced and further restrictions should be in place. The outfitters themselves should also be held accountable. Often their own management style is in itself that adds to the total demise of these areas. The streams, land and wildlife cannot possibly survive the onslaught of activity that now exist in our forest. The current stewards of these lands are not doing nearly enough to slow this erosion of Missouri's heritage for the future. We have a beautiful state that should be available for everyone but not based on the current style of recreation. We must slow this uncontrolled "recreational activity" and we must do it now.	7/18/2009	No			MO	63028
372	I have been floating, camping and fishing on the Ozark riverways for over 40 years. in the beginning, it was not hard to find a secluded camping spot on the river where you would rarely see another person all weekend. With the increase in floters from liveries, horseback riders and ATV usage all over the place, it is hard to find a peaceful, serene place to camp and enjoy the simple pleasures and the natural beauty of the riverways. I think that everyone has a right to enjoy their particular activity and would not want to restrict that. But maybe there should be some segregation of the river for certain activities. It seems Emenence is popular for the Horseback riders so maybe there should be boundaries for the trails. I had someone ride through my campsite two years ago just above Acres Ferry and naturally their horse took a dump in our campsite. They were polite and all, but we had to clean up the mess so we didn't walk in it or smell it all weekend. I would like to see certain areas where horses, ATV's and Drunk floaters are prohibited so some of us that just want the seclusion of the outdoors can enjoy it.	7/18/2009	No			MO	63131
373	1. no-action 2. none of the alternatives 3.horse power limits 3 miles above or below the van buren bridge and the 40 horse power limits should be removed 4.why do we need to have any horse power limits on current river above or below the van buren bridge as i has boated on the river my entire life and floated it also and the larger power boats make it easier to get where you need to be and has always help me in recovery efforts when i have saved some one's life while they where floating in a canoe and turned over and got pinned between a root wad and the canoe and also an inner tube and we have also recuded people that had dove off of the bluffs on current river and had to transport them down river to the Van Buren bridge for medical treatment while pass-out. the last time was at bass rock and i called 911 and i my self and another boater and his wife performed cpr and saved the womans life and transported her down river to the van buren bridge to awaiting ems staff and we where at the north landing for 7 minutes before the park service even made it up river to the bridge and about 30 minutes had past after i made the 911 call to the Carter county sheriff's office. 5. yes if you would like to keep the park full of visitors, the park service need's to step back and loosen some of the rules, as a child my parents and my family would come home to van buren to camp at big springs and we would be herrassed by the park service rangers the whole time we would be camped. If the camping fee receipt tag is in the window or dash of your car there is no reason for the ranger to come into your camp and ask to see it. or to start asking you and your children alot of questions when they know you are life long residents of the county. and your whole family are hospital medical staff, van buren town nurse and so forth	7/19/2009	No			MO	65802
374	Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help restore and maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways--except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the Rivers' health comes first. Control the frequency and number of non-motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, tubes, etc.) on the rivers to alleviate crowding caused by large clusters of these watercraft closely spaced in time. Designate the Big Spring Natural Area as a wilderness region. The Big Spring Natural Area lies very near the legendary Big Spring and is the backcountry portion of the old Big Spring State Park that has been protected since the 1920's. Preserving this example of native Missouri untouched for future generations is an easy decision and all conservationists should support it.	7/19/2009	No			MO	63117
375	1) To me, my friends, and my family, alternative A comes the closest. We favor limited development and more wilderness 2) More wilderness areas 3) Restrict motorboats 4) 5) Thank you for this opportunity	7/19/2009	No			MO	63366
376	1) Alternative A for the Current River is already close to my idea. I along with several friends often kayak the Current River and find it one of the most beautiful rivers in Missouri and the US. We have been floating the river for approximately 13 years. Over those 13 we have seen a significant decline in the quality of the river, quality being the cleanliness, quietness, and fish population. Over the past several years we have seen a significant increase in the boating activity. Most of the boats have no regard to the kayakers, canoes or anyone else on the river. We have also seen a significant increase in drinking and drug use on the river. We completed a 3 day float trip from 7/16 - 7/18. The float was very	7/19/2009	No			MO	63019

	pleasant down to Round Springs, after Round Springs we encountered many of boats, and with the boats, the drinking, the rowdiness, and complete disregard to the beauty of the river. By limiting the HP of boats as outlined in Alternative A, this will significantly reduce the amount of boat traffic and frankly the accessibility of the river by those who only see it as a way for them to have fun. 2) I am most concerned with the boating as well as the number of individuals allowed on the river by the local outfitters. I think that the local outfitters should be limited to the total number of craft they let on the river. Additionally I think the outfitters should be have a responsibility in helping to "police" the rivers. 3) I own my kayak, the only part of any of the plans is limited where folks can camp on the rivers. I would rather see standards put in place as to how people camp on the river. 4) I would like to see more management of the river from Baptist Camp down to Two Rivers. 5) I would like to see published guidelines for camping on the river and additional crackdown on the drinking so as to make the river more family friendly. I personally think the two best proposals that will make a significant impact are the restriction of the motorized boats and limiting the total number of craft for each outfitter. That will allow the river to return more to its natural state. Thank you for considering my view. I live 2 hours away from the Current River, I have friends that live 2 thousand miles away and come all the way in just to float on that river because of its natural beauty. This is a treasure to be preserved. I would love for my 3 sons to be able to enjoy the river as I have. Thanks, Matt					
377	TOPIC 1. Plan A is more in line with my ideal. I have been visiting the area with my family since I was very young and one of the primary reasons I return as often as i do is because of lack of development and scarcity of motor boats. TOPIC 2. I do not feel that the quality of the environment and scenery could be preserved if plan C were implimented. Hiking and equestrian trails are fine but roads and motorized vehicles really detract from the experience. I like the idea of wilderness designation. TOPIC 3. Enlarging the existing campgrounds might be ok if needed, but otherwise development should be kept to a minimum. I would also like to see a minimal amount of motorized activity on the Upper current and the Jack's fork.	7/19/2009	No		MO	65401
378	1. No-Action. 2. No-Action. 3. Changing anything. 4. Van Buren. Just this weekend we floated a 20 mile stretch from Log Yard to Shoat Hole. For the first five hours we saw no floaters and three boats and that was from Log Yard to Waymeyer. If was beautiful and peaceful. If people want that type of atmosphere that is an area on the river they should float. The last two hours were from Waymeyer to Shoat Hole. There were people and boats and I loved it. That is the type of atmosphere that I and many other people prefer to be in and so that is why I choose to float from Waymeyer, to be around the people. 5. I think that people who plan on visiting the Current and Jack's Fork rivers need to do some research and planning on what they want to see and do. If they want to be in a peaceful setting they need to make arrangements to go to those types of places or float and vist during the week. I have lived in Van Buren right on the river for two summers, during the week there is absolutely noone on the river. If anyone wants peace and quiet that is the time to be there.	7/20/2009	No		MO	63640
379	1) I like the options in Alternatives A and B and would like to see the two combined. I think people should have access, but illegal trails should be closed and motorized boats and other vehicles should be kept to a bare minimum. I like the idea of returning to traditional time honored ways of exploring and enjoying the river. All activities should be kept appropriate for all members of the family and the drunken brawl float parties should be stopped. 2) Limt horseback riding to approved trails and motorized boats and bvehicles should be kept to a bare minimum. 3) Business as usual is not working and increasing motorized conveyances is detrimental to the natrual outdoors. People go to the outdoors to experience nature- not to be inundated with "civilization" we can get that at home. 4) Alternatives A and B address things adequately. 5) none	7/20/2009	No		MO	65109
380	1) My wife and I prefer Alternative A, which seeks to restore the ONSR to the relatively primitive state the region was in at the time of NSR designation. We have floated the Current and Jack's Fork numerous times, and typically have a good time, despite the speed boats and rowdy college crowds. Lately, however, we have been seeking out more remote float destinations in an effort to enjoy a more natural experience without the speed boats, loud music and teenage drunks. We have been largely unsuccessful. Our most recent trip to the Courtois was a nightmare we will never repeat, and the neighboring Huzzah looked just as out of control and will never see our business. We both love floating (it's one of the reasons I remained here after college) but we are to the point where we will not float on weekends anymore. Many of our friends who have floated with us for the past 20 years feel the same way; some now refuse to get on the rivers and just hang out at the campsite all day (if they bother to come at all). We have a float planned on the Jack's Fork in September, but I doubt any of us will actually get into the water since part of the river is now impaired due to fecal matter from horses. What a shame. 5) Obviously, state and federal officials must do a better job working with local government officials in counties that border the ONSR, especially Shannon County, where county officials seem openly hostile to conservation and preservation efforts. Ozarks residents deserve to earn a living, but not at the expense of this national treasure. Perhaps horse trails could be rerouted away from the river in order to minimize crossings and manure pollution. Illegal roads across the rivers must be closed, and strict limits should be placed on boat motors (trolling motors are fine). I have always referred to our annual float on the Meramec as the "Disney" float because of all of the people, loud music and fast boats, and I think it's terrible that the Current and Jack's Fork have become "Disney-fied." Maybe we'll have better luck finding finding a quiet float stream in Arkansas.	7/20/2009	No		MO	65202
381	I am writing to express my support for Alternative "A" which will provide the greatest protection for the rivers while also providing the opportunity for appropriate recreation. The NPS *must* ensure low impact, family friendly recreation that focuses on enjoying the natural beauty of the area. I value the Ozark National Scenic Riverways because of their natural beauty- these are treasures of Missouri and we must protect them! To ensure that my children can enjoy these wild places as I have, please close unauthorized roads and enforce the current no ATV policy. Finally, I ask you to support Wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract. There are so few wild places left in our state, and living in a big city, I can tell you that we NEED these wild places- in tact and protected! Thank you for your time, Tarah Demant	7/20/2009	No		MO	63130
382	I support Alternative A. Additionally, I am in favor of a plan that creates conditions favorable to low-impact, family-friendly recreation. To this end, I support restricting access points, closing unauthorized roads, enforcing the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. I also favor some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. I also favor moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. I am in favor of designating a Big Spring Wilderness area.	7/20/2009	No	Sierra Club	MO	64113

	Thank you. Sincerely, Ellen Brenneman Kansas City						
383	I would recommend the Alternative A management plan. My decision stems from my belief that the Park should be devoted to family oriented activities with minimal ATV interventions, better water quality protection by reducing number of power boats and horses. All unauthorized access points to the park should be closed. The water regime for this park is more suitable for non-motorized boats and canoes. It is one of better parks in Missouri that gives us a view of the natural habitats for many wild animals. Please maintain the high quality of its environment.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65203
384	1) I support option 'A'. 2) I have visited this area since I was a child, some 60 years. I believe this should be an experience of the wilderness of the Ozarks in a family friendly manner. The intrusion of motor boats, horse pollution, ATVs, and disruptive public behavior needs to be reigned in. I do favor interpretative locations for the history of this ozark area. 3) ATVs and excessive horse trail development should be avoided. 4) The Primitive zones are important and need to be enhanced. Horse and pedestrian trails need to avoid damage to sensitive areas. 5) I see the Big Springs Wilderness tract as especially important and in need of conservation.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63127
385	Government is failing to protect the beautiful rivers of Missouri. Please coordinate efforts from all government agencies and enforce a good plan for protection and conservation. The following destructive forces are among those at work. Large Motors on small rivers. Too much use and too loud use by individuals drinking and otherwise not compatible, in small craft and on banks. Dangerous close contact between motorboats and paddled craft. Large numbers of horses are being allowed to concentrate in certain areas so that horse waste gets into the rivers. Speed of powerboats on the river is very dangerous and totally disregards the presence of swimmers and wildlife in the river. Non-degradable trash is being put in the river and washing up on private and public banks. Please take quick and thoughtful action Jeff Wolfe	7/20/2009	No			MO	64628
386	1. I prefer alternative A as the best way to manage and preserve the ONSR. 2. I feel strongest about preserving the Big Springs area as a Wilderness protected tract. If that area isn't preserved, we can never get it back to top condition for future generations to visit and enjoy. I also think we should seriously restrict horses from much of the river area. While I love and enjoy horses, they are a big problem with water purity. The riverway has been compromised and it is vital to clean it up and improve the quality of the water. 3. I am against any alternative that allows more horse access or more motor boat access, simply because they compromise the quality of the water and the safety of animals, birds, and fish in the area. 4. I just love the whole stretch of the river. I probably have never traveled all 134 miles of it, but I have traveled the majority of those miles and some stretches I have canoed over and over during a 35 year period. I have seen worsening conditions and then sometimes better conditions. 5. The most important strategies are to strictly limit horse access, motor boat and any kind of gasoline motor access, and to check routinely to discourage drunkenness and inappropriate behavior on the ONSR. It will take a lot of vigilance, but we have a jewel here that we don't want to lose.	7/20/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63108
387	1. Preliminary alternative A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The implementation of a quieter, less crowded and slower riverways is to my liking. When I visit the area, I leave no trace, use no mechanized form of transportation and love the splendour of the quieter areas. 2. Certainly, the Big Spring area should be designated 'wilderness'. I am in favor of strict limits on motorboating. The closing of unauthorized roads, enforcement of the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers are of prime interest. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. I am in favor of moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 3. What should not be included are motorboating, the addition of boat ramps, or the increase of use of horses as currently used.	7/20/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63108
388	I am in support for alternative A. It is in the best interest of the ONSR to keep the area as pristine as possible so that future generations can enjoy the riverways as we have enjoyed them. ATV's should not be allowed in close proximity to the rivers...they are best used in specific motorcycle/ATV park areas or on the owners' private lands instead of creating noise/air/water pollution when they invade the scenic riverways. The same goes for motorboats polluting the areas used by people floating down the rivers in peaceful conditions. Keep our riverways clean and quiet so that we might enjoy the peaceful surrounding as nature has intended.	7/20/2009	No		sierra club	Missouri	63143
389	1. I support Alternative A. 2. Minimized the human impact on the rivers by restricting motor boats, ATVs and road building in the river shed. 3. Use of motorized boats and vehicles. The noise they create ruins the river experience. We have been terrorized by jet boats racing by our canoe at a high rate of speed. 4. Our favorite stretch of the river is Akers Ferry to Round Spring. This area is particularly beautiful and the canoeing skill involved is perfect for our skill level. Plan A seems, from the map, to be left largely "as is" and that would be fine. 5. Wilderness experience, peaceful floating and simple camping areas.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63119
390	1. Prefer Alt. A 2. Minimize the use of motor craft - there are lots of lakes where motor boats have the run of the water but we have precious few clear rivers. 3. No motors upstream of Two Rivers. 4. ? 5. - keep motor vehicles OUT of the river - restrict vehicular and horse access points - develop foot-travel access points - I don't know how many horse trail crossings exist. Is it possible to construct a horse-crossing bridge to keep the animals out of the water? This would provide a SINGLE safe crossing. Would need to locate it at a narrow section of the river where that reach of the river is laterally stable (due to local rock outcropping, etc.). The bridge ends could be located back away from the river banks (as should be any horse trails). The bridge could be slightly arched and designed to allow dung to be flushed toward both ends, thus NOT over the sides directly into the river. Without fairly strict controls on these rivers, they will be loved to death!! It doesn't take long to ruin clear, free-flowing rivers but recovery may never be fully attained.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65548
391	1) I prefer Option A, since it provides the most protection to the ONS. 2) Limiting ATVs, limiting the number of horses in the river, reducing the horsepower of motorboats above Powder Mill on the Current. 4) I love the stretch between Round Spring and Powder Mill Ferry. That is why I would reduce the horsepower of boats allowed on that stretch - when I floated there last summer with my family, I was disturbed by the noise and	7/20/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63119

	erosion caused by these engines.						
392	I see no need for boats of higher horsepower than 40 on the current river, and sensible speed limits should be posted and enforced. The use of atvs should be forbidden on any but existing vehicle trails. Unauthorized access points should be closed. The area above Big Springs should be a wilderness area. The conservation easments need to be enforced.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63937
393	1) Alternative A is closest to my idea for management. Although I am an avid canoeist, I have avoided the Ozark National Scenic Riverways because I dislike overcrowded, coliform-laden waters. 2) Keeping Big Spring as wilderness; low-impact activities. 3) I don't think high-horsepower motorboats or ATVs are compatible with the nature of the area. 4) N/A 5) A permit system (as is used in the Boundary Waters) may be necessary to enhance the experience in a large part of the Riverway.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65203
394	please take an affirmative action to preserve onsr for future generations. I understand that allowing citizens to enjoy what the rivers have to offered must be controled so that no damage is being done in the meantime. If strict rules and regulations are what is needed to keep the area preserve, clean, and healthy then so be it.	7/20/2009	No		sierra club	MO	65740
395	Dear Sirs: Without sounding Alarmist Alt B and Alt C are not Alternatives at All. I choose A. Simply put you are at a loss to understanding your charge of protection of the resource. Please, please step back and understand the science you have available to you. That this place is being loved to death and overdeveloped!! Stop the bleeding or at least recognize the critical need to slow the blood flow at every opportunity you have available. It is incredible that the Park Service continues to fail to protect these magic places from Man's destructive ways. Limitations and Enforcement regarding the use of the resource are the answer. Do Your Job!!! Too Many ATVs and Horses are ruining the waterway and you are do nothing to stop this; except offering management plans to ALLOW more free for all activities. What do you assume your charge to be in protection of the park? Parks are protection of lands for the future peoples of the nation. You must NEVER allow any increase of use by hikers, boaters, horsemen or any park user that degrades the resource, that is your charge. David Hicks	7/20/2009	No		Ozark Society	AR	72015
396	1. Yes proposal A is closest to my idea. 2. control of ATV's 3.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65809
397	I strongly support Action A. There are absolutely NO places left in Missouri for those of us who are desperately searching for a glimmer of peace, tranquility, and a chance to appreciate what little minimally spoiled natural beauty, serenity, and ecological integrity there was any hope left of experiencing via the waterways. The Park Service has totally caved into the shrill demands of the locals and allowed all manner of loud and destructive motorized conveyances to ruin any quality experience on either the Current or Jack's Fork. I remember when there was a time you could at least put a canoe on the Current and find a gravel bar where you could camp and be left alone for the night--not anymore! Now it seems anyone with an ATV or 4-wheel drive truck can access almost every single inch of shoreline. And it's absolutely absurd and dangerous that high-power jet boats are allowed to prowl the ONSR totally uninhibited. There isn't a single stretch of scenic waterway in Missouri free from them for paddlers to enjoy without being made sport of by drunken locals displaying their machismo and outright disdain for us. I also take the unfortunate position of supporting the number of canoes on any given day be restricted. Especially since the vast majority who descend upon the river anymore aren't there to appreciate the river but to get as loud, drunk, and as obnoxious as humanly possible with apparently no sense of consideration or fear of personal accountability. As far as I'm concerned, the ONSR are a lost cause because the agencies involved have not had the spine to stand up to the short-sighted interests who have ruined it. I appreciate this opportunity to express my thoughts, but it seems it comes too little too late and I'm sure my voice will be shouted down by those more interested in those who find their pleasure in destroying the river and ruining the experience for the rest of us. As for me, I prefer to make the extra drive to the Buffalo River in Arkansas with my canoeing dollars.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65039
398	5) I am interested in peaceful, safe recreation on a natural river and I want to ensure that any new management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers helps restore the park to a healthy, natural state, while also providing for low impact recreation.	7/20/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63114
399	ONSR is an area that should be protected from further encroachment by humans on or in vehicles of any sort, as well as equestrian trails. If someone owns a horse, they have land that the horse resides on, they can use that land to ride/exercise their horse. We are quickly losing natural areas of many sorts, and I strongly oppose further loss by giving access to ATVs, boats, or anything that is not part of the natural state of the existing land/waterways. We are already shoving animals in natural environments into smaller and smaller spaces by taking over their land to build on, we are already losing precious natural environments that are irreplaceable by human desire to tear up more land with ATVs, pollute the air with gas exhaust from those, pollute the air with the noise of those vehicles...the same applies to the waterways with motorized boats. I acknowledge that horses are living creatures, but they have no business in this type of setting. Keep the area pristine, keep the noise and air pollution away, and leave the area quiet and peaceful, and un "developed." The horses don't need to mingle with hikers, or walkers, and don't need to be on land where they will destroy/damage natural areas by the weight of their body and their rider.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63129
400	I AM ALL FOR MAITAINING WHAT WE ALREADY HAVE ON ONSR. I AM NOT FOR ANY FURTHER COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE RIVERWAYS.	7/20/2009	No		SIERRA CLUB	MO	65201

401	1. I support Alternative A for the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate recreation. 2. I support creating conditions for low impact, family friendly recreation that focus on enjoying the natural beauty of the area. 3. To address current problems I believe unauthorized roads must be closed. Continue the enforcement of the current no ATV policy, and close the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. I recommend some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 4. Special areas need to be protected. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. Support Wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract.	7/21/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65039
402	1) A - least development. But even allowing lower horsepower boats by the public should be prohibited. While in 50's and 60's people used these here, the numbers would have been far fewer than the number of people who will do so in future (and currently). Commercial tourist operators must also be kept to a minimum if not altogether disallowed. 2) A 3) C	7/21/2009	No		Sierra club, Starkville	MS	39759
403	I mostly support alternative A. The upper length of the river is heavily used by canoes and no motorized vehicals should be allowed there. A limit on the number of canoes would be a plus. I would like to see the closing unauthorized roads, enforcing the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. I would also like to see some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. Therefore moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails would help. Special areas need to be protected. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63366
404	1. Yes, I would encourage the Park Service to adopt has Alternative A, which includes the greatest protection for the rivers and river water quality, and species preservation. 2. It is vitally important that the Park Service adopt a plan that provides conditions for low impact to the river systems. 3. I would suggest the Park Service address current problems, like closing unauthorized roads, enforcing the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers, and close the upper part of the river to motorized boating. Water quality is being adversely impacted by uncontrolled equestrian use and access to the river. The riding trails need to be away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 4. The Wilderness designation is good on Plan A. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. 5. These rivers are as close to wilderness rivers as we have in Missouri. They should be managed as such. They are the crown jewel of the Ozarks. They harbor important species that are adversely impacted by incursions of man's mechanical devices, and horses. If we can't protect these rivers, we can't protect anything in Missouri.	7/21/2009	No			MO	65804
405	I would like the plan to reverse the trend toward uses and users which make big impacts. My key concepts are clean water, i.e. strong controls on new trails for horses and ATV's. Limits on the numbers of canoes that may be placed on the river, i.e. preserve the quality of experience from the drunken, boombox, lash ten canoes together crowds. These rivers have been discovered and they will be used UP by re-creators who have theme parks as their predominate model of a good time. Use is now guaranteed, the pendulum MUST now shift to preservation.	7/21/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	64063
406	The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers must be protected from ATV's and other disturbances to the environment. The new management plan should provide for nature to thrive and low negative impact to the environment.	7/21/2009	No			MO	65355
407	1. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate recreation I support this alternative. 2. I support creating conditions for low impact, family friendly recreation that focus on enjoying the natural beauty of the area. 3. I support closing unauthorized roads, enforcing the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. I wish that some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. Please moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 4.Special areas need to be protected. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I support Wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract. Please preserve what we have left before is's too late.	7/21/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63128
408	Thank you for the opportunity to express my views and concerns about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I believe that something as beautiful and rare as the Current River should not be viewed as something to be exploited in any way. It belongs to all of us and our future generations and desrves to be protected as much as possible. In particular, obnoxious ATVs, which severely scar the land just for the purpose of offering a cheap thrill, should not be allowed anywhere near Ozark streams. In fact, I wouldn't allow them on any public land due to noise and air pollution. In addition, I would hope that horse trails that cross Ozark streams would be severely limited due to the inevitable and disgusting pollution that they bring. I would also hope that special protection would be given to the Big spring region of the Current river. I have long enjoyed the ONSR streams but have been absolutely horrified at how they have been exploited in recent times. To visit any of the floating rivers on a weekend or holiday is to observe a thoroughly revolting misuse of a natural treasure. The rivers are being overused and abused by people intent on being as rowdy and destructive as they possibly can. Please put a halt to this obscene exploitation -- or at least severely curtail it. I accept that humans are a part of the ecological equation but senseless destruction, overuse, and exploitation have no place in such a rare and delicate surrounding.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63043
409	I have been a regular visitor to ONSR for the past 38 years. I commend you for the overall reduction in litter - especially beer cans -in the streams. 1. Alternative A is closest to my preferences for management of the area. 2. I have experienced an alarming increase in vehicular activity near the rivers. It has become pretty difficult to find a gravel bar on which to camp that doesn't have some kind of vehicle activity or evidence thereof within spitting distance. I strongly support the notion of closing unauthorized roadways & maybe even reducing some of those presently authorized. Also, I am very much in favor of wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. I didn't see this specifically in the summary, but I am also	7/21/2009	No			MO	63640

	concerned about the numbers of horses in the Jack's Fork near Eminence, I have participated in the Eminence Trail Rides several times. While it is a joy to ride one's horse in the wild splendor of ONSR, it is very disconcerting to see hundreds of horses going every which way in the river. 3. I don't personally care about living history demos. 4. Whenever possible I canoe & camp in the upper section of the Current or the stretch of the Jack's Fork from Hwy 17 to Alley Spring. Those are the areas nearest my heart, and I beg you to work toward reducing the vehicular activity. I would more often float the Jack's Fork to the confluence, but I find much unattractive about the area immediate to Eminence & for a ways below. Town sewage, cattle in the river, and the trail rides are some specifics. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Keep up the good work.						
410	1. I like Alternative A because it will do the best job of keeping the watershed healthy and keeping the springs, natural features, animals and plants alive for us all to enjoy. It will still provide recreation which must be balanced to maintain the health of the ecosystem. 2.The Big Spring tract must be designated a Wilderness area. 5. I request that there be no more than 20 access points on the 134 mile length of the river and unauthorized roads should be closed as well. The no ATV policy must be enforced. The number of horses using the area and entering the river must be controlled so the water is safe for swimming. The horse trails should be moved away from the river. Some stretches of the river should be closed to motor boats.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63138
411	1. Alternative A is closest to what I would like to see on the rivers. I canoe or kayak the Current and Jack's Fork rivers several times a year, frequently staying overnight on a gravel bar. I enjoy the peace and beauty of the river in its natural state and I enjoy paddling without the sounds and smells of powerful boats. I think fishing with small motors is not only acceptable but I find most of them to be very pleasant. I have had several encounters with large horsepower boats that have passed full throttle within one or two feet of my canoe. I must assume that there are power boaters who resent our presence and are trying to intimidate us or possibly cause harm. I don't mind horseback riding but, the "trail rides" put far too many horses and their fecal matter into the river. I wonder about the safety of swimming after they have passes through. 2. The Jack's Fork and upper Current Rivers should have horsepower restrictions that would allow fishing boats but not speeding john boats. Trail riding should be restricted or eliminated from the more natural parts of the rivers. Closing illegal roads is very important to restore plant and animal habitat. The Big Spring area should be declared wilderness. 3. Encouraging more power boats with higher horsepower limits will ruin the streams which are already suffering damage from the current limits. Encouraging more trail riding and use of ATVs damages the river and should not occur. 4. It is critical to increase protection for the Jack's Fork and the upper and middle sections of the Current river. Let the power boaters and trail riders use the lower section of the Current. 5. I know that it is expensive, but there should be more water patrol presence on the river. There are too many power boaters who are driving dangerously and drinking. Canoeists and all boaters should also have coolers checked for glass bottles. Ban loud radios on the river.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63021-5903
412	In August 2008, on a weekday afternoon there were almost no birds at Montauk State Park near the hatchery while I was there for over 2 hours. This June the birds there looked uncoordinated. Is this another silent spring? The resources of the Current river and Jack's Fork are overutilized in summer months. Any expansion should be in the shoulder seasons. Please do not relax any limits at this time. Please find out what in the fish food is killing the birds. Some of the fattest diabetics I had in my practice frequently ate Missouri trout.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63650
413	The change we need has nothing to do with the size or power rating of outboard boat motors! We have a greed issue. Our river has been turned into an adult amusement park, by the handful of business that profit from floaters. Visitors to our area seem to have little or no respect for our back yard. This can be witnessed daily from Waymer to Big Springs.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63965
414	1) Option A is closest to what I would suggest. We should reduce some of the motorized activities on the waterways to allow people to enjoy the river in peace. The plan should also include restricting ATVs and dirt bikes to the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. The plan should mandate that all unofficial and extraneous river access roads are closed. 2) Big Spring area should be designated wilderness 5) In general, the Ozark Riverways are a beautiful natural part of our Missouri heritage and should be maintained in a way that we can continue to enjoy them for years to come. Motorized boats, ATVS and even horseback riding on sensitive land can damage the riverways. There should be designated areas where people can enjoy float trips if they want, as well as more peaceful areas for canoeing and fishing.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63104
415	I support alternative A. I have canoed the Current many times since moving to Missouri. I have a friend who is currently floating the Current from its start to end. We should not let boats with motors on the river and limit access from ATM's. They are noisy and destroy the river banks. Also, you should do all you can do to limit horses in the river. Try and keep it as primitive as possible. I understand there is a possibility that Big Springs could be designated a wilderness area. That would be awesome. Please try to leave this area in its primitive form for our children and grandchildren to use.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63385
416	1) Yes A A limit on 4-wheeler activity in the stream bed areas, and a limit on the number of large trail rides on horseback would be beneficial. 2) Limiting the use of mechanized forms of travel. 3) Roads that allow foot access to scenic areas such as Jam-up cave on the Jacks Fork should be kept open as they are now. 4) The upper reaches of these rivers are my favorites and need to be preserved 5) I think plan A addresses many of the problems related to these rivers. It is a difficult balance to both preserve and allow access to these areas. I have been on one or the other of these rivers multiple times each year for the past 30 years and I would like to see the preserved and maintained in their natural states as much as possible.	7/21/2009	No			MO	65689
417	1. The Park Service has provided four draft alternatives for management. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate recreation. I support A. 2. It is important to create conditions for low impact, family friendly recreation that focus on enjoying the natural beauty of the area. 3. To address current problems we should close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, and close the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. Some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. We should move riding trails away from the river,	7/21/2009	No			MO	63130

	limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 4. Special areas need to be protected. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I support Wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract.						
418	Plan A is the only acceptable plan to protect the rivers for the future.The rivers are already overused and the quality of the water is at risk. The rivers are a national treasure in a world where there is less and less areas of pristine beauty. Close roads and access points that are used as party places. Limit motor size so we can have quiet on the river. No power boats above Blue Spring so there will be quiet camps to enjoy nature. Limit numbers of horses with permits or a lottery. Limit canoes with a lottery. Please save the river in a primitive and pristine state. The meremec was once a beautiful and clear stream and now it's lower sections are green and muddy from agriculture,livestock and heavy use. There was a time on the Current that wooden jon boats with very small engines were the norm and people still enjoyed the river in them. Our culture has such a need for speed now that they want ever bigger and faster machines. Please take the rivers back to a slower and quieter and cleaner time.	7/21/2009	No			MO	63090
419	1) NO ACTION - This Alternative provides the best option for area residents who access the park by boat. I would improve it by improving and adding boat access in the Upper Current - South Segment and the Lower Current where floaters do not frequent. This would allow boaters to conveniently use these areas and voluntarily avoid the heavily floated areas where the well developed accesses currently exist (Two Rivers, Watercress, Van Buren Bridge and Big Springs). I would also modify the regulation verbage to allow the 60 HP engines, rated at the powerhead. This would allow the use of the poplar engines being used today, including those being used by the National Park Service. These engines provide enough power so that normal family can go boating without creating excessive speed which the Park Service seems to be concerned with. 2) NO Comment 3) No decrease in horsepower should be included. Decreasing the horsepower would cause undue hardship on local citizens who have invested millions of dollars in boats and would restrict our ability to share the river experience with our families. The Plan should be about increasing opportunities with reasonable protection for the Park. I believe that no additional lands should be given Wilderness Status because past experience has proven that this restricts access to all but a small portion oth population. The plan should be about increasing opportunities to appreciate and enjoy the Park. 4) The biggest concern that I have is not even addressed in the Plan. That is the lack of adequate and developed boat access on the Winona side of the Upper Current- Lower Segement(Rocky Creek area) and the west side of the Lower Current - (Cedar Springs). Developed access in these areas would allow boaters an alternative to the poplar landings at Two Rivers, Watercress, Van Buren Bridge, and Big Springs, where the is a high number of tubes and canoes. 5) The most important concept the Park Service should always keep in mind is that while it is your job to manage and protect the Park for all citizens, it is the people of the area who will feel they own a part of the river. It is a part of our daily lives for those who live close by, our history and heritage. I feel the Park service should listen to those of us who live in the area instead of all of the people who only use the park once or twice a year.	7/21/2009	No			MO	65438
420	Why are people allowed to pollute public land and profit from it at the same time, when it was wisely set aside by our government for the enjoyment of all of the taxpayers? If we cannot get away from traffic and noise in a pristine environment like national parks,where can we do that? Is the Ken Burns documentary on the National Parks this fall going to be just a history lesson of what our country used to believe in or can we rise up to the challenge of keeping this legacy for all future generations?	7/21/2009	No			MO	63117
421	1.The Park Service has provided four draft alternatives for management. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate recreation. Among the alternatives, we recommend supporting A. 2.Express support for creating conditions for low impact, family friendly recreation that focus on enjoying the natural beauty of the area. 3.To address current problems we recommend closing unauthorized roads, enforcing the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. We recommend some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. We recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 4.Special areas need to be protected. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. Support Wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract.	7/21/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63139
422	I love the Current River! Please do the following: * substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails * limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs * reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats * enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations * limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination * designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. Thanks! Adm	7/21/2009	No			MO	63130
423	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Answer 1) Actually, none of the alternatives are close to my ideal. I like various parts of No-Action, Alternative A and Alternative B. I can honestly say there isn't anything about Alternative C I much care for. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Answer 2) I feel STRONGLY that maintaining the water quality of the springs and rivers should be the guiding principle behind all management decisions. Water quality and our amazing Ozark springs are why the park was founded, and all stewardship and management decisions should first have to answer the question: "What will be the impact on spring water quality, quantity, life within the springs, and consequently, the water quality levels of the rivers which form from them. I strongly would like the Big Spring Wilderness Area to be established, regardless of what the final plan is. ONSR must serve all constituents from families requesting developed areas like Alley Spring,to	7/22/2009	No			MO	63069

Other things I would like to see included:

A. An emphasis on management for human carrying capacity of the river. By this, I mean management to redistribute use from everyone piling on Saturday to on-season weekdays, and making it possible to shift access year round, instead of those 45 months from late April to mid October. This may require creating an access permit system.

B. Continued emphasis on non-motorized recreation above Hwy. 106, with horsepower restrictions from Hwy. 106 north. I'd be happy if nothing larger than a trolling motor was allowed above Akers. and 15-25 between Akers and Owls Bend. Establish a policy on outboard jet boats. On the lower Current, I'd keep the current HP set up, but no more than 40 HP anywhere there are swimmers. All along the river, we need MORE enforcement of current safe boating laws by everyone operating watercraft. In general, I'd ban jet boats of any type above Hwy. 106. I might also try to educate people that just using jet boats and sucking gravel tears up the river by destroying fish habitat. I don't know that the good old boys know that. Ozark Riverways is not, nor should it be a boat race course. Motors are fine if responsibly used, but way too many people do not know boating law. I wish you needed a license to operate a motorized boat.

C. Keep rental limits as they are. Phase out concessionaire aluminum boats. Do NOT expand rafts. Rafts are drunken party barges. I'm on the Meramec. I know.

D. I would not object to a modest daily launch fee for private craft used by anyone over 12 years old: (no more than \$5/unit including tubers or \$20 per related family per day). Also establish a yearly permit-- say \$30. Both daily and yearly launch fees could be on stickers to adhere to the watercraft. This would enable NPS to get a handle on how many non-concessionaire craft there are. Launch fees would go to hire friendly river ranger/interpreters to keep an eye on things, and deal with problems before they become crises. Officer Friendly, not the Gestapo falling out of trees. Also to support river cleanup efforts.

E. In the last few years ONSR has returned to interpreting Ozarks culture, close to what they did in the early years of the park. Keep it up! Make it more interactive, not just lectures. In the summer of 1973, James S "Swiney" Rayfield, an Eminence native who was a schoolteacher and summer ranger, made a BIG impression on my by his woods lore, his knowledge of local history and the fact that he didn't just show us things talked about the last trout at Alley -- he had us make grapevine turkey calls, eat wild cherries, catch minnows. Hey, after 36 years, I still remember his name and face. Edna Staples did a two hour 'one room school' at the school she helped save. We sat at the desks, did homework, got yelled at for whispering; she taught us Ozark games like marbles and mumblety peg and we had a short spelldown. Riverways needs more "show" and less "tell."

F. Horses: Too MANY horses have ruined Two Rivers access, the Shawnee Creek area and other parts of the park. I've even been to Big Spring, not generally thought of as a 'horsey' part of the park, and encountered horse manure and attendant flies at the spring. This horse problem is most evident during summer when peak family tourist use is going on. Parts of the park trails have been churned beyond human hiking use by horses. I would limit horse use to the same numbers as current canoe use throughout the park, with no single party of horses exceeding 100 per square mile at one time (Actually, I'd like to see 50, but that will never happen.) The "million horse party weekend" has got to stop. Just as the feral horse numbers are controlled and became a tourist asset, so should be the tame horses. Perhaps NPS could work with CCTR and others to promote a more "Ozarkian" horse experience...smaller groups, more interpretive outreach of the trail rides (including riding mules, skidding mules, pulling teams, etc) in return for access, and rotating the parts of the park being used by horses, while giving other parts a couple of years to recover, just like one moves cattle from pasture to pasture.

G. ATVs. We already have laws on the ATVs. We need MORE enforcement and more ticketing off off-road gratuitous riding. At the same time, as the population ages, handicapped ATV use will increase. Perhaps NPS could work with accessibility organizations to ensure that ATVs are used for actual handicapped access to nature, and as the work vehicles they were originally intended. Persons ticketed for ATV infractions and abuse of the park should not be fined, but made to do trail work as community service in lieu of fine.

H. Roads. Park roads, especially those beaten by horses and ATVs and local trucks, should be reexamined and probably about 25% of them existing before, and 75% of those established since 1970 should be closed. The remaining roads should be improved to allow car access, reengineered and hardened to reduce hillside erosion into the creeks and rivers. And take the bulldozers away from the Shannon County Highway Department. Those folks are dangerous and out of control [It was interesting to me that at the 2007 Eminence Christmas parade, the Mo. Dept. of Conservation, premier fisheries, forest and wildlife agency, was represented by a bulldozer. Only in Shannon County.]

3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways?

Answer 3) Alternative C. Anything which increases horsepower limits, allows more rental boats, horses, increases park development (excepting those parts like improving roads to lessen erosion or better sewage control). Pretty much, Dent/Shannon/Carter counties do NOT NEED to turn into Stone or Taney Counties, nor does Riverways need to become as developed as Yellowstone. This is the Ozarks. If the visitors have to rough it...well, so much the better! Conversely, you cannot put things back the way they were in 1940 or even 1964. I'd like to see more experiential 'special events' -- yes, NPS lead johnboat floats, old forestry demos, civilian service projects, an opportunity to live Ozark culture, not just watch it as at the Alley Haunting. Something more like Shannondale Crafts Camp. It would be neat to have a two spring and two fall weeks where things were like 1900-1940 in the Park -- almost like an Ozark rendezvous, weeds to aim down the middle, neither too strict, nor too lenient, neither strictly preservationist, nor wild eyed development and commercially oriented. It needs to rein in the horses, the horsepower, the drunken jetboaters, and arrogant St. Louis canoeists. It needs to walk the line between letting everyone do their thing, and no one do nothing. It has to maximize opportunity (if only once in a lifetime) for all, while at the same time realizing that returning visitors form the core of it's advocacy group. It cannot unduly restrict the people whose families once owned these lands, nor cater exclusively to the enviro flatlanders. Even though it cannot be everything to everyone all of the time, it needs to be something to some of the people some of the time. It needs to preserve the raw emotional power of the water and land and animals, and reflect the Ozark character, all in a civilized and sane manner. In short the only way for the new GMP to succeed is to quote Ecclesiastes: "there is a time for every purpose under heaven." And maybe you ought to put the Dillards, the Bressler Brothers and Jim Orchard and the Ozark Bluegrass Boys on the CD player when you all finally sit down to write a preferred alterative. Catch the spirit of those people in the GMP, and you will have done the best you can do. Best wishes

424	1) The plan that most matches my idea would be plan A, with no-action being a distant 2nd. 2) I think that any plan adopted should limit the number of horses on the river and limit the number of places where horses are allowed to cross the river. In addition, horse manure should not come into contact with the river affecting water quality. ATV use should also be banned in the park. 5) I think creating and expanding hiking trails along the river would be helpful. I would also like a policy of "horse diapers" for any horse trails, especially those that cross the river. In general, I would like to limit motorized vehicles in the park.	7/22/2009	No		Green Wood	MO	63130
425	1. Alternative A is closest to my views on how to manage the riverways. 2. The wilderness experience needs to be protected. Unauthorized trails and roads should be closed. ATV use should not be allowed. Horses should be moved away from the river with limited crossings. These rivers are a unique and important resource for our state and country. Once they are developed, they will never be the same again. The quiet, secluded wilderness experience must be preserved. Motor boats should be allowed only in limited areas, and with HP restrictions. There are so few true wilderness experiences left in the world - please preserve what we have.	7/22/2009	No			MO	65803
426	Alternative A is the best offered. My favorite river, Black River, is not included here, but I feel that improvements to one stream will impact all. The change may be negative at first, as irresponsible ATV drivers and canoeists - as opposed to those to drive and canoe with care and respect for the sustainability of the area - will come to less-regulated streams. Hopefully, the beauty and enjoyment of the ONSR will arouse envy and all of our wonderful Missouri rivers will remain usable for many people for many years - and the can-tossing canoe floaters and gravel bar-damaging ATVs will go away.	7/22/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63129
427	1.No Action 2.no action 3.Do not limit below Big Spring. The river is plenty capable of handling the motors there and people have invested large amounts on boats and motors to enjoy this. 4.I especially like to use Roberts field to Log Yard and myself and my family get to spend great family time in our boat. I have a forty horse motor and I have spent a great deal of money to enjoy this. 5.Personally I think the jacks fork river could be made alot more user friendly if gravel was took out. This used to be common practice and the river was deeper,easier to float in a canoe and there was great fishing.	7/22/2009	No			MO	65548
428	1. Alternative A for each. There are sufficient rivers in Missouri which allow motorized boats. These boats are disruptive to wildlife and to people who wish to enjoy the true outdoors. They also add oil/gasoline to the ecosystem. 2. and 3. Again, elimination of motorized boats should be a priority. 4. Occasionally, I see evidence of soap debris above Akers. Both campers and people living in the watershed should be fully educated in the impact of their activities. 5. There could be a special place where people who do not float could visit an interpretative center with a nice view of the river(s). There are a couple bridges crossing the upper Current River (near Rounds Springs for example) which could allow people to have a view of what it is like to experience a "pristine" environment. A nicely done center would not be out of place here.	7/22/2009	No			MO	65401
429	5) * substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails * limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs * reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats * enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations * limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination * designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations.	7/22/2009	No			IL	62234
430	1.No-Action/alternative A 2.Limit motorized boats,atv and motorcycle use,limit number of non motorized craft,control horse trail use 3.More developement 4.I spend most of my time above Blue Springs.Alternative A would solve many of the problems I've had in the past. 5.Do not overdevelop the river,provide natural access to river,keep providing excellent maintainance and services	7/22/2009	No			MO	63139
431	1) alternative A 2) the plan should highlight the natural features of the rivers. 3) i am very much against allowing atv access in the rivers. also these rivers are not appropriate for motorboats. 4) the springs should be protected. 5) i think it is important to maintain a family friendly atmosphere that restricts "party" floaters. also there needs to be enforcement of the no atv in the rivers rule.	7/22/2009	No		sierra club	MO	63118
432	My preliminary comments: my interests include a much-reduced motorized and horse use, a reduced A plan. Realistically, seasonal mixed-use on the river would probably work best. Question 1. Plan A, my first choice. However, NO LIVING HISTORY. PLEASE. SPARE US. 1. a. NO "LIVING HISTORY" AT ALL, EVER, ANYWHERE WITHIN 1,000 MILES OF ANY NPS SITE.. These are always as bland and uninformative as possible, focused on some generic notion of "pioneers". They're poorly researched and poorly presented because 99% of well-intentioned "re-enactors" simply can't make the transition away from 21st century comforts. Too many accommodations are made for 21st century audiences. They learn nothing as a result. And, in the Midwest especially, "living history" events tend to ignore the more than 250 years of French colonization of Indian nations that preceded 1803. Ozarks-based "living history" events are the worst offenders. The. Absolute. Worst. Eliminate "living history" from any plan. NO LIVING HISTORY. NONE. EVER. PLEASE. 1.b. If NPS decides to build 'educational centers' throughout, they should be as low-impact as possible; i.e., no concrete or asphalt paving. But the idea of ranger- and self-guided tours into natural history or cultural history areas is VERY interesting and should be supported in the plan. Question 2. Natural and cultural resource management should be especially high priorities; protecting archaeological sites, both pre-historic and historic, should be top any list. Getting Big Spring in to a wilderness protection area is equally important. Question 3. NO LIVING HISTORY, EVER, ANYWHERE NEAR ANY NPS SITE UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES--NO, I REPEAT, NO, LIVING HISTORY. Question 4. NPS campgrounds along the Current River are beautiful and well-maintained, but they tend to be "over-mowed". If it were possible to re-organize the way the campgrounds are managed to include more native plants and less mowing, that would be fantastic. Question 5. This would be extremely complicated, but if float companies were encouraged to be outlets of information about natural and cultural resources, that would be great. At the same time, if the history of their presence along the rivers were included as part of the NPS materials that are handed out in the park and camp areas, that would be great too. But again, extremely complicated.	7/22/2009	No			MO	63119

433	1) A is closest to the original vision. Originally we all agreed on the need to preserve a few special places in as close to their original state as possible while still allowing the citizens of this nation to explore and enjoy them. 5) God has stopped creating land and we have all ready identified this land as being one of the few places that isn't to be totally inundated by noise, ruined by pollution, and swamped by wall-to-wall people. The original design has been under daily assault by commercial interests, bringing noise, pollution and crowds of people on ATVs and motorized craft, desecrating the park and violating the founding principals. We have now created an area which anyone interested in nature would avoid on weekends. The pollution threatens to keep humans out of the river while allowing innumerable horses free privy privileges. PLEASE, let us return to the original mission of the Park and further restrict the illegal accesses, ATV traffic and horse volume that is illegal but tolerated. We need to be spending what limited resources the Park Service has on enforcement of the original intent, not in expanding facilities. I don't envy your job and recognize the conflicting pressures you face. Good luck.	7/22/2009	No			MO	65804
434	Topic question 2 I have just returned to my childhood home of Missouri after 18 years on the west coast, the last 15 in the Pacific Northwest. After living in a region that values and protects its natural environment, I am extremely eager to see Missouri improve its track record and actions in this regard. The Current River is one of the hallmark natural environments in Missouri that I have been eager to share with my children, but am saddened that it is not the environment it was during my childhood -- it has not been protected for future generations. Please, let's improve this course. To save the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, it is imperative that you limit the number of visitors, limit access sites, increase oversight, and regulate appropriate use and conduct. Specifically: - Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help restore and maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. - Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways--except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the Rivers' health comes first. - Control the frequency and number of non-motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, tubes, etc.) on the rivers to alleviate crowding caused by large clusters of these watercraft closely spaced in time. - Designate the Big Spring Natural Area as a wilderness region. The Big Spring Natural Area lies very near the legendary Big Spring and is the backcountry portion of the old Big Spring State Park that has been protected since the 1920's. Preserving this example of native Missouri untouched for future generations is an easy decision and all conservationists should support it. I appreciate and encourage your efforts to save these rivers.	7/22/2009	No			MO	63017
435	1) Alternative A 2) Maintain the areas in a low-impact manner that preserves the natural beauty 3) Opening roads or allowing access on unauthorized roads, relaxing the NO ATV policy, allowing the use of unauthorized boat access areas. Allowing more motor boats or motor boats in certain areas. Allowing livestock that damage the water quality 4) The entire ONSR area is special and unique, thus it's designation! Big Spring Wilderness area. 5) Keep the mindset that there will always be a tomorrow and what we have now should be preserved for a day 100 years from now. We humans are only visitors to these area, passing through its antiquity for a brief period of our lifetime. These areas should be managed in a way that recognizes their uniqueness, beauty and sacredness. Short-term (i.e. the span of one person's lifetime) goals and desires to utilize the area merely for personal profit at the expense of the area's character is pure ignorance.	7/22/2009	No			MO	64151
436	1. Alternative A is my idea of the best management plan. All the points are ones I agree with and I would make no modifications. 2. The motorized horsepower limits and non-motorized sections are musts. Limit horseback riding in the area to almost nil. 3. Nothing from the other plans should be included in the management plan. It's time to return the rivers to their natural condition. 4. The section of the Current River from Montauk to Blue Spring is very special to me as well as the Jack's Fork from Prongs to Two Rivers. My sons and brothers floated these waters in the early 1970's and enjoyed the pristine, quiet, reflective nature of both rivers. Plan A comes the closest to re-creating this wonderful setting. 5. I believe whatever is done that emphasizes the natural and chronological history of these rivers is an important plus. Present and future generations must be inspired and educated so that the wonderful gifts we have received in these valleys are maintained forever. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on these plans.	7/22/2009	No		Missouri Smallmouth Alliance	MO	63301
437	Option A is the best option. The park needs to be kept as primitive as possible. Jacks Fork above Alley Spring is where I go the most.	7/22/2009	No			MO	65793
438	1.5 million people visit this area a year, yet Shannon County remains one of the poorest in the nation with a per capita income \$13,127. All your plan will do is further disenfranchise the local people. You should do nothing that would deprive the local populus of their enjoyment of the area.	7/22/2009	No			MO	65401
439	1. Alternative C with the exception of the confusion over the horsepower being 40 horses at the power head of the engine. Leave the horsepower issue allown until there is scientific and measured impact to the resourses. If your are managing on "feelings" of some of the visitors and or anxiety of those who float and see the motorized vessles, please take that out of your planning document. However, work with the interested groups on all sides to provide alternatives to the possible rule change that you would have to go through with limiting horsepower futher. 1a. In the development section for all of the alternatives except the no action one...provide examples of what devleopments you would expect to provide. Example, state...expand the electrification of the primary develeoped campgrounds...all indications are that having electriity provided is keeping campers more satisfied, bringing in a better family oriented group and providing more fee revenue for the park. Or explaing that boat lauch areas will be improved, a new visitor center will be planned for and or upgrade the historical old state park areas of the park. 2. Some of the suggested small stretches of the rivers on the Jacks Fork or the upper Current could be restricted from allowing motorized vessels during peak season periods. 2a. You should place in the planning document more clear guidlines on how you plan to manage all of the private, scenic and state lands you have within the boundary, including the various roads and the issues that surround them. 3. Do not address "Wilderness" areas...the park service has ample regulations that address all of the issues of those proposed areas now. 3a. Drop addressing horsepower, but you may want to address	7/22/2009	No			MO	63965

	<p>vessel size, length and or types. There may be areas of the rivers that you should only allow certain class of vessels; example, no longer than 16 feet, no motorized, ect. 4. The whole park is of concern to me, there is a lack of marked and or significantly marked and identified boundary, there is a lack of proper signing and direction provided with signs to many parts of the park. The changing of landscapes and or historic walkways; such was done in 2006 with completely adding a whole new section of stonewall to the Big Spring's walkway without any consultation with the public, historians and or consideration of the historic "view". Roads are in some state of needing repair...the Big Springs spring branch bridge is in embarrassing condition and the surface is pot holed. There is talk of providing a restroom facility more nearer to the Big Springs pavilion, but no action has been provided. 4a. There has been an impact statement developed for the necessary need of a boat launch near the Waymeyer landing, with a request for comments made some time about a year now with no update as to what that action is going to be. 4b. I see unauthorized signs on park property along the river south of Van Buren and no action by the Rangers has been taken. 4c. Finally in this section I find that the alternatives have been clouded by the fact that addressing horsepower again is taking away the need to address more overall needs of the park. Nothing is mentioned about concessions provided and the need to have some "interpretive boat tour" for those who can not or will not have means to boat the river when they visit the area. The state park has this service for years, but those days are gone and now the NPS should explore providing this service with qualified seasonals near the Big Springs area of the park. This service is provided at USS Arizona Memorial in Hawaii and park service owned vessels at Voyagers in Minn. 5. I have mentioned the expansion of electrification of the campgrounds, provide a seasonal boat tour to the public which should be part of the education and interpretive programs provided. Develop planning and request for funding for a visitor center that would hold exhibits and auditorium, and sales area that should set this park up as most other parks in the system have. I am astounded that after some forty-five years, we have not provided the public a central area to collect information, have off season programs for schools, and or allow the exhibitry of the parks many historical artifacts be displayed to tell the multiple stories of this area. Wilson Creek, the Arch, Buffalo River all have visitor centers for the public to become oriented in the area, but with the new four lane highway more traffic will pass through the area without the knowledge they would have if they saw something that would stop them along the way. Good luck</p>						
440	<p>1. I vote Alternative B. The area seems best suited for an increase in Natural and Primitive Zones. Options for the expansion of recreation and development zones exist in Missouri and Arkansas outside of the Riverway, but options outside of the Riverway for the maintenance or expansion of natural and primitive zones appear limited. 5. Consider temporarily adding an alcohol-free section of the Riverway and then expand, reduce or eliminate it depending on usage.</p>	7/22/2009	No			MO	63122
441	<p>1) I strongly feel that our rivers and streams must be protected from overuse by ATV's and motor boats that pollute and destroy.</p>	7/22/2009	No			MO	63052
442	<p>#5 Its hard for me to support an alternative other than No-action. I just want to see the Park service quit restricting horse use and acting like we are less than other users. Keep the access roads open. Keep the horse trails open. If changes in maintenance can be made that help the river then fine but the constant attack on recreation is ridiculous. If we keep locking up our public lands then support for them will dry up and in the long run it will be bad for these special places. I can support some restrictions on commercial horse use but private users should have the freedom to wander and wonder our national rivers. The freedom to responsibly use our public lands should not be restricted. I personally am a birder and a canoer as well as a horseback rider and hiker. I just want to be able to use our public lands. Not ruin them but have access. I would support the alternative with the most freedom for horseback riders.</p>	7/22/2009	No			AR	72601
443	<p>On behalf of Audubon Missouri, and its board of directors, I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration. Tony Robyn Executive Director/VP Audubon Missouri</p>	7/22/2009	No		Audubon Missouri	MO	64804

444	1) A 2) Small no. of low hp boats. Closing illegal trails & roads.	7/22/2009	No			MO	63122
445	1) I prefer Alternative A. 2) The motorboat limits proposed in Alternative A should be included in the final management plan. Jet boats are dangerous. A few years ago, I stood on a gravel bar and watched in helpless horror as an oblivious jet boater almost ran over my dog. I am not sure which boats are affected by the proposed limits. I only know the boats now on the river are too fast, too loud and too stinky. 3) I strongly feel boat speeds and boat pollution should be minimized in the future management of the national riverways. 4) Some of my fondest childhood memories are the johnboat rides from the Big Spring State Park dock. I do not have a problem with sensible, non-lethal johnboats. 5) The federal government used eminent domain to take property from the people of Dent, Shannon and Carter Counties with the promise of preserving the area "unimpaired for future generations". If the NPS is unable to keep this promise, they should consider giving the land back. Loud jet boats are not part of the unique cultural heritage of the Ozark people.	7/22/2009	No		Master Naturalist	MO	65401
446	I agree with the Friends of Ozark Riverways on all points. We must save this special resource and become more diligent about protecting it and the people who enjoy it. 1) Alternative A should be implemented before a jet boat kills a swimmer. 2) Hellbenders in the Ozarks are in serious trouble. Until the decline of these magnificent salamanders is reversed, limiting motorboats to the lower half of the riverways is reasonable. 3) Oily sheens from motor boats should not be tolerated on the Upper Current or the Jacks Fork. The Jacks Fork is already impaired. 4) Watching fish swim in clear water is special. 5) The park service should get carbon credits if they can decrease motor boat abuse. I would really like to see NO motorized vehicles allowed anywhere near the rivers, but I not that is unrealistic.	7/23/2009	No		Ozark Rivers Audubon	MO	65401
447	I strongly recommend Alternative A. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways can be one of the natural treasures not only of Missouri but also of our nation. We need to keep it a natural, unspoiled environment, one that can take people back to nature and an earlier time when commerce did not direct its uses. Motor boats are dangerous to floaters and swimmers and disturb the water life of the rivers. The trail rides on the Jack's Fork are also destructive - to the ecology and the health of the river. They erode banks, pollute the waters, and destroy the ecology.	7/23/2009	No		Meramec Hills chapter - Missouri Naturalists	MO	65401
448	1) I prefer that a no-action approach be taken with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Very Respectfully, Fred W. Smith	7/23/2009	No			MO	63010
449	#1 A is the best however i feel that all moteized boots should be disallowed except for emergency or patrol activities	7/23/2009	No			MO	65560
450	1) Alternative A is close to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 2) A. I feel strongly that going back to a more primitive state of the riverway is the best course of action. B. I also feel strongly that the use of powerboats on the riverways should be banned and/or severely limited as their use does not promote the "wilderness" and "scenic" aspects of what the management of the riverways was supposed to do. C. I also feel strongly that the closing and repairing of the "unauthorized" trails and accesses is also the best course of action for the riverways.	7/23/2009	No			MO	65552
451	A. I believe the National Park Service has failed in its mandate to safeguard the Ozark Scenic National Riverway from encroachment and abuse.	7/23/2009	No			MO	65203-1444
452	Please follow alternative A. I have canoed both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, but not for some years. At the time I did I chose times to canoe when there would be less traffic. Even though I found refuse left behind, particularly on the Current, there was little visible or sound intrusion on the wilderness setting. They were beautiful experiences only because the surroundings were mostly pristine and untrammled. Because of reports I have heard since then have been reluctant to go there. The original intent of National Scenic Rivers should remain the law governing its use. All we need is one more area that was once pristine, ruined by noise, pollution, and degradation.	7/23/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65202
453	1. The alternative A provided by the Park Service will go a long way for preserving and protecting this valuable natural resource from being ruined by unnecessary encroachment, especially from mototized vehicles. 2. We don't have many pristine areas left in this country. We must do whatever we can to create conditions for low impact use that allows everyone to enjoy this gem in it's natural state. 3. Let's close unauthorized roads, and restrict motorized boats so if someone wants to enjoy the river area they have to either hike in or canoe/kayak in. 4. I don't know why we cannot protect the entire 134 miles, but if we need to make trade offs let's keep our ace in the hole -- the Big Springs area. 5. I recently canoed from Cedar Grove to Two Rivers and camped three nights along the Current River. I was appalled to discover at the first campsite that the gravel bar above the river had been churned into a mud hole from ATV's. Sure enough, just as we were setting camp in the few dry spots, along came four ATV's to not only drown out the natural sounds of this magnificent setting, but also tear up the vegetation. The ATV folks ought to have a place they can enjoy their sport, but does it have to be in this gem of a natural wilderness?	7/23/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63119
454	1) Alternative 1 is the closest to my idea of looking at the future of our state parks. I think the protection of our natural resources be it , plant, animal, water quality or just the peace and quiet of out parks is first and foremost for protecting . I think we should take more time to enhance the trail systems we have in the park and if a trail was cut illigally it should be closed. I think the park has to look at why the trail was cut though. Does it go to a place that riders or hikers just cant resist? Is making it a legal trail and option? If the answer is no then it should be marked as closed and there needs to be a full time patrol ranger to uphold the law. I think all overnight group activities need to be guided or at lease groups should	7/23/2009	No			MO	65548

	<p>have to sign in to protect both people and the park itself. There is alot of heavy drinking and partying that happens in our parks and it is uncalled for. There is a place for that in the towns and it doesnt need to be carried out into the park Yes Big Spring should be designated a wilderness area. You cannot protect the primitive qualities of the area without wilderness designation in my opinion. Its a nice thought but people are not that disiplined. Perhaps there could be a special permitting system so if someone wanted to enter the wilderness area for photography or plant studies ect. they could with special permission. On the other side of that coin there should be ample camping sites, riding trails, oppertunities for bird watching and hiking in the park. Though an area may need closing the public needs to feel like they have plenty of options to enjoy the park system in other areas. Also, if an area is closed it should be explained. Dont just slap a closed sign up and expect people to abide by it without explanation. Put out newspaper articles, Hold a meeting, post reason for closing on the boards at the park, Let people understand and be a part of. Thank you for this oppertunity to comment on tese issues. One thing that makes me crazy when I enter the park system is the amount of exotic plants growing along the trails. There is an abundance of Sericea weed and Knapp-weed in park and it is a disgrace.It is pushing out he native plants. A good spraying or mowing before these exotics go to seed in in order. Id be glad to help.</p>					
455	<p>1) A. Include highland hiking trails. 2) Proper management and sustainability of natural resources, reestablishment of native vegetation, decreased access points and off road vehicles, seclusion of developement, Big Springs Wilderness Area, regulation of floater and boater densities and behaviors. 3)No regulation of motorboats and off road vehicles, allowance of development, and maintained access points. 4)Akers-Round Spring and Big Spring, the alternatives do address them. I favor alternative A for proper management of these areas. 5)For all alternatives: Re-establishment of Riparian Buffers and native vegetation (forest species, river cain, tall grasses, forbs, etc.) along riverways to decrease erosion, sedimentation, nutrients and other pollutants in and around the rivers. This would also create better habitat and keep visitors from degrading the riparian habitat and soil along the riverways.</p>	7/23/2009	No		University of Missouri, Environmental Science	MO 65201
456	<p>Topic Question #1: The No-Action alternative would be my prefernce. As far as modifying it, I have no direct thoughts on any changes. My personal experiences on our majestic Current River has been positive as a whole. We used a motorboat for the enjoyment of this river. We encounter people using various other types of transportation, ie: canoes, kayaks, tubes, etc.; and our overall experiences have been good. We respect the rights of others on the river and have in many instances been their source of assistance in times of dire need. Examples include plucking children and people from the water and returning them to gravel bars and then proceeding to collect their possessions and help them get going again. Rescuing those truly terrified...example: a child clinging to a branch on a swift shoal, parents on the bank screaming for their child (they can't swim) and my husband diving in, going to the child, bringing to our boat and then the bar when the parents were waiting. What would happen to those folks if anything else besides the no-action alternative is put in place? Through the years there have been so many of those types of occurrences. Along with sharing our water, lunch and whatever else we had with canoers who lost everything...we could always cut our day short and go home...they had to finish their trip. We've provided first aid supplies to others who needed it. We pick up trash left or lost by others on the river. For the area we use, we provide help when needed, enjoy our fishing trips a great deal and don't want to see anything change. For many, the boat/motor is the only reasonable usage instrument...they are older..more frail perhaps and would be excluded under the other alternatives. In this hectic world we all need our getaway space..the river is ours...we relax the moment we get there, better than any nerve pill as you can absorb natural beauty anywhere along the river, and continually be amazed at the new things you encounter. So, I guess what I am trying to say is please leave things as they are, let us all enjoy the river in the way that pleases us, don't take away our freedom to decide how to spend a day, or two on the Current. Topic #2: The No-action alternative. Topic #3: The other alternatives. Topic #4: Of course the areas we frequent...Log Yard north to Blue Spring and Paint Rock south to Waymire are those most dear to us. My husband was raised on the banks of the Current..On what is now the Schwartz Farm at Boat N Hole.....its like going home when we are there....We would just like to be able to enjoy them the way that we have been...since he was a child, over 60 years ago. The only alternative that addresses our desires for "our little piece of the river" is the No-Action alternative. Topic #5: I realize that there are congestion issues on the river in some areas, especially Van Buren, we stay away from there on the weekends and holidays for those reasons. Actually we rarely go the river other than during the week. How to handle the mass of tubers and people in general in those areas would require a logistical approach for the amount of persons each day accessing the river in those areas. You speak of visitor experiences....the river itself is the experience..the moments that are not matched anywhere else....the river speaks for itself when we are allowed the freedom to use it. Come and try it yourself sometime, you will be engulfed in a magic that is only the Current...come hear her voice, feel her majesty, see her beauty.....Do not take her away from us. I support the No-Action alternative. Thank you for taking the time to hear my voice.</p>	7/23/2009	No			MO 63638
457	<p>The park service is already violating the intent of the original management plan by allowing motorized boats, new accesses, and not enforcing the rules. I strongly feel there should be: NO drunks – in addition to the obvious reasons, accidents, deaths, and I would like to be able to take my nieces on the river without the foul language, harassment, nudity and piles of empty beer cans. NO ATVs – destroys the river, riverbank and they create new illegal trails. There is no where you can go that an ATV doesn't come screaming down to the river. NO motorized boats – cause accidents – note the recent deaths on the Current from a collision, motorized boats not in the original intent of the management plan. Motorized boats can swamp canoes and kayaks, destroy the fragile riverbank ecosystem with their wave wash. NO horses – destroy the trails, create illegal trail and they are placing you can not get in the water because of ecoli – does this tell you there are too many horses??? Jo An Emerson gets a bucket full of money from the horse folks – does this override the need to preserve one a national scenic waterway? There is way too much development in the area. This is meant to be a natural reserve, not an industry. One of the few remaining placing you could float a canoe and view the beautiful MO countryside has become an overcrowded, loud, trashy, party zone with horses, ATV, motorized boats and other loud toys. Please give us a back a place to enjoy the scenery, peace, nature and take our kids without having to expose them to X-rated behavior. Thank you Nancy Tokraks</p>	7/23/2009	No			MO 63123

458	1) alternative A is my choice. I feel strongly about restoring the past beauty and scerenity of our beautiful rivers. 2)I feel motorized vessels and vehicles should be limited as well as horsetrails so close to the river. All create huge safty concerns as well as disturbing the natural wonders. 3)The addition of motorized vessels, vehicles, and horsetrails. 4)My favorite stretch is on the Current River between Baptist Camp and Owls Bend. There is so much to marvel at along the way and if limits aren't set, parts of this stretch are in danger of loosing its magnificence. 5)Education of the importance of respecting the river and everything on and around it. Please....we are so fortunate to live in a state with so much to offer, this a great opportunity to make things right, lets not blow it! Thank you, Nancy Jennings	7/23/2009	No			MO	63139
459	1) NO-ACTION IS CLOSER TO MY IDEA OF THE NEW MANAGEMENT PLAN. HOWEVER, I THINK IT SHOULD BE REVISED TO REMOVE LIMITS ON BOAT MOTORS. MY REASONING FOR THIS IS THAT I BELIEVE IT WOULD RELIEVE SOME CONGESTION IN THE VAN BUREN STRETCH. 3) I THINK ANY MOVE TO TURN PARTS OF THE RIVER INTO WILDERNESS AREAS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED. THE RIVER WAS DEVELOPED FOR ALL TO ENJOY; NOT JUST INFREQUENT VISITORS OR LOCAL PATRONS. 4) THE LOG YARD AREA SHOULD RESTRICT CAMPING TO THE GRAVEL BAR AREA, LEAVING THE BOAT LAUNCH AREA FREE FOR VEHICLES TO MANUEVER. 5) I THINK A VERY IMPORTANT STRATEGY WOULD BE TO PROMOTE FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION BETWEEN CANOERS/TUBERS AND BOATERS. I SEE A LOT LESS ANIMOSITY BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS THAN IN PAST YEARS. ALMOST EVERY BOATER HAS AT LEAST ONE STORY OF RESCUING CANOERS/TUBERS FROM A ROOT-WAD, OR EXHAUSTION, OR NEAR-DROWNING, ETC. I ALSO SEE BOATERS PICKING UP LITTER AND DEBRIS FROM THE WATER. I APPRECIATE THE PUBLIC MEETINGS CONCERNING THIS ISSUE, AND WOULD SUGGEST THEY BE HELD ON A REGULAR BASIS (POSSIBLY ANNUALLY OR BI-ANNUALLY), TO ALLOW A FORUM FOR ONSR TO KEEP THE PUBLIC INFORMED, AND FOR THE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT. I ALSO SEE A LOT LESS ANIMOSITY AND DISTRUST TOWARD ONSR PERSONNEL FROM THE PUBLIC. I THINK THESE MEETINGS WOULD HELP TO DEVELOP THE FEELING OF A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE PUBLIC AND ONSR TO PROTECT THE RIVERWAYS FOR ALL OF US AND OUR KIDS AND GRANDKIDS.	7/23/2009	No			MO	63638
460	1) NO-ACTION IS CLOSER TO MY IDEA OF THE NEW MANAGEMENT PLAN. HOWEVER, I THINK IT SHOULD BE REVISED TO REMOVE LIMITS ON BOAT MOTORS. MY REASONING FOR THIS IS THAT I BELIEVE IT WOULD RELIEVE SOME CONGESTION IN THE VAN BUREN STRETCH. 3) I THINK ANY MOVE TO TURN PARTS OF THE RIVER INTO WILDERNESS AREAS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED. THE RIVER WAS DEVELOPED FOR ALL TO ENJOY; NOT JUST INFREQUENT VISITORS OR LOCAL PATRONS. 4) THE LOG YARD AREA SHOULD RESTRICT CAMPING TO THE GRAVEL BAR AREA, LEAVING THE BOAT LAUNCH AREA FREE FOR VEHICLES TO MANUEVER. 5) I THINK A VERY IMPORTANT STRATEGY WOULD BE TO PROMOTE FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION BETWEEN CANOERS/TUBERS AND BOATERS. I SEE A LOT LESS ANIMOSITY BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS THAN IN PAST YEARS. ALMOST EVERY BOATER HAS AT LEAST ONE STORY OF RESCUING CANOERS/TUBERS FROM A ROOT-WAD, OR EXHAUSTION, OR NEAR-DROWNING, ETC. I ALSO SEE BOATERS PICKING UP LITTER AND DEBRIS FROM THE WATER. I APPRECIATE THE PUBLIC MEETINGS CONCERNING THIS ISSUE, AND WOULD SUGGEST THEY BE HELD ON A REGULAR BASIS (POSSIBLY ANNUALLY OR BI-ANNUALLY), TO ALLOW A FORUM FOR ONSR TO KEEP THE PUBLIC INFORMED, AND FOR THE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE INPUT. I ALSO SEE A LOT LESS ANIMOSITY AND DISTRUST TOWARD ONSR PERSONNEL FROM THE PUBLIC. I THINK THESE MEETINGS WOULD HELP TO DEVELOP THE FEELING OF A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE PUBLIC AND ONSR TO PROTECT THE RIVERWAYS FOR ALL OF US AND OUR KIDS AND GRANDKIDS.	7/23/2009	No			MO	63638
461	1) We prefer Alternative A, but with further restrictions on horse numbers and crossings, and with no horsepower allowed above Van Buren. 2) Much stronger enforcement of ORV and horse trail abuses, and illegal roads and trails. We greatly appreciate your crackdown on drunken lewd behavior of some users (abusers). 4) We're really tired of local (presumed) idiots swamping our canoe deliberately. No horsepower allowed above Van Buren. 5) Don't forget to protect the viewshed as well as the watershed.	7/23/2009	No			MO	65201
462	This answers all questions except #3 and #5. I have gone to the Ozark National Scenic Rivers many, many times to canoe and kayak, sun, swim, sight-see the beautiful springs and to camp. I have always treasured the beautiful scenic riverways as a place to reconnect to the natural world. My best times in Missouri were and are on those rivers. However, the park does not keep up with its purpose to maintain the ONSR for everyone. Some groups have activities that are damaging to the OSNR environment and to the experience of other groups. We must CO-EXIST with everyone and the OSNR park should be maintained for everyone – not just a select few to the detriment of others. My choice, therefore, is for Alternative A—to protect the park for traditional non-motorized use, protect the river corridor, protect the Ozarks historical value, to protect the Big Spring Tract in wilderness designation and to close illegal roads into ONSR. Please protect and preserve the OSNR for everyone to use and for future generations—and do not let the unthinking few ruin it for all the people. Thank you, Sue Skidmore	7/24/2009	No			MO	65804
463	1. Out of the four alternatives, my preference is the No-Action alternative. I would like to see there be fewer restrictions regarding boating on the river than there already are. I would like to see the "gap" between Van Buren's bridge through Big Springs eliminated and no horsepower restrictions what so ever on the river. However, none of the four preliminary alternatives show this and so therefore, I want the No-Action alternative. 2. Besides the No-Action, I feel that the remaining three alternatives are quite radical. Limiting horsepower, restricting motor vehicle use, horseback riding restrictions, etc. makes it feel that the government is getting too involved. We have been riding our horses through this river for centuries. Has there ever been a water quality study done to prove that horses and boat exhaust is diminishing the water quality? 3. I really feel that ANY restrictions on boaters should not be in the alternative plans. There are far too many restrictions as it stands and we really don't need anymore. 4. The river is protected already on all of the major springs. What more restrictions can you do? I would HATE to see Big Springs become wilderness, or much less, any of the springs. I love going to Big Springs to picnic and BBQ and would not appreciate if that right was taken from me. Making it so a park service member could lead me around there would be equally as hated as well. 5. First off, the current plan we are under needs to be re-addressed. I am a floater and a boater. This summer I have already been on 4 float trips. The NPS works very closely with the MO Water Patrol. Some of the reasons we are undergoing new proposals is that a VERY SMALL amount of complaints were	7/24/2009	No			MO	63965

	received during the summer of 2006. Since the waterways receive roughly 1.8 million visitors per year, this totals one complaint per 4,852 visitors or less than .02%. Not enough complaints in my opinion to undergo such radical changes. I believe that one responsibility of the NPS is to prevent underage drinking, obscene gestures, and illegal drugs on the river. Let me ask this, if you were driving on the highway and saw a highway patrol parked on the side of the road - would you speed? NO is the obvious answer and that is because you SAW the patrolman. Over my MANY float trips that I have taken, I NEVER see park service nor water patrol past what's called "Mill Creek." The NPS and Water Patrol need to get in people's sight so these acts will occur less. Why do we need more restrictions and alternatives on a job that is currently done poorly. Please pass the no-action, and get our park service to do a better job of enforcing the plan we are currently under.					
464	I began floating the upper Current (Baptist Camp to Two Rivers) in 1973. I've floated with fairly large groups, I chaired the Columbia Troop 704 50 mile float for 4 years when my son was in scouting. However, most of my floating has been with my wife. I always scheduled the Boy Scout floats during the week, so the boys would not be exposed to the obnoxious drunks that abound during the weekends. I wish that I could have scheduled all our floating during the work week to avoid them, but that wasn't possible. I don't advocate that you ban drinking, but I do believe that increased visibility of Park Rangers would keep people in check. 1) I lean towards Alternative A. I believe horses and ATV's should be banned from the river and campgroups, especially from Baptist Camp to Two Rivers. Horses and ATV's cause bank eroison, stream turbidity. ATV noise is unbearable and horses just smell. Please maintain this area as wild and scenic riverway. 4) Baptist Camp to Two Rivers is a special place to me. Limit mortorized boating to maintenance, law enforcement, and any emergencies, except, during the gigging season. Increase the visibility of Park Rangers (supplemented by volunteers) on weekends to curtain obnoxious behavior. Limiting the number of canoes (rafts, tubes, etc.) in a float party could also have a positive effect on people behavior. Any group with more than 10-15 canoes tends to be louder, more obnoxious than smaller groups. Thanks for the opportunity to share my thoughts.	7/24/2009	No		MO	65201
465	I believe Option A will provide the best protection and long term preservation of ONSR. As a long-time resident and frequent hiker and canoeist, I have seen the damage ATV and unrestricted equestrian use has done to both our streams and our trails. I favor the protections in Option A as the best management choice-for present and future users. Thank you,	7/24/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO 63376
466	1. Alternative A is the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways! This riverway is a national treasure, unmatched anywhere else in the USA. We need to LIMIT ATV and horse access and the use of high horsepower motorboats. There are plenty of other lakes, rivers, and forests where individuals can use their atv's, horses, and high-horsepower motors. There are few places left in the USA where we can enjoy paddling canoes and canoe camping any distance in a semi-natural, unspoiled setting. We need natural areas for low-impact, family-friendly recreation and the Ozark National Scenic Riverway should be such an area.	7/24/2009	No		MO	63141
467	1 My choice would be plan A. I am especially concerned about having a management plan that conserves the river and park and does not allow damage. It is recognized that so many river access points - many or most of which were not planned but have are just created by users - allow the river bank to be damaged and wildlife to be driven off. This damage won't be repaired in one season or a year but may take of decade of controlled access to recover. The unplanned access is largely by vehicles including ORVs and trucks for camping too close to the river. Camping may have to be restricte to approved sites which may be developed or primitive.	7/24/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO 63043
468	#1 No action #2 No action #3 A,B and C #4 improve boat ramps, open feilds for wildlife grazing, no closed roads, no boat ramp fee's	7/24/2009	No		NWTF	MO 63873
469	#5 Let me be quite frank....The National Park Service has failed miserably in its management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. To illustrate one only has to visit the Current River on any given summer weekend in order to see...drunk, drugged, and disorderly conduct all along the weekend. Power boats driven at reckless speeds through channels that should be restricted to paddle craft....an abundance of unauthorized accesses....and horse people who apparently do not know how to stay on designated trails, riding in the river from gravel bar to gravel bar. My suggestion....arrest those who are drunk and disorderly....bar motors on the rivers except for law enforcement...and keep the horses on the trails. Quit letting the abusers of this NATIONAL resource get by with it. It is the NATIONAL Park Service after all. Save the Scenic Riverways for the nation.	7/24/2009	No		Ozark Mountain Paddlers	MO 65742
470	1) I would have to say that option A would be my ideal way to manage the ONSR. The only modification I would suggest is a seasonal 25hp limit, Labor Day through Memorial Day from Alley Spring to Two Rivers to allow for gigging boats. 2) I really favor the non-motorized sections above Alley Spring and Round Spring in option A. This will make it much more relaxing for floaters and minimize impacts from motorized boats in those areas. 3) I am strongly against motorized boats above alley spring and above round spring. I also think we should not continue with the 40hp restriction above Van Buren and instead should lower it to a 25hp restriction where the 40hp restriction is currently instated. 4) I would say if we go with option A those areas I am interested in would benefit from this option. 5) I would say since these rivers are considered part of the scenic river ways then we need to make the most effort to keep them scenic and preserve the biologic integrity. I think the way to do this is to be more stringent on hp laws and promote eco-tourism. The scenic river ways are host to many endemic species and habitats and we need to do our best to juggle recreational use and preservation.	7/24/2009	No		MO	65775
471	First, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the planning for future uses of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. For many years, I and my family have enjoyed the wonders and beauty of these rivers and are very interested in saving them for future generations to also love and enjoy. Over the past years we have noted a number of changes to the riverways; most not for the good. The impact of too many people with too little concern for the rivers and the land surrounding the rivers has made many disturbing changes to the rivers. Some of these changes are being already addressed such as limiting types of coolers on the rivers and monitoring for excessive drinking and drug use. However, other	7/24/2009	No		MO	63131

	<p>actions are impacting the rivers in ways that are not being addressed under the current management plan and need to be addressed. Regarding the proposed plans, I favor Alternative A which protects and preserves the greatest area of the rivers. I believe it is critical to limit motorized boating from many areas of the rivers. Too often the quiet and beauty of a canoe trip is disturbed by a load, noisy outboard with no regard for the canoes or kayaks. I have had to "dodge" out of the way from these boats too often even though they were following "speed limits". The fact that a canoe is under human power and thus is slow in its reactions means the outboard needs to give room and right-of-way to the canoe but most of the time it is the canoe diving out of the way. Being right means little after you are run over. The areas proposed for limitation are the narrowest areas and the areas with some of the faster currents making coexistence of outboards aand non-motorized boats difficult. I urge limiting access points to the rivers to only those under control of the park service. Too many times have I found an ATV or a 4X4 sitting or driving in the river with damage to the river and its banks. Sadly, many users of these vehicles do not understand or care about the damage they do to this fragile ecosystem. The arguement that they should have as much right to the rivers as others is flawed since others do not impact or damage the enviroment nearly as much. Providing limited access is flawed also since these vehicles often enter at an approved point but then drive up and down the rivers and banks from there. Even allowing "crossing Points" is a failed policy since the riders often do not honor the limitations and restrictions to stay in those sites and the damage they do still spreads far downstream. There are many private areas in Missouri that riders of ATVs or 4X4s can choose to use without destroying public land. Some private landholders may argue that it is their land and they should have the right to do with it as they want but the waterways are public land and the impact on these public properties by private property abuse is no different than a large corporation polluting the land and air around it. I urge the planners to also limit severely the number of horse allowed on the rivers and even in the surrounding areas. The runoff from these stables and farms has just as much impact on the ecosystem of these streams as direct pollution. Again, it makes no sense to provide "limited" access if the horseback riders do not honor these restrictions. The agruement that horses have always been allowed on the rivers is wrong. These rivers and their ecosystems were there before horses. After horses were introduced to the enviroment of these streams, the numbers were far less than the numbers seen today with less impact both direct and indirect. Regarding future camping and campgrounds; I urge the planners to continue to support the current park campsites and to more strongly enforce private campgrounds to preserve the rivers. The well-managed sites at Pulltite and Akers Ferry demonstrate that you can still have numerouss campsites and minimal impact. Camping on the river is wonderful but only if the campers respect and honor the river system. Enforcement of regulations designed to protect the rivers by on-river rangers would be required. Regarding the economics of limiting access and uses of the riverwys, I wish to remind the planners that while in the short-term, letting an anything goes attitude may benefit some in the surrounding communities, only by protecting and preserving the natural beauty and wonders of these rivers will the long-term and sustainable economic benefits be achieved. No one wants to vist a washed-out, dirty river. I thank you for this opportunity to address the future of these rivers that my family, friends, and I have come to love through the years. I urge you to act strongly to save these river systems and ecosystems. There so many other places for those who choose to abuse the rivers to go to without destroying the last great rivers in Missouri. Thank you. Sincerely, Herluf G. Lund Jr., M.D.</p>						
472	As uban scrawl has taken more and more of the countryside and turned it into track housing, the landscape is certainly changing. With a growing population the wilderness sites are becoming 'play grounds' for the power toy generation. It is very important for all liife that there are places left that are not over run with development and very invasive tourism practices. This is an area that is in need of protection....good stewardship by us two leggers. There is an eco system that is fragile and deserves to be allowed to evolve in its natural state.	7/24/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	64053
473	1. A is the alternative closest to my ideal. 2. Closing unauthorized access. 5. Limit the number of floaters per day via permit or some facsimile thereof.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63640
474	1. A 2. Leave rivers as natural as possible. 3. No more roads or ATV access. No motorized craft on rivers. 4. N/A 5. Cut down on licenses for canoe liveries. Too many people are using the rivers but not caring for them.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63304
475	1.Alternative A is closer to my idea of how the park should be managed. 2.The park should be brought back to it's more natural state. Damage done by illegal road building should be repaired and these roads permanently closed. There needs to be money allocated for police enforcement of the road closers. There should be no boating above 25mph and then only on the areas designated. 3.There should be no motorized boats over 25 mph.. 4. The big Spring state park area should be designated wilderness. 5. Flora and fauna should be identified and protocted. Efforts to educate the public should be undertaken.	7/24/2009	No			MO	65401
476	1) alternative A I don't know about all the specifics, but I know low-impact plans are better for the enviornment and also for people in the long-run. There alot of paces to go in Mo. for gas powered machines to play (boats, atv's, ect.) Please let our quiet spaces remain quiet, and therefore, cleaner, healthier.	7/25/2009	No			MO	63090
477	1) Alternative A is, in my opinion, the best and most sustainable way to handle the future of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and bring maximum enjoyment to the most visitors. 2) Please keep high-horsepowered boats and vehicles away from the majority of rivers. I don't believe that the folks on ATVs appreciate the serenity and beauty of their surroundings. Their choice of activity merely take it away from others. I would appreciate it if folks would leave the gas-powered engines in the city. 5) Having representatives of the government or river volunteers stationed in the nearest town or at the trail heads area would enhance visitor experience and greatly assist in law enforcement. Sincerely, Andrea Armstrong Kansas City, MO	7/25/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	64113

478	NO-ACTION	7/25/2009	No			MO	63638
479	(1) No Action	7/25/2009	No			MO	65702
480	(1) No Action	7/25/2009	No			MO	65702
481	1. I think alternative A is the best one for the greatest river protection and opportunities for appropriate recreation. 2. All river management, indeed all land management, should include conditions for low impact, family friendly recreation focusing on enjoying the natural beauty of the area. 3. a. close unauthorized roads b. enforce the current no ATV policy c. close the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers d. some stretches of the river should be closed to motor boating e. water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. Move riding trails away from the river, limit equestrian stream crossings, and limit the numbers of horses on the trails. 4. Special areas need to be protected. For example, designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. 5. There are so few truly undisturbed natural areas left. Please do the utmost to protect this special region, and minimize adverse impacts from visitors who are enjoying the area.	7/25/2009	No			MO	64055
482	4. the riverways are a great resource the way they are...they are monitored against abuse by boaters something that was needed...the rivers should be kept as close to the past as possible....that means education about the heritage of the people who lived there and no vehicles allowed it would ruin the rivers and its native animals. we are lucky to have the rivers and people always run down the gov't but we owe it to the people in the gov't with the insight to acquire the land etc. please no to motors anyway shape or form on this land and water....thanks	7/25/2009	No		sierra club	MO	65231
483	1) Alternative A is the closest to my ideal, but I would prefer more areas without motorized boating. I would propose that a moratorium on the use of motorized boats be placed on a section of river (for example, from Powder Mill to Log Yard)for several years in order to evaluate the effects of erosion from the increased use of motorized boats. This study's results should then be compared to adjacent sections where motorized boating was permitted. 2) Limiting motorized boats and limiting the number of canoes should be included. Development should be minimized along the riverway. 3) I feel strongly that opening over 70% of the river to motorized boats has a detrimental effect on wildlife, fisheries, erosion and the general public's experience. 4) One of our favorite stretches of the Current River is from Powder Mill to Log Yard. Our canoe experiences have definitely deteriorated due to the increase use of motorized craft in these areas. The majority of the motorized boats roar up and down the river, they do not slow down for canoers, they have no courtesy for fellow boaters or concern for the environment. It is also apparent that erosion has increased dramatically. Our last three experiences on the Current River have not been pleasant and if the trend continues we would not recommend anyone go to the Current River for a canoe trip. 5) As noted above, we recommend establishing an experimental tract to determine the effect of motorized boats on erosion and wildlife.	7/25/2009	No			MO	63621
484	Dear Superintendent Detring, Thank you and the National Park Service (NPS) for allowing for and taking into consideration my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OSNR) proposed management plans. Although the publicity about the plans appears scarce as I did not hear about the community meetings until after they were completed--and I was on the Jack's Fork in early June and did not see any notice of the meetings. It might have been prudent to post the meetings at the various informational boards throughout the OSNR at least a couple of months prior to the meetings as that would inform those that most use the park in a timely fashion. I trust that, as a public servant, you will give due diligence to everyone's comments. When I say "I", "me" or "my" I am referring to myself and my three children-my family. When I use "we", "us", or "our" and I am referring to my family, other family members and friends who share my thoughts and concerns on these plans. We have been visiting and enjoying camping, fishing and floating the Upper Current-above Akers Ferry and the Upper Jacks Fork-above Alley Spring for over 35 years. Sometimes we have three generations camping together. And this year we had four as one of our few remaining fathers was able to be with us. To quote a couple of songs from the 70's--"It's a family affair" and "We are family". In those years we have had a spring and fall "trophy trout" trip on the upper Current and an early summer "primitive" trip on the Jacks Fork. I also have used and continue to use these areas mainly from September through May as that is when the rivers are least used. I have averaged a trip every other month from September through May since the mid 1980's. I also have been visiting these two areas during the week in the summers (ah, the advantages of being a teacher). I generally avoid the rivers on the weekends from Labor Day to Memorial Day because I prefer the tranquility of the river rather than the sounds of the multitudinous floaters. Before commenting on the various proposed plans I would like to review a little history of the area and its usages. Since the Civil War the Ozark hills (except for a small area along Highway 19 south of Highway 60)have been clear-cut logged out on three separate occasions. So that for all practical purposes the OSNR should not be considered "wilderness". Attempting to designate portions of the OSNR as wilderness would be a fallacy as the Wilderness Act of 1964 was meant to be used to designate true wilderness areas-as untouched by man as possible, i.e., Alaska's wilderness areas. It seems to me that were the NPS to designate areas in the OSNR as wilderness areas it would have to rip out the hardwood forest areas and return it to its pre-Civil status as mainly short leaf pine forest which certainly wouldn't be feasible. The historical usages of these two rivers since the beginnings of the 20th century have been many-recreational floating, fishing, swimming, camping, hunting and even baptisms. These usages were facilitated first by the horse and buggy and then the automobile using county roads and logging	7/26/2009	No		Ducks Unlimited	MO	63383

	<p>trails. Being able to drive to the river and enjoy it has long been a staple of Missouri's outdoor loving folks. The people doing so have come and gone in small, medium and large groups. Since the OSNR designation many groups, ours included, have enjoyed the rivers. The recent, early 00's, ruling of only two tents and 6 campers per has thus hindered our enjoyment of the rivers as now we have to spread out among 4-5 sites to accommodate our group. The attempt by the NPS to control the rowdy behavior of the few has negatively affected many more by restricting legitimate visitors to such small groups. More on that below. Response/Comments on question #1: The "No Action" response would be our choice with one caveat. That being the rule allowing only 2 tents and 6 campers per site be modified to allow larger groups on primitive sites such as up river from Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork or Cedar Grove on the Current. Perhaps some sort of prior registration with a deposit could be implemented in order to ensure that no damage is done to the sites. The current rules allow larger group camping on gravel bars which has a much greater potential to damage the river ecosystem than large group camping in designated areas with privies and trash cans. The large amount of human waste generated on a gravel bar, even if buried, would be subject to being released into the river system during flooding. Unfortunately, I have seen too much solid human waste and paper and smelled urine on far too many gravel bars over the years. Allowing larger group camping in designated areas would help alleviate this problem. Also I would like to see implemented a non motorized zone (except that trolling motors could be used) above Akers Ferry on the Current and above Alley Springs on the Jacks Fork (except perhaps for the rough fish gigging season). And I would like to see stricter enforcement of horseback riding and off road vehicles to the proper roads/trails as I have seen much trash left behind by some of the riders/drivers. Also the unauthorized horseback riding off the roads/trails has caused erosion and has allowed horse waste to runoff into the rivers. The NPS water quality report for the OSNR of a few years back made clear the problem of bacterial contamination that is of equine origin. Response to question #2: I believe that it is a good idea to designate river usage by zones as it can allow for more tailored usage as desired by the users of each zone. The upper Current can be quite different than the lower Current in some usages and game fish species. Perhaps restricting the number of rental canoes per day on the upper Current and Jacks Fork to no more than current levels would help. Response to question #3: Any plan that would add anything other than perhaps a few more primitive camping sites should not be implemented. Proper maintenance of current facilities should be a priority-not adding more. Response to question #4: See above introduction for our "special" areas. Other than the "No Action" alternative, the other plans appear to be either quite restrictive-Plans A & B or allow for too much development and usage-Plan C. Again, having the ability to camp in a group larger than six is our priority. Some sort of pre-registration/deposit system would be easy to setup and administer. Having the ability to camp in primitive sites away from all others with family and friends is what has drawn us to these areas over the years. Response to question #5: The management strategies of maintaining current facilities in excellent condition, of allowing for a mechanism for more than six people per primitve camping site, restricting the number of rental canoes, and enforcing existing rules and regulations especially regarding off road vehicles and horseback riding would go a long way to enhancing my experiences in OSNR. In conclusion, there are many of us who believe in "taking out" more than we "bring in" and respecting the rivers. Over the years we have done our best to pick up as much litter and trash as possible (and unfortunately it's been more than we would like) to help the NPS maintain the OSNR as a pristine setting. A "more than six group" of campers is not necessarily the problem. People not respecting the OSNR is and those who choose to disrespect the river should be appropriately dealt with under current rules and regulations. Again, I appreciate the chance to express my/our thoughts and opinions. Take care! Sincerely, Duane E. Swacker (and family and friends)</p>						
485	<p>1) I was born and raised in Shannon County. My brother, sister, and I spent endless summer days playing in the refreshing water and on the gravel bars up-stream from Akers. Now, as an adult coming back to spend the summer months at our family's home a mile from the Current River, the first brave dip in the water always reminds me that I am home. Alternative A does the best job of matching the National Park Service's mission to preserve "unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations." I support the following elements found in Alternative A: • Emphasis on traditional, non-mechanized activities. • Close roads and trails that have developed illegally. • Rehabilitate native vegetation. • Conduct living history programs. • Designate Big Spring as a Wilderness Area. • Limit use of motor boats to downstream of Round Spring. Alternative A does the best job of protecting the beauty and natural integrity of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers so that generations of children can continue to be inspired by their natural grace. 2) The plan should mandate strong, unwavering protection of the natural settings along the rivers. I was horrified to see that Plan C included wording like "higher tolerance for resource impacts in more heavily used areas." The job of the Park Service should be to stand firm in the protection of the rivers as a natural resource; the public counts on them to limit resource impact to protect the health of our rivers. Future management plans should clearly stipulate that protection of the rivers' natural ecosystems is paramount. 3) The Ozark National Scenic Riverways should focus on non-motorized enjoyment of the riverways. There are many forest areas, lakes, and rivers in Missouri that provide opportunities for motorized activities like ATVs and motor boats. 4) I was born and raised near Akers Ferry. My family treasures the section of the Current River from Cedargrove to Pulltite. 5) The National Park Service should initiate a stronger presence in the ONSR. We depend on them to uphold their mission: to protect this awesome natural resource and educate the public about its natural and cultural importance.</p>	7/26/2009	No			MO	65201
486	<p>1. Yes, Alternative B. I would modify this alternative to include banning ATVs and jetboats, and limiting the number of canoes on the river. 2. Limiting development to a bare minimum (such as 1% in Both A & B) and maintaining a fairly high percentage of primitive area are very important pieces to the management plan. Providing trails to some of the more hidden features of the area for educational purposes could be beneficial. 3. Increasing the public's access to outdoor recreation--activities for fun--which would bring more people to the area and increase the commercial services should not be included in the management plan. Alternative C flies in the face of the federal protection afforded these scenic rivers. 5. I would encourage the park to close roads and trails that have been illegally developed. And, it is not uncommon in other national parks to close overused areas for limited periods of time. I think a balance between pure recreation and enjoyment of natural sights and sounds with the latter being the most important and key to the desired preservation of the wildness of the area is the key. If this means limiting or banning some</p>	7/26/2009	No			KS	66205

	activities, that should be a strategy of the plan.						
487	Alternative 1 is the preferred plan. There should be better staffing to prevent rowdyism, and other misdemeaners. This had improved in current years. Tkar the horses out of the rivers because of the 3.coliThis is the No-Action alternative Alternative 4 protect Tanvat, Baptisr Camp, and Parker Ford Alternative5 5 close many of the accesses back tp the '83 plan or even to the '72 plan	7/26/2009	No		Ozark Fly Fishers	MO	63105
488	1) A is closest to my ideal. 2) Eliminating or severely restricting motor boat usage on and motorized vehicles near the rivers. 3) I'm not in favor of the horse traffic, but it doesn't bother me as much as the noise that allowing motorized boats and other vehicles allows. Maybe rather the proposing limits on the number of horses, require them to wear manure catchers. 4) I can't say there is any one particular part of the NPS system that is my favorite and needs the most protecting. 5) I don't believe in jail-time and its my guess that some of the violators wouldn't ever pay ticketing fines, so maybe a more drastic impounding of violating vehicles is warranted? Take away the toys if they can't play by the rules.	7/26/2009	No			MO	63122
489	This letter is in support of Alternativ A appropriate recreation. Among the alternatives, we recommend supporting A. As an advocate and eplorer of wild places, I encourage you to maximize the low impact, less environmentally impactful forms of use and recreation. Providing for such protects the environment while allowing use, and preserving use for future generations. Proving the opportunity for family freindly forms of recreation helps promote the need to get children outdoors to experience and appreciate nature, and provides an environment to teach children respect for nature while having an enjoyable experience with their families. I encourage you to close all unauthorized roads and to strictly enforce the no ATV policy that is in place. Unauthorized vehicle use, be it an ATV or boat, damanges the environment and encourages further unauthorized trespass. Please be as diligent as possible in enforcing the current regulations and permanently closing and rehabilitating all unauthorized roads and river access points. The environment will gratefully respond! Additionally, it would benefit wildlife, acquatic species and the river itself if portions of the river were closed to motor boating. Since the water quality is hazardous in some areas due to the uncontrolled number of horses in the river, please move riding trails away from the river, limit equestrian stream crossings and limit the numbers of horses on the trails. Finally, special areas need to be protected. The Big Spring tract should become designated wilderness. This designation would provide much needed habitat protection, and provide you with a strong enforcement tool for unauthorized and inappropriate use of the area. Please support wildernes designation for Big Spring. Thank you for considering my comments.	7/26/2009	No		Sierra Club	OR	97086
490	1. Alternative A is the alternative which provides the best management plan for the future of the ONSR and for those who want to enjoy its natural characteristics. 2. I strongly support the stretch of non motorized river and overall greater protection of the natural character of the river. I strongly support the designation of Big Springs Wilderness area. 3. I think there should be no areas on the river without limits on motor boat HP, no areas without some limits on number of horses. 4. Big Springs area is important to protect and Wilderness designation is the best and appropriate option. I have enjoyed the Current and Jacks Fork river since childhood. I have seen it change, for the worse, over the years. The whole area needs greater protection than it is currently receiving. 5. The management plan needs to address enforcing the current ban on off road vehicles in the ONSR, also the number of horse back riders needs to be limited. It is a scandal that water quality has been impaired by a type of recreation the NPS should be controlling. I know of no one who wants to eliminate equestrian use of the ONSR but the water quality contamination resulting from large rides is a health risk to others. What is the NPS going to do to close all the unauthorized access points along the river? This needs to be covered in the new management plan. thank you for consideration of my comments.	7/26/2009	No			MO	63130
491	1. My sons and I have had enjoyable canoe floats on the Current River in past years on weekdays, and I want unmarred experiences line this to be available to future visitors. I support draft alternative A, as it provides the greatest protection for low-impact, family-friendly activity that's least likely to disturb the scenery and ecosystem which the National Park Service is supposed to protect. 2. No comment. 3. Do not include learning centers, as they would bring increased foot traffic. Bulletin board information about the ecosystem can be placed at boat put-in points. The Ozark heritage can be instructed about at other locations outside the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 4. I advocate designating a Big Spring Wilderness Area, to provide additional protection to wildlife. 5. Unauthorized roads should be closed, and the official policy should be that no all-terrain vehicles are allowed to operate within the National Scenic Riverways (the Current and the Jacks Fork and their watersheds). Unauthorized boat access points along the river should be closed, and regular patrols by NPS personnel should ensure that they are not used. Some stretches of these rivers should be closed to motor boating, in order to enable families to experience the sounds of the natural area, and to enable the rivers to heal from the disturbances of motor boating. Jet boats should not be allowed anywhere on these rivers. Horse riding trails should be moved away from the river to avoid pollution of the water by the horse manure, and the numbers of horse should be limited, to contain erosion of the watersheds by the horses' hooves.	7/26/2009	No			MO	63501-2146
492	1: The closest alternatives are A for both the Current and Jacks Fork. I would like to see enforced restrictions concerning the use of ATVs. The existence of the eroded trails and the noise associated with their use degrades the experience of using the river. There are alternative areas in which to use ATVs. Select some areas which can be degraded that do not have the significance of the NSR. 2: The limitation of horsepower. 5: The number of approved and non-approved access points along the river should be reduced. The erosion of the unique qualities of the NCR will continue unless there is significant action to halt it. The nature of the difference between low impact users and the high impact users results in the creeping change in character of the NSR into degraded experience for the low impact user. More effort should be put into preserving and sharing the human and natural history of the Current River and Jacks Fork River and watershed. Their is still significant resentment to the method of creation of the NSR. A recognition of the history of the area and sharing this with the public has its own intrinsic worth as well as helping to reduce the resentment to the method of creation of the NSR. The impact of horses on the NSR should be reduced. Limited access should be maintained,	7/27/2009	No			MO	65793

	but increased education to the negative impact of horse use should be part of the program. Enforcement should also be part of the plan. thank you for the opportunity for input.						
493	1) I'm a kayaker that appreciates the solitude that was once a part of the Ozark National Wild & Scenic Rivers. That solitude is fast disappearing as people with engines (motoboats, ATVs, etc) have invaded the rivers. It seems to me that Alternative A would be the best plan for the Current and Jacks Fork. The fewer engine-powered craft on, or near to, these rivers would be a welcome change. 2) More nonmotorized zones, primitive zones, and natural zones. 3) Less motors. 4) Yes, I think the alternatives address most areas quite well. 5) Although I think it would lead to a storm of protest, NPS should strongly consider prohibiting alcohol on the rivers (but not in the campgrounds).	7/27/2009	No		Missouri Whitewater Association	MO	63701
494	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Response: My family and I have been frequent visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("ONSR") for over 40 years. For the last 33 years, we have averaged three multi-day camping trips to the ONSR per year. We recognize the difficult task facing the NPS in developing the GMP to balance the need to preserve the ecological integrity of the ONSR with the desires of visitors to enjoy various activities which may affect that integrity negatively or may affect negatively the enjoyment of other ONSR visitors. In our view, Preliminary Alternatives A, B and C while offering a general idea of the NPS proposals do not provide sufficient information from which to form a firm opinion. Of most concern to my family and I are the future restrictions, if any, on camping. For nearly 40 years our family and friends enjoyed camping in the upper Jacks Fork and Current Rivers until a few years ago, when the NPS restricted camping in secluded sites to no more than 6 people and two tents. We now have a family of 7. Thus, we cannot legally camp in the sites that we have enjoyed for most of our lives. Two or more families wishing to camp in proximity in these areas are effectively precluded from enjoying that experience – unless they float and camp on a gravel bar on which, under the current rules, an unlimited number of campers is permitted. These distinctions seem senseless and do not strike the proper balance between protecting the ONSR and permitting reasonable enjoyment by visitors. Furthermore, restricting primitive camping to 6 people and two tents has created a very real and present safety issue for families wishing to camp in the more remote areas of the ONSR. While we have fully enjoyed our use of the ONSR over the years, there have been several occasions where we have felt threatened by others whose motives for visiting have been less than honorable. On two separate occasions, car thieves attempting to secrete themselves and their stolen vehicles from authorities entered our campsite and made us and our children quite nervous. Luckily, because we were with a sizable crowd of family and friends, they did not harm us. In both instances, the criminals were eventually apprehended by rangers. On many more occasions we have been faced with other potential transgressors that were discouraged from any foul play by our numbers. The rangers cannot patrol these remote areas sufficiently, thus, for families to enjoy them in safety, they must do so in groups. Under the current rules, a 5000 square foot primitive camping area has the same restriction as a 1000 square foot area – 6 people and two tents. That simply doesn't make any sense. If there are to be limits on the number of campers / tents in each authorized primitive camping area, the limits should be dictated by the size of the camp site. For example, one of our favorite camp sites in the ONSR (or anywhere in the world for that matter) is the first camp site immediately up stream from Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork. That site is at least 6,000 square feet in size, yet it has the same limit as a site approximately one mile north on the hill above the road which has roughly 1000 square feet available for camping. We certainly recognize the need to protect the ONSR and curtail rowdy behavior, excessive drinking and drug use etc., but NPS policies should not have the effect of preventing families from using the park – no matter how unintentional that effect may be. Family use should be encouraged not effectively prohibited. "Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater." As stated in Newsletter #3 issued by the NPS in the Spring / Summer of 2009: "Determining user capacity does not necessarily involve identifying a "magic number" for visitor use, and it does not necessarily imply strict use limits. NPS managers could develop a variety of strategies to prevent conditions such as unnecessary damage to resources, diminished visitor enjoyment, displacement of visitors, or expensive repairs arising from use of an area." Thus, we encourage the NPS to develop the strategies discussed in the Newsletter for camping restrictions in the ONSR and permit interested members of the public to address those specific strategies rather than continuing with the current rules in place for primitive camping – essentially a "magic number" one-size-fits-all policy. Potential alternative strategies to consider include: (i) adjusting the number of campers / tents based on the size of the site as discussed above; (ii) basing the fee for each site on the number of people or tents that are present. The fee today is only \$5 per day per site, increasing the fee or basing it on the number of tents / people per site, may achieve the intended effect of reducing over-crowding within a given site without effectively discriminating against large families or groups; and/or (iii) allowing reservations for specific groups in specific camping areas with deposits required to cover any damage or costs for liter clean up etc.. This should discourage improper use or abuse of the site. The ONSR is a precious resource that needs protection and we are certainly willing to pay to ensure that resource remains protected. We believe strongly, however, that the NPS should permit interested persons to review its user capacity / camping restriction proposals prior to implementation of any of the Preliminary Alternatives. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Response: As stated in response to 1 above, we feel strongly that the user capacity analysis to be performed by the NPS, should be explained in detail and should allow for comments and suggestions of interested parties prior to any implementation. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Response: Alternative A seems to be more restrictive in many respects and would significantly curtail several of the activities that park visitors enjoy today, however, the extent to which those activities may be restricted seems unclear and possibly subject to further refinement by the NPS. The ambiguity of the potential restrictions in Alternative A is of most concern to us. It appears that most restrictions will curtail to some extent, the use of motorized boats, horseback riding and bicycling (presumably off-road cycling). We did not see any additional proposed restrictions on the use of	7/27/2009	No			MO	63021

	ATV's, although we assume there may be further curtailment of ATV use within the ONSR under one or more of the alternatives. While we are not avid horseback riders, we are fond of motorized boats and ATV's. That said, motorized boats and ATV's are not a good fit for the upper stretches of the Jacks Fork and the Current. The rivers are narrower and the surrounding areas more secluded in those sections and have less capacity to handle those activities without negatively affecting the use of the rivers for other visitors or absorbing the environmental impact resulting from motorized equipment. Thus, we concur with the notion that those sections of the river should not be subjected to those types of activities or at least subjected only on a seasonal basis. Horseback riding is less intrusive on other park visitors than motorized boats or ATV's. We can only leave to experts, the environmental impact that horseback riding may have on the riverways and, therefore, do not offer an opinion on that issue. We do, however, believe that overnight camping with horses is inappropriate for most areas at or near rivers in th						
495	To restrict motor size any futher will cause families to "overload" smaller boats to be able to get everyone to the river. The motor size regulation currently in place is clearly the right choice. You got it right the first time.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63965
496	I appreciate clean water, natural streams and public areas for low impact recreation. I support alternative A.	7/27/2009	No			CA	95472
497	1) A the remaining rivers need to be kept in a wilderness state with limited public access 4) The "upper" potions of these rivers must be preserved to promote healthy eco-systems and clean water 5) prohibit the use of motorized crafts and vehicles limit the number of public access points increase the level of fines and/or penalty if the laws are violated	7/27/2009	No			MO	63124
498	1) I believe that overall Alternative A is the best option for the Riverways, as it will be most likely to endure the long-term survival of the park as a relatively pristine recreation area. I might add a few elements from Alternative B, such as providing a few new trails to sites that are culturally, historically, ecologically or biologically significant. 2) The presence of powered watercraft and motor vehicles should be curtailed, and all illegal access points to the park should be effectively (not just nominally) closed. 3) I don't like most of the actions described in Alternative C, as any natural area can only take so much activity, and so many people, before it is no longer anything like a natural area. In particular, access for able bodied people who want to use motorized watercraft and motor vehicles should be forbidden in much of not most of the park, with exceptions and special provisions for physically handicapped people. In addition, while horseback riding certainly should be permitted in many parts of the park, access should be restricted if and when when pollution, other environmental degradation, or or trail damage becomes a problem. 4) No, I don't have any particular local concerns. The entire system is lovely--and at risk. 5) Hopefully outfitters (who want more access all the time) can be persuaded that some access restrictions are for their own long-term benefit. And hopefully ATV drivers and their lobbies can be persuaded that while access to much of the Mark Twain National Forest is reasonable, there must be total or almost total restrictions on their access to the Riverways. A national scenic riverway does not exist as a playground for motor vehicles.	7/27/2009	No		Missouri Parks Association	MO	64111
499	I am particularly concerned about the CAFO's, the concentrated animal feed operations. Animal wastes from these CAFO's are leaking into our rivers and streams. If this is not stopped, we will have nothing but dead rivers and this exercise will be academic.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63132
500	(5) --Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! --Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails --Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! --Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring --Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			AR	72714
501	Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there are some areas that are special to me and that I am concerned about. Please manage these riverways with our children and grandchildren in mind. We need to preserve our national treasures.	7/27/2009	No			IL	62454
502	The Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be saved.	7/27/2009	No			AR	72653
503	Send Your Comments Today! (this link will take you to the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site) Dear Eugenia, After suffering from years of abuse and neglect, one of our nation's most beautiful waterways--the Ozark National Scenic Riverways--is in trouble. The spring-fed rivers are polluted and overrun with motor boats and trails degraded from off-road vehicle use. But, the National Park Service has opened a General Management Plan (GMP) and is asking for your help in preserving this truly special place. Take Action Now: With only FIVE DAYS LEFT to comment, we must tell the Park Service that these beautiful rivers must be saved. By taking action today, you will help ensure that illegal access roads are eliminated and that the waters of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways once again run clean and clear. How to Comment: To comment, please click here. This link will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site. The page you will see displayed is the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan comment page. Simply cut and paste the comments below; we highly encourage you to add your own comments as well. After completing the comment form, make sure you click the "Submit" button. Let the Park Service know that: Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by	7/27/2009	No			MO	64114

	eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!						
504	I urge you to implement the following. Continue to enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren. Thank you for your time.	7/27/2009	No			IL	61107
505	In response to Questions 2 and 5: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Thank you for your consideration! Roberta Nash	7/27/2009	No			IL	60093
506	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren I cannot personally protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers...but you can. You have the power to save these natural places, and I ask you to accept the responsibility you have been given to be a great steward of our natural resources. Thank you, Carol Coe Blue Springs, MO	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	MO	64015
507	are talking about preserving only 134 miles of the beautiful Ozark area. This land does not belong exclusively to a few select locals. It is public land and should be administered accordingly. Once the land and waterways have been abused beyond the point of no return the very people who are abusing it will blame others for not protecting it. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60707
508	It's really a "Circle of Life." We have to take care of our air, land, water ... we have only one chance with this planet and with the life it supports. If our waterways are suffering, something is not being taken care of on land, oir upstream. What goes around, comes around. I live near beautiful Dogwood Canyon in Stone County, Missouri. As you drive away from that truly well-kept park, there is a sign that reads: REMEMBER, WE ALL LIVE DOWNSTREAM. That says it all! Linda Burlingame	7/27/2009	No			MO	65686
509	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they?	7/27/2009	No			MO	63119
510	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: • Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! • Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails • Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! • Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring • Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Thank you for listening. We must protect our scenic waterways.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63052
511	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: • Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! • Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails • Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! • Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring • Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! I have lived in Missouri for most of my 68 years. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways area is a unique setting in which to experience the region's scenic and, occasionally, wildlife treasures. Abuse of the streams -- especially by all-terrain recreational vehicles -- is an absurd offense that should be terminated. Thanks very much for the opportunity to comment.	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	MO	63011
512	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60607

513	My parents honeymooned in the Ozarks 70 years ago. They described it as an area of incredible beauty. Let's keep it that way for future generations.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60614
514	**Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! **Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails **Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! **Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring **Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	62711-6211
515	Keep our rivers clean and clear; keep our rivers available. Preserve our legacy.	7/27/2009	No		Chicago Media Watch	IL	60202
516	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60625
517	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren I think power boats should not be allowed at all.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60435
518	Waterways like Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be protected with more stringent policies and enhanced enforcement. The following are way to preserve this beautiful waterway: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren. We must treasure the protect these areas.	7/27/2009	No			IL	62012
519	* Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60660
520	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: 1. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			IL	60461
521	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: -Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! -Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails -Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! -Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring -Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60202
522	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren This beautiful area is being destroyed by a combination of idiots that have no regard for the beauty of a natural environment, and a lack of enforcement of existing laws and regulations. Please fix this before it is too late. Thanks	7/27/2009	No			MO	64151
523	5) Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park, Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails, Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river, Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring, and Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60008
524	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			AR	72901

525	Keep this area for our children and grandchildren	7/27/2009	No			MO	64113
526	Dear Superintendent: I am writing in support of the National Park Service's Alternative A for management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I fell in love with these rivers and my husband in the summer of 1978 and have been returning every year to camp and float. My four sons grew up with memories of the Jack's Fork & Current Rivers and now bring their friends to the area to show off Missouri's natural beauty. Our out-of-town visitors especially marvel at these rivers's clarity and the gem that Big Springs is. Designation of Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect this valuable resource. Aside from my personal preference for keeping these clear streams in a natural state, I believe this resource, kept natural, serves as an increasingly important economic resource. There are other alternatives to the competing uses (ATVs, motor-boating, equestrian trails). However, there are few alternatives for those of us who want to float fish and camp in a pristine, natural setting. My family alone has rented hundreds of canoes! We have also been on other rivers in Missouri and Arkansas. We will not be returning to many of these rivers precisely because of the noise and pollution of motorboats. It does not make sense, when funds are scarce, to build more roads and increase maintenance costs in our parks. I think the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be kept as natural and undisturbed as possible. Thank you for listening.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63118
527	1) Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Specifically, it has the greatest portion of Natural and Primitive land-based zones and the greatest portion of Non-Motorized river-based zones. These are conditions exceedingly difficult to find outside the Ozark National Scenic Riverway in Missouri. Moreover, designating the Big Spring tract as wilderness would be of great benefit to Missourians and to those who visit our state. 2) Repairing damage already done by removing illegal roads and trails, especially those cut into the banks of the river, enforce existing horsepower limits on boats and prohibitions on ATVs, and working to reduce the number of horses allowed along riveside trails are all to be encouraged in future management of national riverways. 3) Expanded 'Developed' areas around Akers, Welsh Landing, Round Spring, Alley Spring, Two Rivers, Powder Mill, and most especially Big Spring should be excluded from any future management plan. Development, especially of lodge, restaurant, administrative, and maintenance facilities should take place outside the boundaries of the park and away from the river. 4) I am especially interested in preserving the solitude I have found floating from Baptist Campground to Round Spring and beyond. I have been especially appalled by the behavior of horseback riders downstream from Eminence. 5) Keep foremost in mind that the opportunities for wilderness or primitive experiences are very few and very precious. I have no objection to motor boats, horses, beer, or parties -- but they have their places, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverway shouldn't be one of them. It may be necessary to tie the preservation of the riverways in pristine form to the provision of places for louder and rowdier recreation elsewhere. Thank you.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63110
528	The alt. that most closely matches my preferances is "A". I prefer to limit offroad use, or eliminate it entirely. While some horse use is acceptable, it is entirely 'out of hand' now. The number of horse parties should be strictly controlled and limited to reduce or eliminate adverse impact on the environment. Motorized uses, including boat motors should be much reduced and controlled. More sections of the rivers should be 'motor-free'. Roads and road cuts to the river should be closed to reduce or eliminate erosion and pollution. I wish to see historic sites preserved and protected, and interpreted to the public. In short, I wish to see the simpler, historic, low-impact uses, including floating, catch-and-release fishing,hiking, sight-seeing, and camping be emphasized, while poluting, eroding, noisy, motorized uses greatly reduced or eliminated. More sections of the rivers should become 'motor-free'. Some improvements to hiking trails would be desirable but no new roads--in fact many existing roads should be eliminated. I would, further, like to see the local, and State governments and local citizens recognize, more actively, the great asset they have in this National Park Service site, to better protect park boundaries, use zoning and other, protection measures to prevent erosion,polution and provide 'buffers'from inappropriate development presures.	7/27/2009	No			AR	72223
529	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: 1) Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2) Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3) Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4) Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5) Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Thank you! This is EXTREMELY important to me, my friends, my family, and my colleagues.	7/27/2009	No			MO	64151
530	* Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	62521
531	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			MO	63116
532	4) The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are the ones I'm most familiar with. I haven't been to either of them in 20 years, but even back then I thought that there were too many power boats and boat launches. I think banning power boats, as in the Boundary Water s would be a great improvement.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60615

533	Please save the Ozarks. It's a Missouri treasure.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63301
534	4) The spring-fed rivers are polluted and overrun with motor boats and trails degraded from off-road vehicle use.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60304
535	1. Alternative A is my idea for the best way to manage ONSR. I strongly recommend alternative A. 2. I strongly support conditions for the lowest impact recreation possible so that families like mine can enjoy the natural beauty natural sounds and natural scents. Low impact recreation will also provide the greatest protection for the rivers, wildlife and native plants of this fragile ecosystem. 3. I strongly recommend enforcing the current no ATV policy, closing unauthorized roads, closing unauthorized boat access points along the river. Unauthorized use had no place in a National Scenic Riverways. I also would like to see some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating to further protect the river and the peaceful quiet. Also I feel the uncontrolled number of horses in the river is hazardous to human users and water quality. I urge that riding trails be moved away from the river, the number of horses on the trails be limited and equestrian stream crossings be limited. 4. Big Springs is a very special area to me. I recommend that the Big Springs tract be protected as a Wilderness area for future generations. 5. I believe this treasure of a natural area needs to be treated as the fragile ecosystem that it is. This pristine area can continue to provide low impact recreation for generations to come only by restoring the park to a healthy natural state. Please develop the management plan accordingly for those of us who appreciate its natural state and for future generations. Thank you.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63126-1941
536	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60660
537	1. Yes, alternative A is already closest to our idea of the best way to manage ONSR. Contained in B, allowing park management to help people discover some of the hidden but special areas of the park would enhance A. 2. Keeping the riverways as natural as possible. As little development and motorized vehicles as possible. 3. See 2. 4. These places for us are the upper portions of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. It appears that Alternative A would adequately address keeping these areas as natural as possible. 5. There needs to be more interaction between rangers and visitors promoting known and unknown portions of the riverways.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63131
538	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60126
539	1) My preference is Alternative A. 2) Motorboat limits should be in place for future management. 3) Motorboats and jetboats would not be allowed. They are noisy, stinky, polluting, dangerous and, most important of all, DISRUPTIVE TO WILDLIFE. People who are speeding around in these types of boats are not there to enjoy the integrity of the rivers! In addition, they are preventing others from doing so. 4) The serenity of the rivers is the reason many people enjoy visiting. Being able to observe birds, mammals and aquatic life is important. 5) Restricting access is necessary, so one approach is to block off the illegal vehicular accesses that unscrupulous people have put in over the years. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please protect the ONSR! Thank you for	7/27/2009	No			MO	65401
540	1) Alternative A 2) Keep as primitive as possible. Limit any motorized vehicles. We are running out of primitive places and they are hard to restore once we go to a motorized direction. Keeping crowds down and allowing family-oriented activities is ideal. Designating the wilderness area is important. I am familiar with an area in Northern Wisconsin in the Chequamegon National Forest that was greatly aided by the designation. Even the diehard motorized vehicle users in the area take pride and brag about the wilderness area. 3) Alternative C scares the hell out of me. Allowing motorized vehicles and other activities that are harmful to the wildlife and habitat while indicating that the Park Service will oversee the damage is dangerous. Also, in bad economic times, staff and resources become very limited and things get out of hand quickly (even in natural terms). 4) Big Spring is the most special, then Upper Current and Jacks Fork. All three areas are addressed well by Alternative A. 5) Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: •Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! •Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails •Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! •Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring •Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60007
541	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60614
542	Thanks for reading my comments. I am supportive of management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways which would: 1) Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2) Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3) Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4) Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5) Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van	7/27/2009	No			MO	63112

	Buren						
543	I believe the Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	61822
544	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			MS	38654
545	5) We are at a critical juncture concerning all of America's waterways. Building roads, parking lots to make access easier is detrimental to the preservation of the river as 'wild' or scenic. I have floated, rafted and canoed down many rivers and there is nothing more discouraging than seeing parking lots full of SUVs and trailer camps and noisy 4 wheelers roaring through the water and through the woods, disturbing the peace and tranquility where there should just be beautiful river scenery. If access is limited to the start and the end of the designated section, then everyone can enjoy the purity of a river unrestrained. Restricting the size and speed of motorboats to only specific sections of the river to prevent wake erosion of the river banks is crucial. Everyone wants the river next to their house so they don't have to walk very far to get to the thing that gives them the most pleasure. Unfortunately it comes at too high a price for the majority of us that want it to remain clean, pristine and enjoyed by more than just those that can afford the luxury of buying riverfront property.	7/27/2009	No			AR	71913
546	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			MO	65559
547	The Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be kept clean. These spring-fed rivers are polluted and overrun with motor boats and trails degraded from off-road vehicle use. Please close illegal access roads so that the waters of this natural rea once again can run clean and clear.	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	IL	60487
548	Topic question 1--I believe Alternative A is the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Topic question 2--(1) access points should be limited to about one every five miles on the river. (2) Easements should be limited and strictly enforced to protect the scenic quality along the river. (3) The river is not an appropriate place for horses given the intensive use of the river. Other national parks strictly limit or prohibit horses in the park. I grew up on a ranch and have ridden horses all my life. Horses do not belong in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. (4) Off-road vehicles that shatter the seclusion and quiet beauty of the rivers should be prohibited. (5) The Big Springs Wilderness should be recommended by the Park Service as wilderness for later designation by Congress. Topic questions 3, 4, and 5--No comments. My wife and I are 74 years old and we have not floated the Current or Jack's Fork recently, but for many years we floated the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers with our friends and children. We have lived in Missouri for almost 50 years and the Current and Jack's Fork are the only places we have vacationed in Missouri. We avoided floating on holidays when the Rivers were crowded and we often went early or late in the season to avoid crowds. We always found our time on the rivers restful and enjoyable. Some of our most memorable vacation experiences were camping and floating on the rivers with our friends and our children. I oppose Alternatives B and C as General Management Plans for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways because they would generate long-term degradation of the Park. Please take action to save this irreplaceable state treasure for my grandchildren. .	7/27/2009	No			MO	65203
549	5 Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60005
550	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: - Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! - Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails - Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! - Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring - Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			IL	60103
551	5) Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			MO	63957

552	<p>1. I prefer management of the Ozark Scenic River ways that emphasizes natural non-motorized outdoor activities and places an emphasis on habitat preservation and wild and wilderness values. Clean water, low noise levels and pristine vistas are extremely important qualities to preserve in this unique region. Currently alternative "A" comes closest to being the preferred management method. 2. Protections for wildlife and habitat should be emphasized. Reduced livestock access and reduced numbers of horses on riverside trails should be implemented to improve water quality and greatly reduce pollution. A ban on off-road vehicles should be implemented and enforced. The 3,500 acres of the Big Spring area should be designated as wilderness and additional contiguous buffer zones managed for wilderness values. Powerboat usage should be eliminated above Two Rivers. These boats easily overfish the river and disrupt wildlife and non-powered floaters. 3. All of the "no-action", "B" and "C" alternatives are insufficient to protect this wonderful area of the nation. Motorized usage and current Levels of equestrian usage near the rivers are detrimental and are unacceptable. 4. I would like to see some more area at Round Springs for primitive camping and increased foot trails. I believe it would be in the best interest of wildlife, the region and the nation to establish a wider protected corridor from the Current River to the Peck Wildlife Area. 5. I would like to see the non-native wild horse population reduced or eliminated and have elk reintroduced as a native species. There should be increased stocking of native fish in the upper sections of the rivers. I would like to see better forestry practices in the Pioneer Forest and other private and public lands that would better reduce erosion and runoff which reaches the river system. Perhaps some additional pit toilets easily available from the river would be of value in convenience for floaters and protection of the river quality.</p>	7/27/2009	No			MO	65810
553	<p>1. Alternative A looks good. I'm reading in the Ozarks Resource Center Broadcaster that it "focuses on more traditional non-motorized forms of recreation, allowing only non-motorized boats on the Upeer Current above Round Spring and on the Jack's Fork . . . It would close roads and trails that have been illegally developed over the years which are leading to erosion-causing off-road vehicle use." "Non-motorized" is the ideal for me. And if that turns out to be politically unfeasible, then the least motorized options would be the least offensive compromise. 2. I would like to see the 3400 acres of the Big Spring Wilderness recommended by the Park Service as wilderness for later designation by Congress. 3. My source says concerning Alternative C that it "increases developed recreation and keeps the existing motorboat usage." My preference is against "developed recreation" and for more primitive, non-motorized river use. 4. See #2. 5. From what I've read, it sounds as if equestrian use needs to be cut way back.</p>	7/27/2009	No		Missouri Coalition for the Environment	MO	64776
554	<p>Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!</p>	7/27/2009	No			IL	60060
555	<p>1) My ideal plan would probably be closest to A, although I would seriously restrict motorized boats of any kind. I also am very supportive of the closing of the illegally developed areas and the roads and trails which lead to them. 2) I like the part of B which would include the dicovering and access of the special hidden areas. 3) I do NOT believe any more development of the area should be allowed. Development should be kept to a bare minimum. I also believe that the increased area of public use should be minimized. The area should be reverted to much more primitive area. 4) I do not believe the alternatives address most of the area properly. Access should be much more limited. 5) I believe the areas already in place for camping and canoeing and horseback riding should be largely left alone as is, barring the illegally developed areas. I SPENT MANY WEEKENDS EACH YEAR AS A YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULT FLOATING THESE RIVERS. I LIVED IN KANSAS CITY THEN. MY YOUNG ADULT DAUGHTERS DO THIS NOW. THEY ALSO HORSEBACK RIDE IN THE AREA. I WANT THE RESTORED PRISTENE CONDITIONS OF THIS AREA TO BE AVAILABLE FOR MY GRANDCHILDREN AND GREAT-GRANDCHILDREN TO ENJOY. THIS IS IN MY STATE....THIS IS THE AREA WHICH HELPED ME TO LEARN TO RESPECT NATURE, WHILE ALLOWING ME TO ENJOY IT. IT GAVE ME PEACE IN A FAST PAGED WORLD. IT GAVE ME A LIFELOG PASSION FOR THINGS NATURAL AND THE PROTECTION OF INDIGENOUS CREATURES AND PLANTLIFE. I KNOW THE TEMPTATION EXISTS TO OVER COMMERCIALIZE THIS AREA AND BRING IN MORE PEOPLE AND MORE DOLLARS. THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR IS A POWERFUL DRAW. I SAY ENOUGH ALREADY. MORE DEVELOPMENT, PEOPLE, AND DOLLARS WILL ONLY DESTROY THIS AREA. THEN FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN THE KINDS OF THINGS THAT I LEARNED IN THIS AREA.</p>	7/27/2009	No			MO	64068
556	<p>1) In my opinion, Alternative A is the best way to manage ONSR because it provides for current restoration and future protection. 2) I feel strongly that unauthorized roads, boat access points, and trails should be closed; the focus should be on low-impact, family-friendly recreation and nature enjoyment; some stretches should be closed to motor boating; Big Spring should be designated as a Wilderness Area. 3) I do not like a number of Alternative C's proposed changes. I want future management of ONSR to limit the amount of motorized activity, maintain and enforce the no ATV policy, manage equestrian trails so they do not harm water quality, and limit new development (facilities, campgrounds, etc.). While I want the public to enjoy ONSR, I don't want them to love it to death. I believe that limiting access and restricting activities are necessary to preserve ONSR as is stated in its purpose: "preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes and unspoiled settings." 4) I feel that Alternative A addresses all of ONSR adequately. My greatest concerns are maintaining good water quality and preserving habitat/biodiversity and archaeological/historic sites. 5) Again I'll state that unauthorized roads, trails, and boat access points should be closed. Equestrian trails should be moved away from the water and stream crossings should be limited. The number of horses on trails should also be limited. I support the designation of Big Spring as a Wilderness Area. My suggested management strategies/approaches are to offer low-impact forms of recreation, provide education and interpretation programs so the public can appreciate ONSR and understand how low-impact recreation maintains ONSR's beauty, and limit activities that do not keep ONSR in an "unimpaired condition." In closing, I would like to state that I am happy to see a commitment to controlling rowdy behavior on the rivers. While many people visit ONSR and enjoy activities in safe, family- and nature-</p>	7/27/2009	No			MO	63116

	friendly ways, others seem to view the rivers and surrounding areas as venues for their floating and camping drunkfests. Please continue all efforts to prevent unsafe and unruly behavior, enforce park laws, and make ONSR a safe place for families to enjoy the beauty of the Ozarks. Thank you for all your diligent work! Sincerely, Renee Payton St. Louis, MO						
557	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No		National Parks Conservation Association	MO	63042
558	I am concerned about the cleanup and protection of our natural rescources, and all actions that are harmful must be addressed! Topic # 1 : I support plan A, as the need for motorized entertainment has destroyed enough natural areas already. Those who must speed and splash through the day are not interested in the quiet natural surroundings, and the pace that is more fitting an area such as this could be once again; a peaceful retreat with minimal man made noise and pollution. Topic # 2 : The limiting of certain motorized craft, power of motor, size, intended use, is a good place to begin the reclaiming of certain more sensitive areas of our gifts of nature along these riverways. Topic # 3 : Increasing motorized access, and expanding modernized camp areas should be limited more to improvements of those that now exist. Commercial increases should be minimized with environmental impact as FIRST concideration, well above those of increased state revenues. Topic # 4 : My concerns while not addressed to specific areas (by name/location)are clear that adjacent lands and least disturbed areas would be best served by plan A. Topic # 5 : Management of waste generated by convienience seakers must be strictly monitored! Noise levels of all kinds must be contained to designated areas, well away from the more pristine locations where one might enjoy an all too temporart turning back of the clock... Most sincerely, Keith F Marx	7/27/2009	No			IL	60411
559	5)Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			MO	64052
560	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60169
561	1) I would say alternative (A) 2) I would like to see more emphasis on low impact, family friendly recreation. 3) 4) 5) Please keep motorized craft (land or water) out of the river corridors.	7/27/2009	No			MO	65256-9584
562	Don't take the rivers from future generations.	7/27/2009	No			AR	72150
563	* Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60148-1639
564	This is Tom Finholt. Please, help save the rivers of America for all of our sake and benefit.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63011
565	5)Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			MO	63130
566	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Trails have been damaged by all the off-road vehicle use. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60459-2139
567	5. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60010

568	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			MO	63128
569	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren. We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			IL	60189
570	Send Your Comments Today! Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! Thanks for helping NPCA reverse the damage to this park and save one of our country's treasured landscapes!	7/27/2009	No			MO	65685
571	Ozark National Forest Scenic Riverways are sacred and beautiful. I suggest we don't touch them anymore than we already do.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60657-5753
572	5) I think you should limit the amount of boats and offroad vehicles allowed to use our riverways. I have thought for years that there are way too many people destroying our systems with unnecessary traffic. I love the Ozarks and their rivers and hate to see them destroyed.	7/27/2009	No			AR	72031
573	"I was born in the Ozark Mountains. . . ." I've been listening to the Patsy Montana song with that refrain. But I moved to Alaska for 37 years but retired back here to be close to family and to enjoy a beauty different from the spectacle which is Alaska----more personal, intimate. I am appalled by all the trash and polution. Let's clean it up and keep it clean! (I sit right now looking out on the Lindley Creek Arm of Lake Pomme de Terre. Not called the Ozark National Scenic Riverway, but totally beautiful and peaceful.)	7/27/2009	No		Mel Carnahan PAC	MO	65767
574	This is in response to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways public lands issue. I'm 52 years of age, me & my family & our friends have enjoyed canoeing the beautiful & peaceful Ozark float streams since we were teenagers. As the years have gone by we noticed more powerboats, then jetskis & atv's using the 'float streams'. Fishermen in john boats with small outboards never caused any problems, they were always courtious to anyone in canoes & slowed down to an idle as we passed each other but as the years passed things just kept getting worse & the operators of the larger john boats with their huge outboards just wanted to get where they were going with their throttles wide open slowing down for no one. It would be nice to be able to enjoy some peace & quiet with family & friends on these beautiful scenic riverways we are blessed with in Missouri without having to hear the sound of outboard motors, jetskis or atv's plus having to deal with the less then friendly operators. Missouri has plenty of lakes & public land to use these motorized vehicles on. Is it asking too much to keep these 'float streams' just that...'float streams' for canoes, kayaks & innertubs. Sincerely, Gene J. Schoenhoff 1749 Hwy 100 W. Hermann, MO 65041 573-486-2591 gjs1957@socket.net	7/27/2009	No			MO	65041
575	I heartily agree with the 5 points supported by the National Parks Conservation Association.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60555
576	Dear Superintendent Detring, # 1) I would like to suggest that Alternative A is the closest plan to what I would like to see in the future management of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. # 2) I would like to see that the Big Spring Wilderness area protections be increased to provide the utmost protections for this area. # 3) I don't know that I have any comments related to this area. # 4) Once again I would like to voice my concerns for greater protections for the Big Spring Wilderness area. Wilderness designation for this area is strongly desired. # 5) I would suggest that the agency restore scenic/conservation easement protections that should have been in force but have been overlooked. I would also suggest the agency reign in commercial horse use. Trail riding is a good thing that should be allowed but massive trail rides are destroying the water quality of the riverways. Regulation of this activity is required since the event promoters seem to have no willingness to keep the event under control. I would also like to see the agency crack down on the excessive and damaging effects of all terain vehicle use in the riverways. I would assume there is plenty of private lands in that area of the state of Missouri for these all terain vehicles to use that if they are not able to obey the rules and regulations imposed in the riverways, they should be asked to take their activities elsewhere. Thanks for consideration of my opinion on the future management of the riverways. I hope to be able to float the Current River later this summer. Also, thanks for all you do to protect the riverways!! Sincerely Patrick Dwyer	7/27/2009	No			MO	63139
577	1) I can not find the four alternatives you have in this question and therefore can not answer as you may like. Certainly "No-Action" is not a choice. I would tend to lean to the most restrictive measures that would still allow responsible folks to have a good time on one of the streams. 2) I'll put these points under this question: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve	7/27/2009	No			MO	63301

	the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren This whole area is a special area and I hope you can come to a good decision to preserve it for today and many tomorrows. Good luck, folks!!! Mark						
581	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! Thanks for helping NPCA reverse the damage to this park and save one of our country's treasured landscapes!	7/27/2009	No			IL	60423
582	Please choose alternative A. We live in the Scenic Riverways area. When friends come to visit they are awed by the relative untouched beauty and environment. They comment that this beauty and tranquility is so rare it must be protected for your children and grandchildren... and mine. Once it's commercialized it's gone for ever. Thank you for your consideration... Donna Hodges.	7/27/2009	No			MO	65588
583	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they?	7/27/2009	No			IL	62650
584	Our team 150 members support alternative A	7/27/2009	No		Stream Team 2991	MO	63015
585	Thank you for the opportunity to comment! #1 Alternative "A" is the closest to my idea of the best way to manage the ONSR. It seems well suited to preserving the area while allowing good use. #2 I feel strongly that the following should be included in future management: +CLOSE ROADS AND TRAILS THAT HAVE BEEN ILLEGALLY DEVELOPED +preserve/designate 3,400 acres wilderness area (Big Spring tract) +Keeping areas of the rivers free from motorized boats #4 Specific area: Areas near Eminence where commercial use threatens the natural environment #5 Further suggestions: +Please strictly enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! +Limit the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails +Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river +Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring +Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and for the work that the Park Service does in the Ozark NSR area!	7/27/2009	No			MO	65588
586	I feel very strongly that our national riverways should be kept as pristine as possible. I live near the Chicago river and it was left without stewardship for so long that reversing it's flow (expensive and challenging) is the only solution to bringing back its viability for the plants, animals and human animals who live in or near it. The Ozark National Scenic Riverway should be protected to the highest level possible.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60618
587	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60466
588	We are native Missourians. We are also campers, canoeists, pleasure boaters, bicyclists, and hikers. We make every effort to protect the environment while enjoying the great outdoors and the beauty of Missouri. However, we are well aware of the attitude of many others in the state who "don't want to be told what to do". They will not assume responsibility for their actions while using our resources for their pleasure. The use of off-the-road vehicles has grown and endangers our land as well as our streams. I recently heard about a man who tore the lower unit off his power boat when he hit an underwater obstruction while going up a creek from Table Rock Lake. Common sense is missing. Rules need to be made regardless of the protests of these irresponsible users.	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	MO	65737
589	The Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri is in just as much need for protection against abusive use of it's natural resources, and merits the same level of protection as our Grand Canyon National Park.	7/27/2009	No			MO	63109
590	* Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	IL	60175
591	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, I'm concerned about the quality of our parks. Therefore, I'm urging the Park Service to do the following things that will maintain and restore the Ozark National Scenic Waterways to a more pristine condition: 1. Enforce the existing ban on the use of off-road vehicles inside the Park. 2. Set limits on the number of horses using the riverside trails in order to keep the water clean. 3. Block some of the existing access roads in order to control riverbank erosion. 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at	7/27/2009	No			IL	60660

	Big Spring. 5. Enforce the limits on powerboat motors to 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren, and 25hp below Van Buren. I appreciate the available comment period for the Waterways. I hope that the existing rules will be enforced and that better care will be taken in the future for the sake of the rivers and parkland. Thank you.					
592	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? No Action: The HP limit should be lifted downstream of the Van Buren Gap. Having the river section w/ a 40 hp limit below the gap to Big Spring has never made any sense. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? The land use patterns as shown on Alternate B is the best plan for the land use for the lands surrounding the river. However the River use and access points should be unchanged. Hunting along the river is a tradition that should remain permitted. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Further restriction on the river use should not be included. The proposed change in the HP limits, and definitions are unfair to the users that have made equipment purchases based on the current HP regulations. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Law enforcement needs to be increase on the river during the summer holiday weekends. During the holiday weekends, the vast number of park users impact the serenity of the river. Please don't make any drastic changes in regulations that affect the users at all other times of the year based on these congested weekends. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? The river is a great smallmouth bass resource downstream of Two Rivers. This resource should be managed as a trophy SMB management area like other areas managed by the MDC. I would like to see a slot limit allowing the public to harvest 11" to 13" fish, and protecting larger fish to grow to trophy size. The ideal area for this would be from Two Rivers to the end of the park.	7/27/2009	No		MO	63043
593	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? No Action: The HP limit should be lifted downstream of the Van Buren Gap. Having the river section w/ a 40 hp limit below the gap to Big Spring has never made any sense. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? The land use patterns as shown on Alternate B is the best plan for the land use for the lands surrounding the river. However the River use and access points should be unchanged. Hunting along the river is a tradition that should remain permitted. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Further restriction on the river use should not be included. The proposed change in the HP limits, and definitions are unfair to the users that have made equipment purchases based on the current HP regulations. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? Law enforcement needs to be increase on the river during the summer holiday weekends. During the holiday weekends, the vast number of park users impact the serenity of the river. Please don't make any drastic changes in regulations that affect the users at all other times of the year based on these congested weekends. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? The river is a great smallmouth bass resource downstream of Two Rivers. This resource should be managed as a trophy SMB management area like other areas managed by the MDC. I would like to see a slot limit allowing the public to harvest 11" to 13" fish, and protecting larger fish to grow to trophy size. The ideal area for this would be from Two Rivers to the end of the park.	7/27/2009	No		MO	63043
594	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: My suggestions are: 1. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. 3. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Note my numbering is of each suggestion instead of answering the specific comment questions.	7/27/2009	No		IL	60187
595	#1 Alternative "A" is the closest to my idea of the best way to manage the ONSR. It seems well suited to preserving the area while allowing good use. #2 I feel strongly that the following should be included in future management: +CLOSE ROADS AND TRAILS THAT HAVE BEEN ILLEGALLY DEVELOPED +preserve/designate 3,400 acres wilderness area (Big Spring tract) +Keeping areas of the rivers free from motorized boats #4 Specific area: Areas near Eminence where commercial use threatens the natural environment #5 Further suggestions: +Please strictly enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! +Limit the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails +Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river +Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring +Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and for the work that the Park Service does in the Ozark NSR area! Dr. Jay Donaldson	7/27/2009	No		MO	65588
596	2) Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: 3) * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 4) * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren. 5) * A Corps of volunteers who live within 50 miles of the waterway and who love the country should be given leadership, resources, and recognition for a regular (every week) activity in cleaning up the river and maintaining the natural flora. I refer you to the Habitat Restoration Team whose long-term members come every Sunday to work in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area north of San Francisco. Some of these people have been	7/27/2009	No	Chicago Conservation Corps	IL	60626

	doing this work on a volunteer basis for more than 15 years. They have parties together, plant and grow seeds in a supported nursery and patrol the pathways in the park looking for exotic plants that are also invasive. Their full-time, hired leader is Maria Alvarez. Two native plant nurseries are supported with experienced, full-time horticulturalists. I am sure the Ozark National Scenic River is worthy of a similar effort. We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!						
597	I have both canoed the Buffalo River and hiked along the trails along the river. The Ozark National Scenic Riverway is a gem that needs to be cared for and maintained as a pristine place for persons to enjoy as nature intended it to appear. Hiking is very low impact on the environment and should do little damage. Canoeing is also low in its impact. This is not true of motorized vehicles such as an ATV which not only tear up the trails but add atmospheric pollution as well as sound pollution. Boats with high horsepower motors also add sound pollution and are more likely to cause shoreline erosion with the wake they create. To maintain this scenic riverway for future generations I would request that the use of motorized vehicles be severely limited to specific trails away from the river or eliminated. We need to cut back on any possible erosion into the river from rutted trails. In time erosion of soil into the river will kill the river as we now know it. Limiting the horsepower of boat motors will reduce the shore erosion due to the wakes created. It will also reduce the stirring up of the bottom sediment which not only detracts from the beauty of the stream but also is tough on fish reproduction. Float fishermen do not need to roar back up the river disturbing not only the environment but also those who are enjoying a quiet canoe trip or a hike along the river. Thank you for your efforts to properly husband this national treasure.	7/27/2009	No		Hill 'n Dale Hikers	AR	72715
598	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! We need to protect these rivers so that our children and grandchildren can enjoy them for years to come.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60004
599	5) Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren.	7/27/2009	No			TN	38119-3063
600	1. No Action. Open all access and campground, roads and introduce more horse trails. Maintain camping areas along the river for traditional hunting camps and family outings. 2. Demonstrations of all traditional Ozark Life, 1920 thru 1968. Such as working farms, etc. Continue to allow the existing motor boat limits. Enhance horse trails. 3. Do not designate wilderness areas. These areas restrict the recreational opportunities at OZARK. Don't eliminate motor boats anywhere. Boaters know in the smaller parts of the river when and how they can run. Limiting in the lower Current may be an option. The present limitations have been accepted after much public outrage. We don't need to re-address with more strictor limitation parkwide. 4. OZARK family ties here apparently are unique. Family roots run deep. People who grew up on the properties consumed by the Government like to come back to reminisce about their childhood and see their old family farms or where they used to be. Most places are not accessible by the older generations. Most areas, you have to walk through brush and thickets or float to access. Most of the older people are unable to do either. OZARK don't provide pictures or any memorabilia to share at the few sparsely manned visitor centers. Round Spring wasn't anything like it is today. It was a populated community and now there is nothing to show for it. Alley was a community gathering place for family activities. Akers Ferry was booming with the camping. I would like to see the old farm lands restored to productive fields as traditionally used. This was part of the livelihood of the families who lived on the river farms. The culture of the people here was hard. They scratched out a living from next to nothing. The people here lived off the land. They knew how to conserve all the resources they had. I have had park personnel tell me "People didn't live like that here". 5. All of the developed campgrounds, (old state park areas) should be groomed as a park. The heritage of the previous keepers took pride in the appearance of the springs, campgrounds and maintained them to be pleasing to see. Beauty is not found in weeds and brush blocking the view of spring branches, riversides and road sides. OZARK has many beautiful springs and natural areas outside the developed campgrounds that can be left to the natural state and not groomed per say. Trails can be developed to these areas for those who hike or like the more natural. My stratigy is if something is groomed and clean when people get there, they are more likely to leave it that way. If you provide them with waist high grass and weeds they will trash it.	7/27/2009	No			MO	65466
601	2) Ozark National Scenic Riverways Must Be Preserved With Stricter Policies And Better Enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10 hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25 hp below Van Vuren. Thank you for your attention to this matter.	7/27/2009	No		National Parks Conservation Association	IL	61822
602	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! 2) Off road vehicles destroy the natural beauty of wilderness by the destruction of plants and riverways, they pollute, and also take away the pleasure of tourist by their noise. The pollution includes the exhaust fumes as well as trash that seems to be left behind by thoughtless operators.	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	IL	62239

	Off road vehicles also create new trails which leads to erosion and unmarked trails that risk the safety of hikers and backpackers. Horses not only destroy trail systems that volunteers have help create but their waste contaminates waterways by polluting the water system with bacterias and viruses that are harmful to hikers and backpackers alike. Horses also create new trails which lead to erosion and unmarked trails that risk the safety of hikers and backpackers. The idea of the backcountry does not include roads but forests, plants, animals, and the riverways.						
603	Do not allow motorized vehicles on the Ozark Scenic Waterways. They ruin the experience of other people visiting these places.	7/27/2009	No		NPCA	MO	63033
604	my name is buddy.my cherokee indian name is a-nam-tay-say.before our land was taken away from the native american we indiand did a verry good job of taking of our land.and on our reservations to day we take care of out land rivers and lakes.we have our wone police and wild life protection.you half to do your part of taking care of you land or one day you will not have your land and we indiand are nor going to give up any more of our land with out a good fight to the end.thank you if you get this far check out my web site www.algotto.com buddy..	7/27/2009	No			IL	62896
605	In August of 2004, my partner and I took a trip down (from the Chicago Suburbs) to the Ozarks near Eminence Missouri. Prior to this trip, I had never really been to a National Forest or a National Scenic Riverway, for that matter. I must say that the beauty, seclusion and wildness of the Ozarks effected me in ways that one can only imagine. I hate to sound cliché about this, but it did change my life for the better. Our trip was based out of Eminence, near the confluence of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. We took two float trips down the rivers; one on the Current and one on the Jacks Fork. The landscape in both destinations was spectacular. The Karst topography in the ozarks, contains the highest concentration of caves and springs in the United States. This is one of the contributing factors to the pristine clarity of the water there. One memory in particular that I will remember forever is the collision with my brother's canoe. Both my older and younger brothers came with on the trip with us. My younger brother Ryan was in my canoe and my older brother Brett was with my partner. Ryan and I were coming around a bend (on the Current River) and the other canoe was stopped next to a tree that had fallen in the river. We had no time to react, and the water was running swiftly that we hit them. All of their gear began to float down stream and we had both capsized. While my partner, Ryan and I were scrambling to pull the boats and our stuff a-shore, Brett was hanging onto a tree branch for "dear life"; keep in mind that the water was not that deep and there was no real threat. He stayed there for about 20 minutes and refused to let go. The rest of us were beginning to get annoyed with him, but he would not let go. The next thing we knew a family of ducks plopped down in the water and swam right past him! It was priceless; these cute fuzzy little ducklings could handle the current but not Brett!! The Ozarks are much more than a river to enjoy. The Ozarks are a timeless landscape of caves, lush forest, and above all, pristine wilderness and biodiversity. Since my trip to the Ozarks, I have decided to pursue a degree in Forest Resource Management at Northern Arizona University. The ozarks must be kept protected from the plethora of threats. We are quickly learning that the things we do have a definite lasting effect on this place that we call home -Earth. I have watched wetlands in my home town of Joliet, IL turn into "cookie cutter" duplexes one after another. With this conversion, I have observed flooding of these homes and surrounding roadways. In addition to the floods, I have observed displaced wildlife. Fox, deer, coyote are forced onto very busy roads because of the ever increasingly urban sprawl that is swallowing up their habitat. In order for the Ozarks to remain a productive ecosystem (or wild oasis for nature lovers) it is necessary to limit the density and extent of human encroachment. Off-road vehicles should be prohibited in all national forest land in my opinion, but especially near water sources. ATVs create massive erosion, which contributes to flooding, landslides, habitat destruction, water pollution, air pollution, and noise pollution (for those of us seeking seclusion) Horses create similar problems with regard to erosion but the horses can be restricted (not eliminated) with proper planning. I would be in favor of eliminating all electric motors on all National Scenic Rivers. These boats create several problems. They create waves that exacerbate shoreline erosion, the emit CO2 and contribute to localized air pollution as well as global warming, and the noise that they create breaks the special quality of the wilderness --silence and serenity. I would like to urge the National Park Service, and all of the public agencies that have jurisdiction over this area to implement plans to restore, and conserve these lands and rivers for generations to come.	7/27/2009	No			IL	60115
606	(4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: - Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! - Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails - Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! - Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring - Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			IL	60201
607	Managing all waterways routinely is a must. If I held a poltical seat to control the Dept. of Natuaral Resources... a plan would be developed to segment river control from multiple resources validating INPUT at the source to OUTPUT at the end. Water Quality, Animal Qallty, Resource Protection, Recreation use with Conservation. Just like the border patrol... every border/river has it protection force.... and let it be known pollutants pay and pay and pay with high media focus. I would do every lake in Illinois personally if it paid as much as my full time job.	7/27/2009	No		STARS International	IL	60156
608	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			MO	63122

609	2. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 2. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 2. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 2. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Thank you for your consideration, Sincerely Ann Collins	7/27/2009	No			MO	63123
610	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			IL	60035
611	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/27/2009	No			IL	60630
612	The Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be protected. Here in Illinois we have polluted our rivers to embarrassing levels and it has been a long struggle, one in which we are still involved, to reverse the effects. It has affected our economy adversely in so many ways. It is difficult to determine if the benefits outweigh the costs but as time goes on we will find that they most certainly do not. Do not let this same error occur in Missouri. Thank you.	7/27/2009	No		Friends of the Illinois River	IL	62626
613	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			TN	38122
614	4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? A. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/27/2009	No			AR	72701-3274
615	4. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a responsibility to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! It is a shame that people have allowed this priceless treasure to become neglected and abused. It is imperative that we do as much as we can to reclaim this beautiful and tranquil area.	7/28/2009	No			VA	22315
616	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! T	7/28/2009	No			IL	60053
617	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			MO	64093
618	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No		National Parks Conservation Association	IL	60104
619	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60201
620	I think our waterways should be clean, however, I would not like to see accesses to our forests blocked. The land should be accessible to the public. What ever happened to the slogan - pack it in, pack it out? Perhaps trails should be made for quads and such.	7/28/2009	No			AR	72846

621	1. Alternative A would be the best proposal for managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The removal of all motorized vehicles for the river (including ATVs, power driven boats, etc.) is necessary to restore this area to it's pristine condition. The number of canoe liveries should be restricted to limit the number of people on the rivers at anyone time. Alcholic beverages should be prohibited to help prevent inappropriate behaviors by people so that the area is family freindly. Horses should not be permitted within a distance to the waterways that would result in contamination of the waters.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63038
622	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/28/2009	No			IL	60625-5107
623	Planning for the future is a no-brainer. It has been because of our ancestors care of our parks and natural areas and rivers that we even still have them, although they could be in much better shape. Hence all the more the reason for this generation, you and your leadership teams to make sure the proper laws and guidelines are in place and then of course enforce them. Obviously the future is in our hands, your hands and actions. Ivan Horn	7/28/2009	No		United Church of Christ	IL	62298
624	1. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			AR	72016
625	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No		NPCA	IL	60457
626	Limit off-road vehicles, power boats and horse trails near the river. Plant native plants to prevent erosion and clense the water.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60010
627	5 • Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! • Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river. • Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring • Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren proper management can allow us to keep our beautiful waterways and let everyone enjoy them. Limiting powered vehicles either near or in the river is my biggest concern. The impact they have on the environment and wildlife and the impact they have on the experience of those of us looking for a natural outdoor experience is of great concern.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65202
628	Dear Superintendent Detring: I wish to offer these comments concerning the General Management Plan alternatives. I am a Missouri resident, an equestrian trail rider, an outdoorsman and a sportsman. I enjoy riding horses, floating, hiking, and other leisure time spent in the Ozark National Scenic Riverway area. I feel the ONSR should be managed to protect the natural resources of our beautiful State, while also providing access to recreational activities such as horseback riding. Horseback riding is a long standing tradition both in my family and has strong cultural ties to the area. I have read the alternatives offered by your Department, and since horses are only to be allowed in the Resource-based and Natural Land-based Management Zones, I feel there should be a blend of alternatives. A blend of alternatives could allow for protection and restoration of degraded biological communities without denying horse access if a well planned trail system is developed and maintained. I would favor nonmechanized forms of recreation, as long as there were allowances for adequate number and size of equestrian staging areas and trail heads to park trucks and trailers. Alternative A mentions closing roads and trails that have been illegally developed. With at least one good road to specific destinations and a large enough trail system to keep "legal" trails from being over used, this alternative is reasonable. The trail system needs to have enough trails that over use does not occur and thus set the stage for closure. Alternative B seems to allow more for this. If only a few trails become designated or "legal", I feel this would be a deliberate set-up to close shared or multi-use trails in the future and would constitute a design for failure. I favor Alternative B to provide a manageable mix to traditional activities. The "Natural Resource Management" within Alternative B seems difficult to match with the additional trails and a network of learning centers. Restoring natural resources to more pristine conditions seems to promote less access. I do not approve of making access difficult but do approve of well managed and planned trails to protect and restore the natural resources while still providing access. I favor education and promotion of such outdoor ethics such as the Leave No Trace Stock program of the Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen (SMMBCH). Many equestrians are aging and unable to access the off road or natural areas by foot. I ask that you recognize and honor the fact that horses and/or mules are a source of conveyance for many. There are handicapped individuals who access trails with horses and mules. I recognize as does SMMBCH an obligation to handicapped persons through the Americans with Disabilities Act to advocate for access. Please be sensitive to this important provision when developing a new General Management Plan. SMMBCH has heard this and experienced requests from municipal areas such as St. Louis where people have claimed horses and mules as a service animal. While this may be an exception, there are still many who can only enjoy our natural resources through some form of conveyance. Many of our southern Missouri trail riders are senior citizens and this provides a way to enjoy our outdoors. While developing and planning for the future management of ONSR, I ask that you recognize the value to the Park of equestrians who belong to and promote the values of Show-Me MO Back County Horsemen as it pertains to conservation, trail ethics, and volunteer service to help preserve our equestrian trails, and our way of life.	7/28/2009	No		SHOW ME MISSOURI BACK COUNTRY HORSEMEN	MO	65706

	Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the comment period for the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Sincerely, John Waitman Marshfield, Missouri						
629	This comment is in reference to the Ozark National Senic Waterwways: Please keep the Waterwways at a completely natural state. An avid canoer that visits the Jack's Folk and Current waterways, I love these areas for their pristine beauty and lack of development. They need to stay that way. Allow for motorized vehicles a seperate and controlled area - away from the rivers. Do not allow for boating in these areas - keep them on the Meramec where the areas are much deeper for the propellers. We have so little natural wildlife areas left. Do not let this place be developed. I would like to have you vote for Admendment A. Thank you.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63132
630	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60613
631	Our National Parks are loved by so many. The Ozark Nation Scenic Riverway is polluted and needs help to restore it to something akin to its former life as a living, viable river. Other rivers have been successfully cleaned. The Ozark can be, too.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60646
632	1 - I frequently travel to the ozark rivers from Tennessee for fishing opportunities and vote for "No-Action". I have not had any problems with overcrowding or lewd behavior and LOVE the smallmouth fishing Missouri has to offer. 2- the public should have un restricked access to our streams and rivers as we always have had.. 3 - no areas designated as wilderness areas thus restricting access 4 - better enforcement of already existing laws - this would prevent many of the problem that only a few areas experience. This would save NPS money in these hard economic times. Enforce what the current law states... Get out and do your job better.	7/28/2009	No			TN	37922
633	1. I prefer plan A. I would also prefer that ATVs be banned from any area designated as primitive. 2. There are few places in the midwest where people can escape to a truly natural setting. ONSR should provide this opportunity. I think horses should be allowed, but their numbers should be limited and they must stay on designated trails and only allowed to cross at a limited number of river crossings, in order to prevent pollution and maintain water quality. ATV and motorized boat use should be banned in primitive areas, and needs to be strictly controlled in other areas because they make noise that detracts from the wilderness experience. The upper parts of both rivers down to Alley and Big Spring should have no motorized boats. 3. Larger outboards (25 hp or more)don't belong on the river. 4. The upper parts of the river need to be kept as primitive as possible. Blue Spring on the Upper Jacks still needs to be upgraded and charge a fee so that partying is discouraged and the area can be more family oriented. 5. I think that building and maintaining more hiking trails would be very consistent with the management of primitive areas. The primary management goal of the park should be protection of the natural resources - the river, caves, flora, and fauna. There is a lot of glade habitat that could be restored.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65793
634	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No		NPCA	IL	60077
635	Please save our rivers.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60611
636	The Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			AR	72701
637	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/28/2009	No			IL	60042-9601
638	1. "A" is the best of the alternatives that are presented. 2. Physically close all illegal/unauthorized roads and trails and prevent their use. Please keep motorized boats off of the rivers for a multitude of reasons. Establish the area (Big Spring tract) as a Wilderness Area. 4. Areas near Eminence are especially threatened by commercial use. 5. Please aggressively enforce the prohibition of off-road vehicle use in the area. Limit motor boat use and strictly enforce the horsepower limitations. Repair and prevent further riverbank erosion damage caused by inappropriate and unauthorized use. Limit the number of horses allowed on the trails. Establish a Big Spring Wilderness Area. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important resource and its use.	7/28/2009	No			AZ	86003

639	<p>26 July 2009 National Park Service Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways PO Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 RE: Comments ONSR general management plan Dear Sir, Please except this letter as my comments, suggestions, and opinions, on the development of your guiding future management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This letter is also being e-mailed to the planning team in Denver, Colorado. However, I still felt that it was important to mail this as a "hard copy" to the office/individuals who will have some of the final suggestions in the decision making process. First, I am not real happy with any of the alternatives in their present form. I feel that each needs some tweaking to be effective. I am also not happy to just answer the five questions on your comment form. Based upon the way that I see things at the present, I would be inclined to vote with the "NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE" first, followed by alternative A. The driver for my "no alternative" selection is based upon the fact that when the riverways was established, certain requirements and guiding conditions were setup. I believe that the Park Service has let slip many of these guiding principals for the Scenic River. A scenic river also has certain connotations of being scenic! Enforce the current standards before adopting additional restrictions. Not a proven track record here. An "Alternative A" selection is given as a secondary choice, because I believe when conflicts arise between the environment, and environmental protection, humans should lose. Preservation is the most important thing that the Park Service can do. That said, here are many of my comments for improvements in the current condition. Build upon them as you see fit. But this is what I want the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers to be for now and for the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highway 106 continues to be a major bike route. The road is scenic and travels through mostly undeveloped parts of the Ozarks. Including two segments of ONSR, Alley Springs and Powder Mill. MDOT doesn't appear interested in doing anything to help prevent accidents with conflicts between bicyclists and vehicles. NPS needs to take the lead and at least develop bike lanes through both park areas. 18-24 inches on either side of 106 would sure help. Maybe this would pressure MDOT to continue this improvement. It is only a matter of time before a bicyclist's death happens. Heck, if the NPS and MDOT had bike lanes, I would love to get out and ride. Too dangerous at present.• Scenic means just that. I do not believe that seeing all kinds of RV's, trailers, campers, and vehicles along the river's edge are very scenic. In some places this has been allowed to get out of hand. Enforce what and where this type of activity is allowed, i.e. Log Yard. The gravel bar was to be for boaters and floaters, I believe. You have a campground for camping when not in a boat or canoe. Gravel bars need to be used for off water users only. Not everyone who has a campers or tent. Not real scenic when I see 100 vehicles along the river. Enforce existing rules that limit accesses. Keep vehicles and equipment away from the water. The same applies to other areas like Powder Mill. Gravel bars used during gigging season doesn't need to have all kinds of vehicles, open fires, etc. on them. Enforce scenic river standards. Too many dispersed sites perhaps? A scenic river designation means limited access spots. You can't be everyone's friend.• Houses and in holdings within the NPS bounds. What has happened there? I though existing homes would be removed when those holders died or decided to move on? Lands were purchased in the past and some had easements to prevent development. Restrictions were made in developments and improvements. Is this being monitored and enforced? A home right next to the river (in Spring Hollow) was sold and then a new porch was added. Aren't there existing rules on development of properties within the riverways boundaries? I understand that another home, which overlooks the rivers downstream from Log Yard, is also up for sale. What gives here? Scenic means scenic. Not just scenic for a selective few who can afford it. If and when properties come up to be sold, then the NPS should step in with a "fair market" value of the home/land and purchase it. I remember some standards out west where inholders were allowed a lifetime permit, but when their life ended, so did ownership. Heirs were not allowed to sell properties. Weren't there provisions made within the ONSR lands on some of these properties? Again, scenic river!• Scenic means scenic. Why are power lines still seen within the park boundaries? Find funding or grants to help the cooperatives put high voltage electrical underground.• Horsepower of boat motors seems to be a big deal. I have to admit that I don't have a powerboat, but I do understand where the locals are coming from. Wonder why do you confuse people? Make it a 25 horsepower throughout the river system. Like the Eleven Point Scenic River. You confuse everyone with seasonal variations and location differences. Standardize. I live about 3 miles away from the Current River, yet even during the summer, I can still hear powerboats on the river. Why? I'm told that the larger the horsepower of the boat the more noise it will produce. But, I don't hear all of them so there must be some variations. Don't you have some type of noise pollution laws in place? 25, 40, or ? doesn't matter to me, but the noise pollution does. If I can hear at my house, I cannot believe how loud it is along the river. Scenic! If you do decide to lower the horsepower along the river, then you have to give the users time to adjust. Require a 25 hp maximum within 7 years and then about six years out start writing warnings. But to overnight require a reduced motor...yes, if I was a powerboat user I would also be really upset unless the NPS had some type of buyout program.• ATV use in the park needs to be prohibited. There are probably more legal users that not, however, those few have screwed up things for others by taking the ATV off roads and/or into the river. Yet, the larger UTVs (including electric carts) should be allowed. These are two passenger vehicles, which are expensive and not really built for off road use. Many older people are starting to use these. At least try it. Allow two passage vehicles on roads only. If it doesn't work, it can be made illegal. After all you allow "street legal" motorcycles within the riverways. They can and do make it off roads on occasion.• Close all those roads that are not needed for limited access points, resource management, or inholdings. Open roads encourage illegal use and resource damage. Enforcement needs to be made at the expense of county commissioners. Priority needs to be made to resource protection and scenic values. The public use comes second.• You have made great improvements by limiting use of springs/spring branches, limiting rowdy behaviors, banning glass and Styrofoam, but there are other scenic river laws that need to be enforced.• If too many people, groups are a problem then you must limit use/access. I have seen one too many canoes floating the river at times. The same applies to horse use. Keep pollution down to nothing or at least a manageable level.• You might open talks up with the US Forest Service about taking over Watercress Recreation area there in Van Buren. Get you Congressional representatives involved. The Forest Service can't seem to keep it up to the same maintenance standards as the NPS. I'm not sure if you can do this, but I would like to see the NPS take over this site. After all it is adjacent to your main office and a holding within the Current River. Laws need to be changed if they prohibit NPS	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
-----	---	-----------	----	--	--	----	-------

640	We must preserve the beauty of this state. We are known for being hateful but we can come together on the need to preserve nature. Elizabeth Smith	7/28/2009	No			MO	64132
641	NO-ACTION	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
642	I support protection for the nation's scenic rivers. I call on the National Parks Service to limit off-road vehicle and motor boat usage on our designated rivers.	7/28/2009	No			NM	88005
643	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Please help to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63074
644	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river!	7/28/2009	No			IL	60302
645	5) I am from St Louis and vacationed in the Ozarks often. It is a beautiful area that needs protection and should not be degraded by short-sighted use by a few. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park. These should be used on private property, not public lands. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. (Or have the horses wear bags to catch their droppings.) Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren. The few should not be allowed to ruin the land for the majority! They can do what they want on their own property.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60045
646	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			IL	60119
647	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! Thank you for helping reverse the damage to this park and save one of our country's treasured landscapes!	7/28/2009	No			FL	32796
648	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! This natural gem needs our help to shine for generations to come. Thanks for helping NPCA reverse the damage to this park and save one of our country's treasured landscapes! Sincerely, Deborah Peterson	7/28/2009	No			MO	63017
649	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren I have many friends in this area and while they like recreational activities they are concerned about what they are leaving to their grandkids. A balance of activity and preservation would be ideal. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.	7/28/2009	No			IL	60045
650	1) Action Plan A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage ONSR. I would severely limit commercial guided overnight trips. While they could prove to be the best friend of the river, too many would have a negative impact on it. I would keep horses out of the stream, or limit the number of horses allowed. The level of pollution in the river is not acceptable. 2) 1. Closing illegal roads and accesses. 2. Limiting or eliminating motorboats. 3. The park would set up some small learning centers. Some new trails would help guide visitors to an old cabin or cemetery, and some ranger programs would help visitors learn more about their Ozark heritage — both history and nature. 4. Keep horses out of the stream by enforcing the "horses on designated trails" rule" 3) I felt that "Take No Action, and Alt C should not be considered at all. 4) My main concern is the Trout water areas, as well as all the fishign areas.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63141

651	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! I live on Lake Hamilton which has no limits on building and too much reckless boat traffic -- cigarette boats and jet skis. It is incumbent upon we citizens of Arkansas to preserve our pristine wildernesses for future generations. Water is our scarcest resource. Please work to preserve our beautiful scenic rivers. We are the Natural State; let's keep it that way. Sincerely	7/28/2009	No		NPCA	AR	71913
652	1-4 I do not have time to review all of these, but I want to keep the Ozark Scenic Riverways as pristine as possible. They should not include less protection, and if anything , more protection. They have been protected fairly well and we can do better. 5.Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			MO	63116
653	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river. Thank you	7/28/2009	No			MO	63110
654	You best protect our Ozark National Scenic Riverways along with all the other riverways & National Scenic routes. People need to be able to enjoy the beauty of Mother Nature without humans polluting the water & running there stupid 4 wheelers through. They can run there stupid 4 wheelers some where else like on there own property or where they are allowed but keep them off of our Scenic riverways & our Parks & that goes for the motor boats. With all the lakes that around the United States the boats are to be put in there. I do not mind canoeing as long as they don't throw there trash but the motor boats & 4 wheelers need to be out of there. So please do what you can to protect our riverways & Parks. Thank You.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65772
655	Save the Ozark National Scenic Riverways!!	7/28/2009	No			OH	45152
656	1) Alternative A comes closest, with some of the cultural and educational opportunities outlined in B included. I would like ONSR to offer more national park-type opportunities: experiencing nature, learning about ecology, studying the culture of the area, etc. Unfortunately, ONSR has become a rowdy playground for big trucks, AWDs and commercial activities that detract from its stature as a national treasure. 2)It is absolutely necessary to stop the illegal road-building that is going on in the park and close the roads that have been allowed to criss-cross formerly pristine areas. I have lived near and used the riverways for more than 30 years, and I HAVE NEVER SEEN SO MUCH VEHICULAR USE AS IS CURRENTLY ALLOWED. Driving right up to the river is not necessary and is severely damaging the resource and altering the experience of enjoying nature. I also support further horsepower restrictions and limiting the number of non-motorized watercraft and horses. I support designating the Big Spring Wilderness Area. 3) I strongly oppose development of more accesses and facilities as outlined in Alternative C. The number of accesses, parking lots, horse trails and unauthorized roads has multiplied many times over since the Riverways was established. Now it is rare to find a place that is inaccessible to trucks and ATVs. "Hardening" areas that get extreme use, such as Flying W, might be an acceptable exception if it preserves natural features and helps alleviate damage. 4)Flying W and the area downstream to Medlock are justifiably popular but pose grave risks of erosion associated with use, especially by horses and vehicles, that are not addressed adequately in the preliminary plan. ONSR should continue to maintain remnants of human settlement, such as Medlock School and Maggard's Cabin. These resources are windows on the past that should be maintained for future generations. 5) I would like to see more research on and protection of the park's rich archeological resources. ONSR could build appreciation for its resources by offering more cultural and educational programming to visitors and working with local schools and civic organizations on projects that recognize its unique human and natural history. ONSR should hold firm to its NPS principles by celebrating and protecting the rivers' rich heritage rather than allowing its exploitation for short-term gains or political expediency.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65201
657	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Thank you!	7/28/2009	No			IL	60527
658	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: 1. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			WA	98119
659	This is tom urge elimination of off-road vehicles from the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the waters, banks, and surroundings. Operation of such motorized equipment is antithetical to the natural values of the ONSR. By the way, I am credited with being the one who first proposed the name Ozark National Scenic Riverways.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65401

660	2 strict limits on motorised vehicles.	7/28/2009	No			MO	64119
661	Ban all motorized boats. No gigging.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63119
662	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No		National Parks Conservation Assoc.	CA	91711
663	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: 1. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			IL	60614
664	1) Alternative B is the closest to my idea of the best management plan. I like the overall goal of enhancing opportunities to discover and learn about the national riverway's natural wonders and Ozark heritage. The rivers provide recreation and enjoyment. However, that goal must be balanced by preserving the health of the riverway environment for current and future generations. I would also like the plan to limit the use of motorized vehicles in and around the waterways and limit the amount of development. Including the following parts of Alternative A would support the balance. - Emphasize greater opportunities for traditional, non mechanized forms of recreation. - Close roads and trails that have been illegally developed. - Commercial services might be limited or modified along different portions of the rivers to achieve desired visitor experiences and resource conditions. 2) Regardless of the alternative chosen, I would like the following items included: - Designate the Big Spring Tract as a wilderness region. - Close roads and trails that have been illegally developed. - Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the riverways. - Limit the number, size and use of motorized boats. - Maintain or restore natural resources to more pristine conditions that lack signs of substantial development or use. Restore degraded biological communities and improve overall natural settings. - Additional trails (some with universal accessibility) would be developed for visitors to access a network of 'discovery sites'. 3) I feel strongly the following items listed in Alternative C should not be implemented. - Additional developed camping sites and additional boat ramps. - Managing natural resources to provide 'high-quality' scenery. 4) The Big Spring Natural Area lies very near to the Big Spring and is the background portion of the old Big Spring State Park that has been protected since the 1920's. This example of a native, natural area of Missouri should continue to be preserved. Designating the area as a Wilderness region should accomplish this goal. 5) An overall goal of any alternative should be to preserve and protect the Park, to insure it's health for current and future generations. Several of the alternatives mention programs to monitor the Park's resources, which I assume would include all aspects of the environment (like water quality, plant/forest/wildlife health of the surrounding area). I would like a plan for comprehensive monitoring and oversight for the Park's environmental heath be included in any Alternative selected.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63128
665	I like the improvements at Alley Springs. Something like that at Montauk would be nice. I don't see the Senic Riverways as a place for noise or horses. I like it because it is quiet and naturally beautiful. Keeping it clean and unpolluted is very important.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65020
666	5. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren Pat Jones	7/28/2009	No			MO	63129
667	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/28/2009	No			IL	60051
668	1. Alternative A is close to the way that I think the Riverway should be managed. I believe that the Natural Resource Management portion of Alternative A should add the monitoring, research, and preservation projects of Alternative B. Research provides correct information for visitor education. Monitoring strengthens our understanding of human impacts and can direct management changes in the future. Preservation protects the integrity, purpose, and significance of a National Riverway. Cultural Resource Management should pay particular attention to Ozark heritage with educational programs and protection of selected historic structures within management zones as Alternative B states. The Big Spring tract as well as any other area should be proposed for Wilderness designation as long as the activities allowed in those Wilderness areas EXCLUDE horseback riding. Horses and Wilderness do not mix. Horse feces have the potential to bring in invasive non-native species to any area, horse trails create large gullies that serve as poop-shoots into our rivers, and horseback riders do not stay on trails. All river sections should be non-motorized north of Big Spring unless there is constant and consistent enforcement of any motorized section. Motorized boaters do not follow speed limits, so keep them south of Big Spring or heavily enforce the limits. Folks can fish out of a canoe, they don't have to have a motor.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65631

	<p>Absolutely NO ATVs anywhere in the National Riverway! You cannot separate surface and ground water in karst systems and horses, motorized boats, and ATVs threaten the spring systems, the 134 miles of "clear", free-flowing, spring-fed rivers that are currently Outstanding National Resource Waters, and the biodiversity of the Highlands. If you can't paddle there or walk there (with a few exceptions for handicap accessibility), you don't get there. 2. All parts of the alternatives should be included, but some selfish, non-homogeneous uses have to be limited. Visitors require services, facilities, education, and activities to ensure a pleasurable experience. The current road network allows plenty of access to resources and all illegal roads should be closed and monitored to ensure that only known access areas are being used in an effort limit traffic to developed areas which will protect natural resources. Interpretation and education are important. Water quality is a prized attribute of the Riverway, so teach it and send folks home with an understanding of why it is as beautiful as it is and show them what happens when resources are abused. Make an educational impact on visitors and the locals alike. Natural and Cultural Management are key to the future of the Riverway. Educate yourselves by pulling local and state resources and information that has been gathered. Many scientifically sound resources are available and state departments and southern Missouri organizations are willing to help. Wilderness designation will facilitate desired activities and will give some backbone to enforcement of nuisance uses that should have been taken care of with original legislation. Capacities should be set although I know that that will literally take an act of Congress and could inhibit local outfitters who are good folks for the most part. But, overall, anyone contributing to natural resource destruction should be overridden regardless of how long their ancestors have been there. This is the Ozark NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY now, it's no longer about them. Selfish, non-homogeneous uses have to be limited spatially. Please put some teeth into the Plan. If you have to include horses, keep them in the highlands, ban all ATVs, limit motorized boats to south of Big Spring, define rules and penalties. Include enforcement as a part of the Plan so that the NPS can get ahold of the situation in the Riverways; it's gotten out of control and a select few are benefiting. 3. I do not believe that my Ozark National Scenic Riverway has to provide a diversity of outdoor recreational opportunities. The opportunities lie within what is appropriate to preserve the integrity of the area. This isn't the wild west, this isn't Chadwick ATV Heaven, this isn't Lake Tahoe. This is a hydro-geologically active, biodiversified Ozark Highlands area that is relatively pristine. The rivers and the landscape ARE what makes this a place worth designating a National Treasure. Motorized recreational opportunities DO cause excessive impacts on National Riverways resources and the NPS can't enforce the limited amount of restrictions as is, so those that seek those types of opportunities need to go elsewhere. The NPS should promote stewardship, enforce rules, and not become Disneyland ticket takers, because this isn't Disneyland, it's so much more. 4. I'm a non-motorized boater and I sleep on the gravel bars when I visit. At the end of Boogen season I find that the gravel bars reek of urine and have been used as toilets as the numerous toilet paper mounds all over the gravel bar suggest. This offends me on numerous levels although I'm not sure what could feasibly be done about it. Perhaps strategically located pit toilets at certain locales? I can tell you which gravel bars are "hit" most often. Signage at those locations? I don't know. It's a specific issue I know, but one that degrades the natural resources and the human experience so I brought it up. We always use WAG Bags and our Pett system and haul everything out, but I know not all do... 5. Important approaches to management? Shoot to kill? Ha. Education and enforcement along with resource preservation/management. More rangers to educate and enforce. More research and monitoring to lead future management. Your strategies are there, you need people to see to it that they are carried out. Good luck. If all my tax money could go to the NPS, it would. Yes, I would like to receive all future info on the planning via email. Please send info to hhoggard@missouristate.edu Thank you.</p>						
669	Please shut down illegal access roads and limit horsepower on boat motors to help this beautiful eco sustem heal!	7/28/2009	No			IL	60446
670	I choose A, but suggest that only way to keep the rivers wild and scenic is to outlaw all alcohol and jet power craft. Why do we have any speed boats on this inland river, when few if any out West have such access? Thank you. Dr Kinsella	7/28/2009	No			MO	63119
671	I love the Ozark waterways and as a Missouri resident am able periodically to go to wild places where I enjoy the waterway. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: **Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! **Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails **Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! **Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring **Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			MO	63116
672	1. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! 2. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails 3. Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! 4. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring 5. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Bure	7/28/2009	No			IL	60623
673	1) Preliminary Alternative "A" is the closest thing to the way I would like to see the Ozark NSR managed. I think the idea of restoring the area to feel of what it was like when it first became a park is what people the majority of people would enjoy more. The loud boats, parties, and drunkenness should be limited to certain stretches so that others can enjoy the river too. I am a river advocate and make a living by showing people the importance of clean water and how to enjoy the natural streams we have here. Alt "A" seems best.I favor the most "wild" setting possible for my trips on the river and it is this reason i never visit the Ozark NSR in the summer due to the crazy floating parties that happen. 2)I feel strongly that there should be a wilderness area designation around Big Spring. Not to do this would be a foolish move that could allow biologic integrity slip away. I also feel that there needs to be designated zones on the river for different uses. A non-motorized boat area would be great! this would not only help the enjoyment of floaters but the wildlife in the river. Closing roads and trails would also be great to allow a more secluded	7/28/2009	No		Longboat Outfitters	MO	65806

	wilderness trip. 3) Do Not make more trails, more roads, or visitor centers! this is a bad idea. Once you give permission for one road then more and more go in until you can drive to nearly every gravel bar in the river. Don't do this Please! 4)I think Alt "A" addresses the areas to some degree. The only thing I suggest is to maintain BMP's near sensitive areas. 5)I can not suggest any other ideas at this point My only plea is not to open the park into a free for all amusment area. That is not what it was meant to be in the begining and that is not what people what to see. People are starved of the natural world and they want to see a pristine spring without a building over it and a rope swing with hanging from a tree. Leave it wild or make it more wild than it is, but don't allow anything more to happen to these great rivers.					
674	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			IL 60611
675	1) plan A. 2) all 3) none 4) the junction of Big Creek and the Current River, and no it does not address this specific area adequately. 5) I think strongly educating and enforcing good management of human waste along the river and on gravel bars is extremely important. You could give people a box to poop in and make them return it to the ranger station when done on the river. put up flyers and hand out pamphlets, make people watch a video before going on the river (especially overnight) about proper management of human waste,,, like how to bury your poop, and go in the woods not the gravel bar, and to burn your T.P., etc. Also the horse trails than cross the river and use the gravel bars, leaving horse poop wherever they travel needs to be controlled. and one more concern is fertilizer runoff and cow feces along the rivers, find a way to limit the amount allowed along scenic river ways.	7/28/2009	No			NV 63332
676	need to have included Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 10hp below Van Buren	7/28/2009	No			MO 64137
677	Alternative A in my opinion would be the best option for the area. Wilderness consideration should be considered for the Big Spring area no matter which alternative is decided for the entire area. As wilderness areas are overused and abused, people all over the country need to speak out to preserve and when needed fix wilderness areas so that our children and grandchildren will have places to go and have adventures where they can enjoy the beauty that once was in areas such as this. Thank you for considering my opinion in this matter.	7/28/2009	No			IL 60067
678	1. I would prefer alternate A, although I'm not sure how the commercial overnight gravel-bar campouts would avoid turning into the loud parties that are a nuisance. Is there a way to regulate the overnights in terms of noise and pollution? I wouldn't mind some educational elements (alternate B) about key sites, but I'd keep the number to a minimum. You don't want to see signs around every bend of a river! 2. I feel strongly that the natural settings need to be protected. I wouldn't mind establishing some trails to sites like caves and springs and other Ozark features (alternate B). People should be able to see the birds, turtles, fish, etc. that are native and that are so abundant in the upper parts of the Jacks Fork River. We love that part--where there is very little commercial activity. 3. I would avoid putting large campgrounds right on the river, and I'd avoid jet skis and boats. Fishing boats with smaller motors that are quiet may be okay. 4. We love the Jacks Fork River near Mountain View, Missouri. We have been going to Bunker Hill Teachers' Resort for over 40 years and would love to keep that area as it is now. I don't know if there is a way to bring some of that to the Current River since it gets so much traffic. 5. Is it possible to outlaw alcohol on the rivers? That seems to be one of the major challenges in terms of individuals' behavior and cans falling in the water (pollution). I do favor outfitters providing canoes and rafts for recreation on the rivers, but their operations should exist away from the rivers, preferably.	7/28/2009	No			MO 63021
679	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/28/2009	No		Nature Conservancy	IL 62966
680	1. Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are the crown jewels of Missouri's natural heritage. As such they should be protected and cherished. My family uses the ONSR for hiking, camping, bird watching, botanizing, fishing and canoeing. I think Alternative A would provide the most family-friendly atmosphere on the river, maintain the natural and cultural heritage of the Ozarks, and promote an outdoor recreation experience that is scarce in the Midwest. We have the Lake of the Ozarks and other reservoirs and rivers to have lots of motorized aquatic sports. 2. Non-motorized recreation and the restoration of degraded biological communities should be the key parts of the future management of the ONSR. As an avid hiker, I would like to see more hiking or hiking/mountain biking trails along the ONSR, especially along the Upper Current River section. Multi-use trails of hiking and horseback riding are from a hiker's perspective, often not very enjoyable. 3. Expansion of horse trails and group horse trail rides should not be included in the future management of the ONSR. Horse trail use is already degrading biological communities and water quality. We need to maintain or reduce current horse use if possible. Gas motorboats, jet skis, and off road vehicles need to be reduced in their use along the ONSR. 4. The places that are special to me include all of the biologically significant springs and caves of the ONSR, all of the designated Missouri Natural Areas (e.g. Jacks Fork Natural Area, Alley Spring Natural Area, Big Spring Pines Natural Area, etc...). 5. Continue to promote a family-friendly ONSR and crack down on parties and lewd behavior on the riverways. I would take the approach of natural community management of natural resources as exemplified in Paul Nelson's (2005) Terrestrial Natural Communities of Missouri book. Maintenance of water quality and best watershed management practices should be the highest goal for the ONSR. Quality water means quality fishing. A balance needs to be made between	7/28/2009	No			MO 65101

	horse use and water quality concerns and also introduction of exotic, invasive species along horse trails.						
681	Preliminary alternative "A" is closest to my idea of managing the Ozark Riverways. I love the idea of keeping the area as natural as possible. And I strongly believe that areas that have been destroyed should be fixed and brought up to as natural an environment as possible. I am against ATVs going into our parks and ruining the natural environments. Quiet, low-impact activities are the best.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63021
682	1. Alternative A - Trained Park Rangers providing guided, educational overnight float trips is preferable to commercial operators. This can reduce the need for enforcement as more people understand the why and how of properly paddling Missouri streams. - Provide a trail to pit toilets, similar to Rocky Mountain National Park, for gravel bars with heavy use. - There should be a protocol given to commercial operators on what they must explain to customers before they put them on the river. This should include things such as the proper way to dispose of human waste, the hazards of downed trees, lean down stream when stuck on a rock, etc. Flight attendants run through a routine on every flight, why not commercial canoe renters too! 2. Reduce Access Points Once this is accomplished it will save money by reducing the amount of areas that need to be policed. 3. During the St. Louis presentation, the presenter at the north end of the room representing the No-Action plan, a police officer, stated that he considered the rule governing motor size ridiculous and would not enforce it. Therefore, you need to: a. Employ people who enforce the rules. b. Design rules that are enforceable. If more money is needed, lobby the legislature to increase funding and encourage a grassroots campaign to help. 4. Current River: Cedar Grove to Akers Ferry Jack's Fork: Hwy 17 to Bay Creek These are areas where you can enjoy nature and you usually don't have to listen to loud music played by someone who thinks everyone else in the world loves the same loud music that he/she does. 5. Research the environmental impact of canoes or find research that has already been completed. Have this readily available for when you are taken to court by the motor boaters, ATV's or equestrians. Summer interns, high school science classes and/or college students in a class or as a thesis could possibly compile this information at low or no cost. One last comment: The last time I was on the Current River with another female friend (both in our 50's), we were flashed by a drunken girl at the urging of her drunken boyfriend. There are places where this is acceptable, such as strip joints and Mardi Gras, but the Current or Jack's Fork Rivers.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63122
683	1) A combination of alternative B and C would be best. With the influx of more park visitors due to the economy, parks need to be able to handle a heavier visitor flow. I do not feel that more motor boating or horseback riding would be beneficial due to the impact that these activities have on the environment. It would also be beneficial to regulate the number of canoes a vendor can place in the river at one time from both a safety and environment friendly standpoint. 2) Protecting plants and wilderness for future generations.Limiting the horsepower of boats needs to be enforced. Pollution of the rivers from trail rides needs to be addressed. 3) Each of the needs of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be addressed and prioritized to keep it a truly Scenic Riverway. 4) Alley Spring and Big Spring are special areas to my family and I, and have been for many years. Time cannot stand still and allow the beauty of these areas to remain the same, however preserving these areas is our duty and obligation for all of the future generations to enjoy. If upheld, the alternatives would address them adequately. 5) The best course would be to combine the preservation of the nature and beauty of this area, with improvements and maintenance to handle larger crowds. No course of action, which would be basically ignoring the needs, would be the greatest mistake	7/28/2009	No			MO	63070
684	1---Preliminary alternative A would be my choice--We need enforcement of current regulations plus some new limits placed on usage 2-----I think limiting the use of power boats from the junction of the Jacks Fork and Current rivers and everything upstream from there would help a lot 3---I like anything that restores the river to a still and quiet state--No ATVs---No power boats---Less horses--Less crossings--Less boat access--Less car camping along the river 4---The junction of Big Creek with the Current River is one of my favorite spots and I have watched the area deteriorate over the years--Too much human waste---Too many ATVs driving right up the middle of the stream---Too many power boats hanging out at the big gravel bar across from Big Creek--I don't think the subject of all the human waste is being addressed at all---By the end of the summer, I am afraid to camp there because of all the exposed toilet paper and human feces--- 5----Education about how to properly crap in the woods and what to do with the toilet paper would help a lot---	7/28/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63332
685	1.) I would prefer Alternative A, but would also support Alternative B. I am a professional fisheries biologist who worked on the Jacks Fork River for 12 years. Jacks Fork and Current rivers have the potential to be world-class fishing rivers and models for non-destructive recreation pursuits. I think that the National Parks Service should place significant emphasis on these types of pursuits, but also include other natural and cultural heritage management. 2.) I have visited many National Parks and have generally been impressed with the way the National Park Service manages to protect and conserve the local natural and cultural heritage. I think this has been lacking at Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and that it is important to return the management to those root objectives. 3.) There is already enough commercialization on these rivers. I think that the canoe/floating outfitters generally do a very nice job. However, I think the management should strive to keep the commercialization at or below the current levels. It disgusts me that these rivers have experienced high nutrient and E. coli levels. These are supposed to be wild and scenic rivers, and not sewage effluent conveyances. I strongly prefer to keep the horses out of the streams. I also prefer to keep additional roads and crossings to a minimum. It is important to have places to go that require some effort to reach, but where people can experience peace and quiet. 4.) No real opinions here. 5.) I refer back to my comments in number 1 above. I believe that the management plan should include a heavy emphasis on natural and cultural heritage, while minimizing motorized access. Also, it would be nice to increase the amount of public education provided to visitors concerning the heritage of the area, so that people will develop an increased respect and appreciation for the area.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65256

686	<p>July 28, 2009 To Whom It May Concern: We, the officers and directors of the Burroughs Audubon Society of Greater Kansas City (the local chapter of National Audubon Society), would like to comment on the proposed General Management Plan for the areas of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers and their watershed which is under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. We recognize the popularity of these areas with tourists and acknowledge that some commercial activity (boat rentals, lodges, stores) along these rivers is necessary to support the local economy. However, this area is unique in its geography and its importance to wildlife (including several bird species of concern), and we feel that preserving its natural qualities (particularly good water quality and relatively large areas of intact native forest and other vegetation) should be a first priority when making long-term management decisions. The Current River area has been designated as an Important Bird Area (with the distinction of being a Global IBA, not only a state IBA). During the summer breeding season, it houses one of the largest remaining populations of the Cerulean Warbler, a species whose population has declined by almost 80% over the past 40 years (according to Breeding Bird Survey data from 1966 to 2003). The area also has critical habitat for Worm-eating Warblers, Swainson's Warblers, and Wood Thrushes, to name just a few of the threatened birds. Besides having clean water and tracts of forest free of scattered areas of development (which can quickly expand once established and create undesirable "islands" of habitat, too small to support a large breeding population of birds), the most important commodity for birds and other wildlife is freedom from excessive human activity, noise and disturbance. With these considerations, the plan designated as "Alternative A" is the one which offers the best opportunity to preserve the area in a condition which will allow the native flora and fauna to continue to thrive. This plan provides for keeping the largest section of the rivers free of motorized boat traffic, which will help minimize noise and also encourage the use of smaller crafts. This will keep human traffic to a lower density during summer, which is the peak of tourist season and also the peak of breeding season for most birds. We suggest that, in the river sections where motorized traffic is allowed, that the horsepower limits not exceed 25 hp in any area, to minimize both noise and speed. Larger and deeper bodies of water exist in the region and are easily accessible to boaters; larger crafts with motors of 40 hp or more should utilize these other recreational areas. Such limitations will also decrease the likelihood of water pollution from fuel spills, and will decrease fossil-fuel emissions that lower air quality in the area. "Alternative A" is also desirable for maintaining the majority of the land area (96%) in a "natural" or "primitive" state. Lower concentrations of human activity will help to decrease soil erosion and littering, events that can quickly degrade wilderness areas. It may also help prevent or slow the inadvertent introduction of invasive plant and animal species into this region. As part of this plan's implementation, we are in favor of the following measures: 1) Limiting horse traffic within the park area (by restricting total numbers of horses allowed in the area in a given time period, and restricting horseback riding to designated trails and river crossings); 2) Maintaining a complete ban on the use of ATVs in the area, and restricting motorized vehicles to roads; 3) Closing all illegally developed roads and trails, which fragment the forest habitat and allow unauthorized river access points (these can lead to river bank erosion and degradation of water quality). In addition to these measures, we suggest that NPS personnel continue building and maintaining relationships with the communities and landowners surrounding their area of jurisdiction, enabling all the parties concerned to cooperate in maintaining this beautiful complex of forests and rivers, with all of its plant and animal species intact. Lastly, we encourage the NPS to make the permanent designation of the back country section of the old Big Spring State Park as a Wilderness Area an important priority in formulating the management plan for the Current and Jack's Fork River areas. Our organization has been involved proudly for over a century (at the local, state and national levels) in preserving our native birds and their habitats. Our particular chapter is fortunate to be here in Missouri, with its extensive rivers and wilderness areas for all to enjoy. We believe that humans can coexist with wildlife and even help it to thrive, given thoughtful planning and consideration. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the management plans for this region so vital to some of Missouri's most threatened breeding birds, and look forward to hearing of future developments and decisions. Sincerely, Elizabeth Stoakes, President Paul Habiger, Vice President Lori Lind, Treasurer Christine Kline, Secretary Joseph Alburty, Board Member Nic Allen, Board Member Shari Harden, Board Member Sherry Leonardo, Board Member Michael O'Keefe, Board Member Heidi Retherford, Board Member Karen Smith, Board Member</p>	7/28/2009	No		Burroughs Audubon Society of Greater Kansas City	MO	64015
687	<p>1) Preliminary alternative A is the best way proposed at this time to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 5) OVERDEVELOPED ACCESS The National Park Service must reverse the trend of allowing more & more access sites. These roads & trails to the water's edge have created openings in the bank vegetation resulting in loss of animal habitat, increased erosion, degradation of the scenic quality of the rivers and increased opportunities for illegal river access by land vehicles, particularly ATV's. I believe the NPS should have the discipline to pursue the original vision of the Riverways by greatly reducing & carefully spacing the access points. SCENIC/CONSERVATION EASEMENTS Since many violations have been ignored or even approved contrary to legal requirements, reform is needed so that these easements will continue to protect the scenic quality of these rivers. The health of the rivers must come first because human populations will always put pressure on resources like the Riverways. COMMERCIAL HORSE USE New commercial facilities have been developed that attract huge numbers of riders & their horses - as many as 3,000 on one weekend. These events have had substantial impacts on thin Ozark soils & the clear waters of the rivers, causing erosion and degrading of water quality. Responsible equestrian use must ensure that the rivers' health comes first. ILLEGAL MOTORIZED USE The greatly increased network of roads has resulted in the park being nearly helpless to control illegal trespass by all types of off-road vehicles. The secluded scenic beauty has too often been shattered. So much vehicle traffic compacts soils, resulting in erosion & pollution, and destruction of habitat. These violations of law & common sense must be stopped.</p>	7/28/2009	No		Missouri Parks Association	MO	65747-7234
688	<p>1. I feel that management alternative A is the most appropriate, followed by alternative B. 2. The impacts of humans are evident in all of our river systems in Missouri and any action that would further protect the two rivers that are the most pristine is the best course of action. Followed closely behind preserving these systems should be education. With the growing disconnect between people and the environment it is important to give the public opportunities to see, experience, and appreciate nature so hopefully they will understand it and want to protect it. 3. I do not agree with any action that would increase the use of motorized equipment on or near the riverways. It has been documented that roads have negative effects on river systems and any action that occurs in the watershed ultimately affects the streams that drain them. Erosion from wave action</p>	7/28/2009	No			MO	65202

	associated with boat travel likely increases sedimentation which is detrimental to native aquatic life. In my perfect world no motorized boats would be allowed on either the Jack's Fork or Current above two rivers. 5. I am not familiar with the existing management plan, but multi-species monitoring is a great tool to observe trends that may indicate the need for changes in management.					
689	1) Alternative A best suits my idea of how the rivers should be managed. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement. 2) Most especially, enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park. Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails. Also, reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river. Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren 3) Alternative C seems to further exploit the area rather than preserve it. That concerns me. 4) The quieter areas of the rivers appeal to me most since my favorite thing to do is float down a river in a kayak or canoe in the early morning. 5) The most important approach is to let nature reign supreme without the distraction of loud motors, etc.	7/28/2009	No		National Parks Conservation Association	LA 70663
690	1) Alternative A most closely matches my vision for the Ozark Scenic Riverways. It should also include provisions to improve water quality, bacteria count from people and horses are a concern. I would also include parts of Alternative B that pertain to learning centers and discovering special things about the park. 2)Wilderness designation for area around Big Spring, closing of roads, improving water quality, restoring degraded areas and areas of the river without motorized boats should be included in any future management plan. 3)More horse trails, more boat ramps and higher levels of social interaction should not be included in future management plans. 4) Wilderness designation for the Big Spring area, non motorized area for the upper Current River are special areas. 5) Limiting alcohol will improve all visitor's experiences. More patrols to limit illegal hunting, illegal use of ATVs and decrease the abuse of alcohol and drug use would improve visitor experiences.	7/28/2009	No			MO 63146
691	Alternative A is closest to my vision of what the park should be about. People should be able to float, swim and enjoy the park without the sound and sight of motorboats and the smell of gas fumes. If people want that they should stay in Kansas City or St Louis, or go to Lake of the Ozarks. Illegally developed roads should be closed and fixed so that it would be hard to tell they were ever there. Protection and Interpretation of Ozarks natural and cultural history should be encouraged. Restoration of native landscapes is also desirable.	7/28/2009	No			MO 63042
692	1. Alternative A is the best of the proposed plans to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverway (ONSR)s. The original intent was to preserve and protect this gem. Some of the specifics for accessibility included in Alternative B could be implemented without degrading the conditions of the park. Limited classes, cave experiences, Ozark culture, etc. could be offered in a well managed plan that would not have significant impact upon the area. 2. Too much of anything is an issue. That includes too much management. However, without management the general public is not self policing and will overburden the resources. That is what is happening now with over use of trails by excessively large organized equestrian events, excessive float outfitters and the resulting party atmosphere on the river without respect for the natural resources of the area, and off road vehicles and equestrian riders creating their own trails and disturbing the natural wildlife. Alternative A would appear to designate management zones to deal with these problems "IF" there is sufficient enforcement of the management plan. Without this enforcement the plan would not be effective. The nature of the park is a long thin stretch of property. The illegal access provided from adjacent properties must be curtailed. This equally affects the land based and river based activities and resources. The designation of the proposed wilderness area as part of Alternative A is most appropriate and will facilitate a management plan to protect the area for future generations. 3 Off road vehicles – There are already parks for off road vehicles or ATV's in the state of Missouri. The ONSR is not the place for committing resources to that endeavor. This facility is for preservation and enjoyment of the resources of the waterways and the surrounding balance of nature in the watershed. Colorado has many parks in the various mountain ranges. They also have parks in close proximity to wilderness areas that are solely for off road vehicles. This provides them a reserved place to pursue their activities yet protects the pristine wilderness areas from the destructive aspects of the sport. Canyon Lands, Bryce, Bridges, Capitol Reef, Zion, Rocky Mountain and the Grand Canyon are among the parks that have significant experience with off road vehicles that can be used for experience with establishing best management practices. Horse trails should be closely managed to prevent over use and miss use. The number of animals using the trails from adjacent non park property is a potential threat which must be identified and controlled by the management plan. Horse trails do not necessarily require river crossings. If they are permitted, the number and location must be minimized to protect the stream banks and water quality of the river. There may be a need to regulate the amount of river traffic. I would hate to see a permit system for use of the river but the number of outfitters and the resulting flotillas of party floaters detract form the purpose of protecting and preserving the riverways system. Many of the western rivers and some of the rivers in Michigan have limits on guides and commercial outfitters to protect the resources. 4 The Jacks Fork and the upper sections of the Current River are special because of their unique qualities. As a member of the Ozark Fly Fishers Stream Team unit which routinely tests water quality, I am keenly aware of the high water quality of the upper Current River. Degradation due to development and use is a very real threat the further down stream you go. A decline in the population of the hellbender may be a significant indicator that the water quality is not as good as we think it is even in the upper reaches of the river. Even the implementation of Alternative A may not be stringent enough to keep the river from declining. 5. There are many rivers, monuments, wilderness areas and parks within the National Park Service which serve as examples of success and failure in how to manage a special area such as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The original intent of this special place was to protect and preserve it for future generations. This must be foremost in any future management plans for this area. Problems pointed out in the previous public comment venues establish a review list on what can be addressed in future management plans. While the location may be unique, the problems with management are not new to public locations. Experience should have been gained from many other parks in how to limit future problems. Yellowstone National Park deals with masses of people, rivers, wilderness areas, off road vehicles, horses, snowmobiles, etc. There are public areas that are sometimes over run with people. There are rivers and streams that are managed in part for the wildlife and part for the people. Streams are sometimes closed to all	7/28/2009	No		Ozark Fly Fishers, Federation of Fly Fishers, Trout Unlimited, Missouri Smallmouth Alliance	MO 63128

	because of the pressure on the resource. Some of the streams are only open for fishing in limited situations. The same is said for trails. Some areas have been closed during winter because of the cost of maintaining the roads. I point out all of these diverse situations because they have all been part of a management plan that addresses the resource, the public and a budget. Yosemite is another park that has unique features and problems. The roads have been closed to personal vehicle traffic at times because of the crowding. Roads are also closed at times because of weather and at times snow chains are required to enter the park. These are all special conditions that are aimed at balancing the preservation of the park resources, protecting the people and providing the public with the experience of this special area and all it has to offer. The bottom line in the development of a new management plan should not be how many people are served by the plan but how well the resource is preserved and protected into the future.						
693	1) Yes, No action. More safety advise for visitors. 2) 3) 4) 5) I feel there should be more resources available to the visitors to teach them about safety on the river. For instance, make it mandatory for the canoe/tube rental companies to show an informative video about safety on the river way to all renters or at least have them make a speech to them. Example: where to float and how to avoid snags and root wads. And explain to them where the boats on the river will be navigating and why they have to run where they do. Also there should be a minimum age for tube renters, very small children should not be allowed to go on the float trips.	7/29/2009	No			MO	63960
694	1. I generally favor the strong protection of the natural settings offered by A, but I also like the cultural experiences in B. 2. Strong protection of natural settings must be the priority; without preservation of the pristine character of the ONSR other important opportunities would be compromised. 3. Mechanized forms of recreation are available elsewhere; nonmechanized recreation should be the focus in ONSR. One factor with mechanized recreation is that it tends to involve a lot of back-and-forth travel. Motorboats go up and down the river, sometimes repeatedly, passing the same canoes again and again. ATVs go in loops, crossing the river as much as possible. The park is too small, too intimate for this sort of recreation; it is much better suited to paddling, walking or even bicycling or horseback riding. 4. We have had a home near Akers for over 30 years. The Current along this stretch is especially dear to us. We settled here because of the Current River, but we've found the people who have formed communities here an equal resource. This is a lived-in environment which provides visitors a chance to see what it means to have roots. 5. I think it's time for NPS to approach management issues with greater confidence. Issues are difficult but I think solutions are possible if NPS takes a strong stand on basic principles, like preservation of the natural resource which everyone respects, and makes a concerted effort to convince users. Management issues are difficult because the park has a long history of human occupation, thinking especially of European settlers. ONSR is not like Yellowstone, for instance, or a wilderness area. ONSR is unspoiled but not wilderness; the challenge is maintaining the experience of traveling through an environment that feels like home, that has fields, homeplaces, schools, churches, cemeteries, favorite swimming holes, baptismal pools, hunting camps and so on, without spoiling those places by overuse, or use, like motor vehicles, atvs and motorboats, that even in small numbers cause significant disruption. The section of river around Medlock Cave is a good example. That area was home to a significant number of families until WW II factory jobs lured residents away. Bluff School, on the west side of the river, is a strong reminder of the community that once lived in relative harmony with the natural environment. The school is even more evocative – and historically significant -- than the school at Alley Spring because it's still in its original setting. At the same time, Medlock Cave is one of the nicest, most delicate, places on the river, with its gentle cascade coming down the hillside in its hidden cul-de-sac. The problem here is protecting the resources – natural and cultural – while providing adequate accessibility. There has been talk of closing the road that comes in to Medlock and the crossing to the school from K Highway. One point of view is that roads like this one were never real public right of ways; they only led to private homes and should not be now maintained. But the school must have been on a county road, and the claim of local families to have access seems to me to have merit. On the other hand, since Shannon County has improved the old road, visitors drive to the river in significant numbers, which causes environmental problems and detracts from the natural experience of visitors using the river. So the issue is difficult. Just the same, people of good will should be able to reach an accommodation. The NPS should stand firm that motor vehicles shall not detract from the natural experience. I see no compelling reason for visitors to be able to drive to the river; parking 100 yards back, or some reasonable distance, isn't too high a price to pay for a more natural experience. Access to Bluff School is more problematic. Should visitors be allowed to drive across the river to reach it? No, the river and its banks can't take that sort of abuse. Its inaccessibility is part of its value; it wasn't easy for scholars to get to it either. Some places should require a little more effort to visit. And it's easy for floaters to stop and walk. In general, it seems to me that NPS should be able to win respect for a principle of "no vehicles within 100 yards of rivers" except near a few major access points, like Baptist Camp, Cedar Grove, Welch Cave, Akers, and so on. A corollary of this principle would be that vehicles (and, I would add, horses) shall not cross the river except at a few major access points. Old roads crossed the river frequently as they went from homeplace to homeplace, switching banks of the river to avoid bluffs. Every riffle is a potential ford, and busier crossings would have ferries. But trails could be laid out to stay on the same side of the river. Visitors' experiences of the Riverways would be enhanced by a system of trails through the fields and forests, but staying back from the rivers. There would be some construction and maintenance expenses involved in providing interesting routes that stay on the same side of the river, but trails would be an economical way to provide access but limit problems, and overall the resource would be better protected and visitors would have richer experiences.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65201
695	1) Alternative C or the "no action" alternative is already close to my view for the ideal in managing the Ozark Scenic Riverways. What would I change? I would add greater interpretive activities and facilities, and ENSURE ACCESS to the river, and forest environments. - These are the Ozark National SCENIC Riverways- which for me (and many reginoal families), means recreation- the rivers are meant to be seen and used. Although this is a National asset, most of the users live in and around the Ozarks- meaning Missouri, Arkansas and Oklahoma. - I do not believe the river is "too crowded"... the river's use increases during the warm months as expected and provides incredible recreation and natural environmental experiences for people. But most of the year the river is quiet and peaceful. - I do agree that some behaviors have been	7/29/2009	No			MO	63090

	<p>excessive, but the Park Service has made great inroads to controlling this and the river is much nicer in recent years. - Greater interpretative program management would be nice in the warm, summer months. 2) The plan SHOULD INCLUDE the following: - Resource-based recreation and Mixed-Use opportunities - Hunting and fishing ACCESS and opportunities - Canoeing, Kayaking, Rafting and Tubing - Hiking, Backpacking and Camping - River camping opportunities (improved with facilities where feasible) - Interpretive centers where feasible, and program management - Providing access for hunting and fishing- and being able to "get there" is extremely important. - There should also be a forest management plan working in concert with adjunct landowners to ensure the health of the region- Wilderness designation would prevent or hinder this effort. 3) The plan SHOULD NOT INCLUDE: - Wilderness designation. This would effectively prevent access to forests for countless recreational opportunities, most specifically involving hunting and access to multi-species hunting opportunities. The Service could control how much access was granted for vehicles and ATV's, and in what manner without wilderness designation, but it seems excessive to designate so much wilderness in the region. Wilderness designation would put far too much of the environment "off limits" for any real access or use. Most of us drive for miles to reach the area- we don't have the time or ability to hike in for miles to use and visit wilderness. - Motorized Boating: We could do without motorized boating in its present form- I see this as more destructive than most activities. There are river opportunities for motorized boaters outside the ONSR. Possible reduce motorized boating to less than 8 h.p. or remove altogether. 4) - The springs are very important and should be protected/managed. Interpretative programs and controlled access would be optimal, but also to allow managed access for diving, etc. - Trout fishing opportunities and access should be preserved for everyone. Along with the history of the region- trout have been a part of the river environment for over 125 years. 5) I believe the most important strategy is one that balances resource USE with STEWARDSHIP. We need to ensure the people can see and use these beautiful national treasures, in a managed, constructive manner. Providing interpretive opportunities and access coupled with education and recreational experience will best meet the needs of the people and the nation as a whole. Thank you for your time and effort.</p>						
696	<p>Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren thank you!</p>	7/29/2009	No			IL	60622
697	<p>Alternative A comes closest to what needs to be done but does not go far enough. Much more enforcement of existing horsepower limits, illegal roads and access and needed budget to do so. Educational component of Alternative B is needed (even to the point of warnings to females on hormonal birth control from peeing in river). Protection of the resource itself needs to be overriding priority above all else. If the river is degraded then all else is reduced in value. If people want to ride horses, ATV's and large motor boats there are many other places they can go. The ONSR should never be allowed to become a "Six Flags/Whitewater" Park combination. Low impact river use should be given top priority above any other heavy footprint use. Horsepower limits on motor boats should be much more restrictive above Big Springs landing. ATV's should be totally prohibited from bluff to bluff in watershed. Horses should be same. This comes from a horse owner, ATV owner and motor boat owner, I go to the river to enjoy a wilderness experience, I can do all these other activities in my backyard or on a large lake. All illegal roads and access should be closed. This is a NATIONAL treasure and park, not a strictly local resource.</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	65738
698	<p>I feel that the Ozark Scenic Waterway should be put into as natural a state as is possible. Proposal A fills my needs better than any of the other proposals. Paul Feldker</p>	7/29/2009	No			IL	62298
699	<p>Protect the river above all else. I own and ride horses, ATV's and motor boats but I go to the river to enjoy the beauty and solitude of near wilderness that does not include the sights and sounds of civilization. All illegal roads and access should be closed, horses and ATV's should be banned from watershed valley. Motor horsepower limits should be strictly enforced and reduced above Big Spring. Alternative A is a good start but does not go far enough in restrictions to negative impacts to this valuable resource. More protection, less development, less impact is needed. Please return to original intent of protection of the river resource as first and overriding priority. All other uses are secondary.</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	65738
700	<p>1) The best alternative presented is the No-Action. This alternative is most closely near my ideal of the best management of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers and the surrounding land. More ideally the management agency would contribute in a meaningful way to the area school districts in as much as the poverty of the area is directly connected to the holding of the profitable land by the federal government and no taxes are created. Payment in lieu of taxes is a pitiful program that is historically underfunded and even un-funded by Congress. 2)Management of the high traffic area from Waymeyer to the bridge in Van Buren should reflect intelligent, creative planning and distribution of all types of watercraft from inner tubes, kayaks,raft and john boats. 3)The concept of creating another Wilderness area in the region is wildly misguided. A wilderness area is readily available for those who seek such serenity in the nearby Irish Wilderness. The misguided creation of such an area would further delete what meager resources it currently derives from visitors. Travelers have the luxury of visiting the area and relishing in it's untouched splendor and tranquility before returning to their own communities filled with modern schools, roads and services blithely unaware that a community impoverished by the existence of such beautiful surroundings struggles through four seasons each year attempting to provide the most basis services of protection and education to it's members. 4) The stretch of the Current from Pin Oak to Rector Chute belonged to by husbands family before smooth talking bureaucrats threatened them into surrendering the heart of their cherished family farm to the National Park service for the creation of the river ways. Words fail to convey the meaning that stretch of the River holds for our family. It may be yours on paper but it will always remain ours in our hearts as it has this past 100 years and shall remain so into the future so long as the river shall run. 5) Other national parks and areas of recreation exist through out our country that share and support their local community. Our family has visited many parks and</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	63965

	seen communities flourish as visitors seek solace in their beautiful places. Provision must be put in place providing resources and opportunity that in some small way off sets the burden of the mixed blessing of having beauty worthy of preserving as your home town.						
701	My name is Anah McMahon, and I'm a strong advocate for keeping the environment in it's natural state with as little disruption by human's actions as possible. Its arrogant to think that the natural world revolves around us. Please consider the following points- Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have an opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! Thank you.	7/29/2009	No			IL	60657
702	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers!	7/29/2009	No			IL	60430
703	1) I favor Alternative B as it has the best blend of cultural, recreational, educational, and protective elements as I see them for ONSR. ONSR does not do enough to foster education regarding the natural and cultural resources by interacting with our visitors. This is true of Law Enforcement Rangers, Interpretation and other divisions. By providing guided and self-guided activities, as outlined in this alternative, is a step in that direction. I am in favor of recreation, which is part of the parks enabling legislation, balanced with resource protection which I realize is a difficult balance to achieve. 2) In Alternative A, I am in favor of closing illegal roads and trails within the park boundaries and re-establishing native vegetation. The public should be provided with reasons why this is being done so that they have a better understanding of "why". The closures need to properly marked so that visitors know what is open to them and what is not. Once this is done, the park needs to enforce the closures and make sure the public adheres to the regulations. I would very much like to see the expansion of the non-motorized trail systems throughout the park as proposed in Alternative C. The horse trail system is too concentrated in the Jacks Fork/Two Rivers areas. Additional hiking/horse trails need to be provided in the Upper and Lower Current districts. This would help to spread out the use; allow for alternative riding/hiking locations so that degraded trails could be closed temporarily for maintenance while still providing open trails and also it would provide a variety of experiences. 3) I feel the unrestricted horsepower limit for motorboats, below Big Spring to the park boundary, which is in the No Action Alternative, should be changed to limit motorboat horsepower to 40 HP. The unrestricted HP is too dangerous and is a distraction to the serenity of the area. 4) The park should follow through with the preferred alternatives decided upon in the 1991 Roads & Trails Study (a component of the 1984 General Management Plan) one of which is to establish staging areas in the Upper and Lower Current Districts for horse riders. Also proposed in the Roads and Trails Study and recommended in the 1984 GMP was the establishment of a horse camp ground within the park. The area which had been designated is not suitable as it is in the Jacks Fork area which already has a large concentration of equestrian use due to the Cross Country Trail Ride commercial operation. I suggest establishing the horse camp in the Lower Current District since this area has no commercial horse operations presently which serves this purpose in the Upper and Jacks Fork districts. Of course, the establishment of designated horse trails would have to be a part of this plan. 5) Whatever alternative is favored needs to be managed and the corresponding regulations need to be enforced!!!! The park's past history has been to ignore, dismiss or choose to not follow the alternatives that have been chosen as "preferred" in its management documents. What is the point of developing a GMP, having public scoping, input and alternative selection if the guidelines, objectives and recommendations are not followed, implemented and enforced? This has been the case all too often in the past which only makes ONSR and the NPS look ridiculous, inefficient and confuses the public. The park needs to step up to the plate and follow the directives of their management documents once they are established. The NPS needs to recognize this and provide ONSR with the manpower, funding and resources to carry out the General Management Plan in its entirety.	7/29/2009	No		Show Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen	MO	63965
704	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park, Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails, Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river, Preserve the 3400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring, Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren, and 25hp below Van Buren. After suffering from years of abuse and neglect, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which is one of our most beautiful waterways is in desperate trouble. The spring-fed rivers are polluted and overrun with motorboats and trails are degraded by off-road vehicle use. Management plans must incorporate scientific recommendations to achieve long term preservation. Clean water is the "new gold" and is more important than oil in terms of preserving life and economy; and this precious resource must be protected and preserved.	7/29/2009	No			IL	60901-4645
705	Keep it clean and preserve its natural beauty.	7/29/2009	No		SOA Watch	IL	60016

706	1. Alternative A is my preference, and I think it would direct management efforts back towards the original goals for ONSR. 2. The most important features for inclusion in the plan include: a) increased focus on ecological restoration; b) maintain horsepower limits at least as restrictive as current regulations; b) reduce impacts of equestrian use on the aquatic and riparian zones (e.g., limit trail crossings, re-locate trails out of riparian area); c) reduce impacts of 4WD vehicles and ORVs on aquatic and riparian areas (e.g., eliminate unauthorized roads/trails); d) maximize wilderness protection for areas meeting criteria for wilderness status. 3. Motorized vehicle use poses the greatest threat to both the ecological integrity of the ONSR and the aesthetic experience of the non-motorized user. Off road vehicle use should be prohibited (and this prohibition should be effectively enforced) and roaded access should be limited to designated river access points and public use areas. Equestrian use should also be restricted, especially in riparian areas, and equestrian river crossings should be tightly regulated. 4. The upper Jacks Fork River is especially scenic and ecologically sensitive and high-impact uses of this area should be minimized.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65201
707	1) Option A as it does the most to preserve the natural habitat. 2)The parts that increase public awareness of the unique character of the riverways 3)The parts that increase the usage of motorized boats on the riverways 4)Option A comes closest to addressing the preservation of the natural riverways for future generations to enjoy. 5)Selected locations for trails/user information to increase awareness to the history, wildlife and flora/fauna of the area.	7/29/2009	No			CO	80033
708	1. No-action, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are amazing just the way they are now. 2. I don't feel strongly that any should be included. 3. I feel strongly that alternative a should not be included. Motorboats should be allowed on all areas of the river that they currently are and should not have strict limitations on horsepower other than those that are already in place. 4. No special concerns about certain areas. 5. At this time I have no other suggestions. I think the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is perfect the way it is right now.	7/29/2009	No			MO	63109
709	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Yes. Alternative A If I modified it I would drop the HP limit even more, to 15 HP as maximum on the entire Current River and have the Jack's Fork as non-motorized. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? A reduction in motor size for as much of the scenic river way as possible, the goal of this is to keep it scenic and that is difficult dealing with boats with large outboards, a model would be like the BWCA in Minnesota. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national river ways? Anything with a limit of 40 HP is too high, we should limit motorized use as much as possible, there are plenty of places to use outboard motors on, this is a special jewel that I have enjoyed spending time on fishing and canoeing and it needs to be protected in its natural state. 4)Ozark National Scenic River ways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? I think you identified the Jack's Fork River in your alternatives which is wise, but I feel the entire stretch is such a unique resource that it all should be protected by limiting motor use as much of the system as possible. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national river ways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? I have seen on the Mississippi River up in Minnesota that on the Wild and scenic stretches of the river they organize canoe trips in larger canoes with USFWS/USPS staff to educate people about the value of the river and its unique attributes and the impacts that motorized use causes	7/29/2009	No			MN	55422
710	All current rivers and land must be preserved from any more erosion, roads, buildings, poisons, nonnative species, human interference!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Stop building more roads in parks. Stop snowmobiles in parks. Stop making more hiking/biking trails in parks. Stop leisure motorboats on rivers. Stop the massive fishing in rivers, lakes, ponds, oceans which is depleting the fish. Stop erosion along rivers and waterfronts. Stop all factories and businesses dumping or allowing runoff of their waste products into water & land. Stop mountaintop removals. Stop infringing on animal habitats. Stop the use of pesticides that run off into our waters.	7/29/2009	No			IL	60564
711	1) The plan that best fits what I think should happen on the upper Current river is the No-Action alternative. We as boaters have already adjusted our boating habits at least once in the past. We have invested a lot of money in our houses, cabins, businesses and boats in the local areas around the Current River with the understanding that we could go on and enjoy the river in the manner we choose. The other options that you propose would cost the areas people and businesses much grief and expense to comply. 2)The No-Action alternative is really to only plan that I can feel comfortable with. If, for instance, you cut the H.P. down to 25 in-order to get a family of four or five up to a gravel bar to have a picnic it would take at least two trips to get everyone up river and then just as many to bring everyone back home again. Therefore creating more boat traffic with overloaded boats creating a larger wake and doing more damage to the river. 3)Alternatives A,B,and C all would be a tragedy for the local economy and people. 4)My family has a cabin, which we just spent a considerable amount of money rebuilding after our fourth flood in 30 years, located in the "Van Buren gap" about two miles down river from the bridge. If you go with either alternatives A, B, or C you would force us to only be able to run our boat from our cabin a quarter mile down river and up to the start of the Park unless we load up the boat and drive 5 or 6 miles around the city to the Big Springs boat launch and go down river. If you know anything about boats you probably already know that they have a tendency to break down from time to time and if you go up river you always have the option in the case of a break-down to float back home. My friends, family and I have been going up river past Pin Oak to get away from all the tubes and most of the canoes to either camp out for the night or just to hang out for the day for years now. It is one of the things that I can remember from my childhood that I really hope I can pass on to my kids in the future. 5)If anything I think that the Park Rangers should be more visible, meaning they should not hide in the bushes around Mill Creek and spy on visitors with binoculars catching them break the law. When you see a Police Officer in the street or on the highway you usually straighten up and fly right. this would work the same way with the people who visit your Parks.	7/29/2009	No			MO	63901

712	1) Alternative A is by far superior to others. 2) The only motorized use should be for official patrols and for emergencies, such as rescue. This should be applied for the full length. Also, ATV and other recreational vehicle use must be severely restricted. Erosion control must be a priority. Similarly, horse riding trails should be controlled to maintain a wilderness experience for floaters. As necessary, floats should be restricted to permit all a sense of isolation, peace, quiet. Wall-to-wall floaters does not provide for a wilderness experience. Deny cattle access to the riverway.	7/29/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63033
713	My preference is for Plan A. I am in favor of limiting the number of river and stream access points, because each one causes erosion; ergo, the fewer the better. Also, Horses' hooves cut up the soil, and their droppings pollute the land and water. Horseback riding does need to be limited. I favor limiting the use of high-powered boats. We have lakes and great big rivers--such as the Missouri, Mississippi, and Meramec in my part of the state--that can be enjoyed in these kinds of boats with much less impact on the natural surroundings. One should be able to enjoy the Ozarks National Waterways without roaring motors disturbing the peace. Illegal lanes, roads, trails, etc., need to be closed, and fines imposed on those who disregard the closings. These add to pollution and erosion of the rivers and riverbanks, and increase human contact with native flora and fauna and ensuing disruption thereof. In summary, my concerns are for the quality of life for the native flora and fauna and for hikers, floaters, and campers, as well as preserving the quality of this unique outdoor area. We should do what we can to help everyone "take only pictures and leave only footprints".	7/29/2009	No			MO	63049
714	i favor plan 1 or is it plan A which is the plan that favors a return to an earlier day no motorboats on the upper Jacks Fork or upper current river. I would like all illegal roads closed as it takes away from the wilderness experience when you hear a 4 wheeler driving through the river. John	7/29/2009	No			MO	63042
715	Please protect the watershed area from abuse from ATVs and the quality of the water from too many horse trails close to the river and runoff areas. Thanks Tom Drummond	7/29/2009	No		St. Louis kayak club	MO	63026
716	1) A 2) Less motorboating & Horseback riding 3) Ramping up facilities & programs for heavy people loads 4) The entire ONSR is important. No area should be left out of GMP. 5) N/A	7/29/2009	No			MO	63129
717	As someone who has floated the rivers studied in this document since the 1960's, I am enthusiastic about the opportunity to endorse Plan A which would endeavor to restore the values that we sought and enjoyed on these great rivers years ago. Long ago, my family and friends all but abandoned floating on the parts of the Scenic River system after mid May in order to avoid the kind of nonsense that has become the norm now. Too many outfitters have had unfettered access to the rivers. In more recent years, the onslaught of 4 wheel drive vehicles, some ATV, some just plain old trucks have blasted accesses to what were once gravel bars reachable only on foot or by river. It is very hard now to find a gravel bar to spend the night on that doesn't have an illegal road to it and doesn't bring with it the fear that a boisterous crowd of revelers will invade your camp in the middle of the night. On a late spring float on the Jack's Fork last year, my wife and I were surprised by the roar of engines on the gravel bar that we were approaching by canoe. Up until then, we were floating on the pristine waters of the Jack's Fork. After watching the 6 ATVs ford the river ahead of us, our float changed to the quality of the Mississippi River. They have no business in or near the water. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Please select Plan A for the protection of the resource. Sincerely, David Ulmer	7/29/2009	No			IL	62246
718	1) Alternative A is the best way to manage the Scenic Riverways. Areas for families to enjoy the beauty and serenity of the river should be preserved and restored. 2) Motorboat limits as described in Alternative A. Also, limiting access by closing illegal roads and trails. Big Spring should be studied for wilderness designation. 3) Noise pollution and oil slicks (from motorboats) have no place on a Scenic Riverway. There are plenty of other recreation opportunities in the Ozarks for motorboats. 4) 5) I like the approach of Alternative A in stressing protection of the Ozark heritage and the resulting types of visitor experiences to be provided by the park service and commercial operators.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65552
719	Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/29/2009	No			IL	60445
720	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/29/2009	No			IL	60004
721	As Christians, we are charged to be good STEWARDS of all of God's creation. It is not for us to exploit any living thing out of greed or pride, or for us to decide that any living thing has no good purpose and thus can be callously done away with. The parables of Jesus are full of examples of what happens when a steward does not take careful heed to what becomes of the Master's property. We will be held accountable for how we use, protect, or abuse God's creation. With respect to management: The ban on off-road vehicles must be enforced. Access roads plowed into the river are an ecological and erosion nightmare; re-think. Enforcing horsepower limits for powerboats is essential; you might even consider banning use of motors, which will bring all visitors closer to experiencing the area the way God intended. We must preserve all possible remaining pristine wilderness. Horses are far less damaging to wildlife areas than are any kind of vehicles with wheels. I would strongly recommend ENCOURAGING horse visits and discouraging or OUTLAWING any kind of wheeled traffic. Again, this allows visitors to experience wildlife areas	7/29/2009	No			AR	72401

	in a purely natural manner, at a natural pace. Thank you for considering my comments.						
722	<p>1) Alternative A is close to my idea of BMP for the ONSR. Also, some aspects of Alternative B should be included. Specifically, I like the idea of some new trails being created to enjoy lesser known historical landmarks within the park. I would insist that as a condition of new trail creation and site improvement that ALL SUCH DEVELOPEMENT BE MINIMALLY INVASSIVE TO SURROUNDING WILD AREA AND (NATIVE) INHABITANTS. 2) I feel that Alternative A needs to be included in future management of the river. Keeping the river mostly nonmechanized is very important to me. Also, proposing the Big Spring tract as a wilderness area is the direction I think the area should be going in. I am a kayaker and canoer and I visit the park at least once every year, some years four or five times. I come back every year for the park's unmatched natural beauty and peaceful solitude and quiet. The first year I bought my daughter she was 7. We swam off the gravel bars and floated the waters. The only marks on tis perfect memory were load drunken party kids and motor boats. The character of the river changes when these unwelcome aspects come into the picture. Keeping the river pristine is part of the intention in the park's creation: In 1960 the Dept. of Interior proposed a law to create Scenic Riverways. "Preservation of the area's fragile quality"would be the basic objective of all planning, development and administration. As early as 1969 the Advisory Council warned of overuse, which could destroy the area. 3) Portions of Alternative C should not be included in future managment practices. Those portions include building more boat ramps and implied large vistior welcoming centers. I had also read somewhere that increased motorboat, jetski and horse use would be allowed, if not in Alternative C, then as possible additions. As for the motorboat and jetskis, ABSOLUTELY NOT! It's hard enough as it is to catch a day without to many visitors to the river without adding trouble these machines would cause to both solitude and safety! As for horse use, I feel as long as it does not errode trails and cause the river damage, certain specifically marked areas/trails should be allowed. Keeping them away from the river and delicate ecosystems must be a condition as well as keeping them separated from other park users that might be seeking peace and quiet. 4) The main area of concern for me is Two Rivers and further upriver. The smaller river size and more natural setting demand softer treatment by the public than down river where larger boats and crowds can be accommodated. So many of the springs and delicate caves exist upriver from T.R. and they require the utmost tippee-toeing on the publics' part. Please keep this area safe for the future generations! It is so special to me and my family and so many visitors who have been touched by it's wild beauty. 5) I would think a major approach to the visitor's river experience would be to play up the river's health and cleanliness and how important patron stewardship is. Basically "If you like the park, help keep it beautiful." This would work for several areas: school groups, public groups, person to person contacts in park and at attractions, signage in parks and at facilites and also in winning public support for proposal of management plans. ***** I would like to thank the NPS for including public input in this decision.</p>	7/29/2009	No		MDC SPRINGFIELD Plateau Master Naturalists	MO	65803
723	We need beauty to stay human.	7/29/2009	No			IL	60073
724	This comment documents my conversation with Patty Davis of your office, in which I requested until August 14 to submit comments on behalf of the Missouri Attorney General's Office. This request was submitted in order to allow coordination with affected state agencies. She left me a voice message on July 28, 2009 indicating that this request had been granted.	7/29/2009	No		Missouri Attorney General's Office	MO	65102
725	<p>1. No-action would be fine with me, but really I think we need to step back and really rethink about how our current activities are affecting the delicate ecosystem of the area. I am really leaning more towards Alternative A. 2. Alternative A. 3. Alternative C. That area, and the people in it, have survived hundreds and hundreds of years without motorized vehicles and watercraft. Fewer restrictions will only hasten the area's decline!!! You know that as well as I do. 4. I have floated and camped on every mile in the ONSR, many, many times. My fondest childhood memories took place there! Please, please protect it from those who just dont understand its place in the world and in my heart. Once the water quality declines for that area, its a fast downhill decline for everything else that depends on it. You know if less restrictions and more access is granted, it will only be a mater of time! 5. Do everything in your power to protect the quality of water that flows into and through the park! IT is what the park is all about! It's just that simple. Nathan Oehrle, Ph.D. Ozarkian for life.</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	65240
726	<p>1) Alternatives A and B are closest to my idea of the best way to manage ONSR. I think it would be beneficial to combine these two alternatives, particularly the interpretive educational component of B and the emphasis on non-motorized boating of A. 2) non-motorized boating (Alternative A) and interpretive educational trails, discovery sites and small learning centers (Alternative B) 3) more boat ramps and higher tolerance for resource impacts (Alternative C) 4) I've always enjoyed the stretch of the Current River from Baptist Camp/Tan Vat to Round Spring, particularly Welch Spring, Pulltite Spring and Cabin and Round Spring. I think Alternatives A and B address those issues related to those areas. 5) none that haven't already been mentioned</p>	7/29/2009	No			IL	60657
727	<p>Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Re: Comments, long range planning. My experiences in the ONSR have thus far been limited to a college canoe trip on the Current River, as part of a conservation class. But that was enough to convince me of the importance of this area, and its unique natural beauty. This area needs to be preserved, and it is important that the National Park Service be willing to invest the money and effort needed to accomplish this. Specifically: It is very important that illegal access to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers be halted. Use of ATV's in the Riverways area should be banned completely if possible, or restricted to developed roads. Motor boat horsepower should be limited, and usage of these rivers by motor boats should be restricted to certain areas of the river. The number of horses allowed access to the river and nearby trails at one time should be reduced, because horses do have an adverse effect on both rivers and trails. I am particularly</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	63119- 1219

	<p>distressed by reports in the papers about rowdy conduct by irresponsible people in canoes. If more staff is needed to police these rivers, then the necessary funds should be spent to hire the staff. There is a report in the papers stating that part of the former Big Spring State Park has been suggested as a possible Wilderness Area. I am strongly in favor of this proposal, as well as other efforts to preserve as much as possible the primitive wilderness character of the Riverways. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this long range plan. Our children and grandchildren should be able to experience the glories of this area themselves, and not have to be content with reading about it in books. Delwin Johnson 837 Fairdale St. Louis, MO 63119-1219 (314) 968-1246</p>						
728	<p>Cave Research Foundation Preliminary Alternatives Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan The Cave Research Foundation and other cave research groups have a long history of involvement with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Since the inception of the park, volunteers have worked with the NPS on cave and karst issues. A formal volunteer agreement with the Missouri Speleological Survey was initiated in 1980 and has continued to this day under the auspices of Cave Research Foundation. The enabling legislation for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) calls for "...conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values... including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River..." One of the changes to the initial bill was to "make clear that recreation is a purpose". However, the primary purpose remains conservation and preservation. One of the insights of this time is to make it obvious that the rivers are not just to be preserved but used. By comparison, rivers in Yellowstone National Park are preserved but not to be used by visitors. However, it is difficult to imagine that anyone in 1964 envisioned the kind of use that the rivers are undergoing today or that such use would be deemed appropriate by the 1964 standards under which the park was established. What is necessary to determine is whether the ONSR will be managed as befits a unit of the National Park Service or if it will continue to decline to something approaching county park status. In what follows, we will discuss what we perceive as problems existing within ONSR, followed by a discussion of the alternatives offered. Finally, we are including a brief discussion of cave and karst management. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES Easement Issues Over the years scenic easement regulations have frequently been ignored or overruled. This has resulted in many great and lasting changes to the scenic qualities of the park. -Scenic easements were entered into voluntarily by landowners. -Scenic easement standards must be adhered to and enforced. Horsepower Limits The present limits on power boat use are described in the River Use Management Plan, written in 1989. This was a follow-up to the 1980 GMP which delayed river use guidelines until outstanding litigation had been settled. Comments on the draft GMP revealed that 80% of respondents favored limiting horsepower. At that time, power boat use was low, probably only 10% of present traffic, and yet many conflicts and complaints were noted. Since the 1989 horsepower limitations were established power boat use has increased exponentially. Virtually all of this use seems to be by local residents, i.e. people from adjoining counties utilizing the park as a day-use site. The 1989 study noted that "the potential for accidents resulting from increased speeds and size of motorboats presently being used... is a growing safety concern..." These problems have greatly increased in the past twenty years. Today it is difficult to take a summer canoe trip below Round Spring without encountering vast numbers of motorboats and their attendant safety problems. The greatest use of these powerboats is speed-boating, with few being used for camping or fishing, traditional uses of powerboats at the time of the enabling legislation. The problem of safety has been made obvious by recent incidents including the unfortunate deaths of boat passengers. -Powerboat use is increasing in regularity and in total days. -Average horsepower continues to climb. -Use of motorboats has changed from camping/fishing to pleasure speed-boating. -Boating courtesy has become a thing of the past. Rarely do boaters slow when meeting canoes. Near accidents and swampings are increasing. Canoeists report harassment by motorboats. -Large parties of motorboaters are taking over gravel bars and leaving trash behind, making it difficult for canoe campers to even use these gravel bars for camping. -Motorboats are noisy, frequently being able to be heard for more than a mile away. -Exhaust and oil residue are polluting the air and water of the park; the visitor experience continues to decline in quality. -Excessive motorboat use has driven family canoe users away from such sections of the river as Powder Mill and Log Yard. -An annual boat permit for the park should be required. Canoe and Tube Use While excessive canoes detract from the visitor experience, they are not as disruptive as motorboats. Most of the complaints about canoe use are related to odious behavior by the occupants. We believe this can be addressed by law enforcement. -The practice of an outfitter bringing canoes from one area to another apparently continues and should not. Concession canoes should be limited to designated zones. -Such limitations on concession could lead to greater use on certain zones that are not currently undergoing much use such as Two Rivers, Powder Mill, and the Log Yard. Reestablishment of a canoe concession in the Powder Mill or Log Yard areas would enhance the use of the park. -An annual boat permit for the park should be required for all canoes and tubes. - The 1989 river use plan mentioned additional measures that could be used to mitigate problems but these were never implemented. Horse Use and Trails Horse use has greatly increased in recent years, largely as a consequence of increased commercial facilities. Viable policies that protect the park have not been developed. At the same time, hiking trails have not been increased and a long-term plan for doing so has not been developed. -Trails were laid out by horse users rather than the park. Normal compliance procedures and assessments do not seem to have occurred. -Due to location and use, trails are rutted and unusable by foot traffic. -Horse feces and urine continue to go into the rivers and tributary streams. -Some present trails should be closed and alternatives such as old roadbeds should be explored. -Day use limits should be established. -Horse permits should be required and commercial operators should be required to be concessionaires. -River crossings should be greatly reduced and eliminated anywhere possible. The issue is one of resource protection, not convenience for horse riders. -Day hiking and backpacking trails should be increased. Wherever possible, these should utilize old traces and road beds rather than making new impacts on the resource. Roads and ATV Use The past 25 years have seen many traces become well-used roads. The result has been to degrade the visitor experience. Traditional use was to utilize gravel bars for overnight river camping. Today it is harder and harder to find a campsite that is not accessible via motorized traffic. Campers have reported more and more intrusions during the night hours and conflicts keep increasing. ATV traffic continues to rise. -Many old traces and illegal roads need to be closed, some permanently and others by gate. -Old traces (historic roadbeds) could be used as hiking and horse trails, such as are done at Buffalo NR. -Illegal ATV/ORV traffic must be stopped. While this is a law enforcement issue, it has not</p>	7/29/2009	No		Cave Research Foundation	MO	63620

	been adequately addressed by management policy. River Accesses and Primitive Camping This is part of the road issue. Most of the new roads, illegal roads, or widened roads are utilized to access the rivers. As these roads have increased in use, so has maintenance of them, by the NPS, county, or even individuals acting on federal lands. This has resulted in severe degradation of the riparian vegetation cover, and it has resulted in visitor experiences that are far from what was envisioned in the enabling legislation. Trailers and other vehicles are now a common site along the rivers. Roads now go all the way to the water at hundreds of points within the park. Trailers are dumping human waste on gravel bars. Other trailers are camped on the river, unattended, for weeks on end. -Illegal roads and widened roads need to be closed. -River banks that have been degra						
729	I support steps that need to be taken to keep our waterways clean. Pleae try to enforce the hp limit and other measures to prevent erosion. C. Gentile	7/29/2009	No		stlouis canoe and kayak	MO	63038
730	1. Alternative A, with increased enforcement. 2. Wilderness designation, resource protection. 3. Anything that would send more people into the wild caves. 4. No comment. 5. I've been on the Current between Cedar Grove and Round Spring maybe 20 times in the last 20 years without ever seeing a ranger on the river. A greater presence would probably help with many of the problems.	7/29/2009	No			MO	63122
731	I think too much access to these waterways without guide lines has GMP guide lines and clean up the waterways and limit and control taken them where they are now and we need to stop this and use the their use to preserve them for the future generations.	7/29/2009	No			IL	60067
732	1. action A 2. action A 5. keep riverways as natural as possible	7/29/2009	No			MO	63701
733	Regarding number 1). I will also submit the signed letter via mail on our letterhead. Thank you. July 28, 2009 Reed E. Detring, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 Dear Mr. Detring: The following are comments on behalf of the St. Louis Audubon Society regarding the preliminary alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. The St. Louis Audubon Society has over 3,000 members in the greater St. Louis area. We are a local affiliate of the National Audubon Society whose mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, primarily birds and other wildlife and their habitats, for the benefit of humanity and the earth's biological diversity. We commend the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for its decision to review its management practices. The increased pressure of horses, mechanized vehicles, easement issues and lack of funding for enforcement is threatening the water quality and overall integrity of this superbly featured region. Many of our Missouri natural areas have been studied for bird habitat and conservation recommendations. The Riverways is within the Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA). This is one of 47 IBA's in the state, and is exceptional because it is one of the largest IBA's and overlaps with two of Missouri Department of Conservation's designated Conservation Opportunity Areas (COA). Since IBA's are important for migrating and breeding birds, the St. Louis Audubon Society and other Audubon affiliates hope to assure that conservation goals for these areas are met. Of the general management proposals for ONSR, the St. Louis Audubon Society recommends Alternative A, opposing Alternatives B and C. Because of the conflicting nature of many of the current activities that are degrading the stream banks and water quality, firm action is definitely in order. We support stronger management with regard to access enforcement and habitat restoration. We oppose increased recreational use and development, particularly in the areas that ONSR states are to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. We agree with a policy to further restrict motorized watercraft, all-terrain vehicles, horse volumes, and unauthorized access points. We support the proposal for wilderness designation of the Big Spring section. The enjoyment, beauty and benefit of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be dependent on it remaining as natural, undeveloped, remote and wildlife-diverse as possible. Sincerely, Karen B. Meyer Vice President of Conservation St. Louis Audubon Society	7/29/2009	No		St. Louis Audubon Society	MO	63122
734	Dear Superintendent Detring, First of all, thank you for your hard work as Superintendent of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I truly appreciate ONSR and the entire National Park System that our Government has had the foresight to protect and make available for Americans and all visitors to our country for generations to come. I am writing to comment on the General Management Plan currently open for public input. As an outdoor enthusiast, I have enjoyed ONSR for many years, which included a summer (1993) working as a volunteer for Interpretation and Research. Having experienced many of the wonderful riverways in Missouri, the Jacks Fork and Current River have become my favorites as the diversity and beauty is unmatched in any other stream system that I have visited. In Newsletter #3, there is a section called "Purpose and Significant Statements" that says, "...the National Park Service is required to be true to the different purposes of the national riverways and ensure that its special qualities are protected for current and future generations." This section includes a description of the various special qualities that set ONSR apart from any other stream system in Missouri and the country. I would like to urge you to work to put the objective to protect this resource before all other demands on ONSR. The rivers and the riparian corridor are like no other in the state and country and, in my mind, merit a Management Plan with far-reaching restrictions to protect this outstanding resource. I think, canoeing, tubing, horseback riding, ATV use, and motorboats must be closely regulated with limits to preserve and minimize negative ecological impacts. With this, Alternative A is the closest match to my views. This past weekend, my family and three others floated from Two Rivers to Roberts Field, camping on a gravel bar half way along. I do not usually float this part of the river and it was obvious why, as the motor boat traffic was heavy, with boats coming through at what seemed like five-minute intervals. The pollution from the exhaust was thick and lingered over the water and made breathing the air very unpleasant and unhealthy for all. The noise pollution from the speed boats disrupted the peace and tranquility of the experience as well as the wake that many of the boats caused, which in places is	7/29/2009	No		Missouri Whitewater Association	MO	63017

	causing obvious shoreline degradation. A lot of the motor boat drivers were polite and slowed down to yield to floaters, but there were some that did not slow down, or they came to a stop, but then sped past once they had clear passage. At one point, we had to wave frantically as the kids were swimming in the river with a motor boat fast approaching. All of us from the group felt that the motor boats were out of place and dangerous on the river. I can certainly see how the motor boat owners enjoy the river, but there are ample other places in Missouri to boat, like the various lakes formed from dams across once clear, free-flowing rivers. Had we not braved this section of the river, we would not have seen Blue Spring a true gem of the Ozarks and perhaps the crown jewel. I would suggest where motor boats are allowed, consider having some periods when motor boats are prohibited so visitors can plan accordingly. In closing, I would like to thank you and all your staff for everything you have done to preserve this very special resource and make our visit to the park very special. Pressure on the environment is ever increasing, and I would encourage ONSR to work to stay true to its core mission to protect this national natural and cultural treasure. Thank you, Joe Sartori						
735	Angel Kruzen Director of the Missouri Water Sentinel Program, Sierra Club 213 E. 3rd Street Mountain View, MO 65548 Reed E. Detring, Superintendent: Ozark National Scenic Riverways PO Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 I appreciate the chance to comment on the many issues that impact the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The free-flowing Jacks Fork and Current Rivers, make this National Park the crown jewel of our state. I have lived here for over 30 years and have seen a lot of the problems develop in the Park over that time. I have also watched and participated in the growing local support for protecting and maintaining these rivers. Therefore, protections for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be continued and strengthened in the current management plan being proposed. After carefully review of the General Management plan, it is evident how vague it is written. Therefore, the following points should be included and considered in the plan: • The need to close roads and trails that have been illegally developed • An emphasis on traditional, non mechanized recreational experiences. • Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks • Restoring the river corridor • A proposal for wilderness designation for the Big Spring tract • Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks • The network of small learning centers with facilities the would include classrooms (I am concerned about the concept that you will have to have additional trails in order to do this) • Restoring the river corridor and having a focused program for research, monitoring and preservation • The Plan is very vague. It needs more information on how you plan to accomplish the goals. • It doesn't deal with the ATV problems. Federal law supersedes state law! ATV's shouldn't be allowed in a National park... let alone one that is statutorily required to "Preserving and protecting the watersheds of the Jacks Fork and Current River". • Easement land needs to be better enforced. To many lands owners with easements restrictions have violated the legal requirements and nothing has been done. The locals even say do what you want because the Park never enforces the restrictions. This needs to stop. • Better and swifter enforcement of counties/cities that violate the clean water act and decided that they can do as they please on ONSR land. • When you look at the about of land in development in Alt. C this raises a LARGE red flag. With the plan being so vague it could mean one thing to this Superintendent and something else for another. To this superintendent it might mean flush toilets, & a Nature Center. But to the next one it could mean a RV park. That is another reason why I strongly oppose Alt C. • Motor boats. NONE should be allowed pass two rivers on the Current or Jacks Fork except the boats that the rangers need to do there job. Horse power should be limited from two Rivers to Van Buren to 10 hp and pass Van Buren 25hp. I understand that because of the way the law was written that you have to let the motorized boats on the river but you can restrict there use. I have been on the river in a canoe when a motorboat has gone by. They thought that it would be fun to swamp the canoe. (I'm not the only one with this experience) The HP needs to be restricted. • This plan doesn't define the expanding problem of Horse trail ride businesses along the Current and Jacks Fork. Increasing the trails for Horses proposed in Alternative C just adds to the problem. The trail rides need to be controlled like the canoe concessioners are. There needs to be strictly enforced limited river crossings, Limit the numbers of facilities outside of the Park and the numbers of horses that stay at the facilities that are allowed to use the park. And also have a method to identify the horse and rider from those facilities. The horse trails need to be removed from the "sacred zones" (Flood Plain) and the number of horse trail river crossings need to be limited. • Increase the numbers of Rangers and maintenance crew. Removing trails, roads etc., will require more rangers and maintenance crew to keep up with the situations that will arise from this. I am concerned that Alt A doesn't allow the trails to be removed from just the flood plain but forces them to be removed altogether. This is not my intend. Right now having read the Alternatives and seeing that I have only one choice I will have to go with Alt. A as the best plan and the most protective of the river.	7/29/2009	No		Water Sentinel, Missouri	MO	65548
736	Hello, Please protect and preserve Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a serene and tranquil wilderness refuge apart from chaotic, self-absorbed modern culture. Please let wildlife have a peaceful and safe home and keep human interference and intrusion to a minimum, especially of those who only abuse and exploit nature. Please don't allow irresponsible, selfish imbeciles to destroy the environment and the tranquility with their polluting, rut-cutting and erosion-causing four-wheelers and other off-road vehicles. The irresponsible can go play on a dirt track somewhere. Please keep Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a refuge for quiet contemplation and relaxation, a harbor away from the madness of our frantic and noisy society, where one may commune with all that is good and be spiritually renewed, as God intended of His wholesome gift of nature. Thank you, David Parker	7/29/2009	No			AR	72120
737	(1) Alternative A is the closest match to how I would like to see these public lands managed. I would like the rivers to be a natural habitat for the native species that live there now, but also for those that may have been living there in greater numbers in previous years, prior to some of the heavier and more motorized use of the rivers. I want the springs that feed the rivers to continue to do so, in an unimpeded way. And I'd like the rivers to remain pristine, clear and unpolluted by the waste or byproducts of either machines (motor boat motors) or touring animals (horses used for massive trail rides to cross the rivers). Overall, I'd like to see the rivers in a very natural state, pristine and quiet. (2) I'd truly like to see minimal or no motorboat use of the river, and where motorboats are allowed that the motor horsepower be restricted to a very low number in order to reduce both pollution from the motors, and to reduce the physical and aural (auditory) disturbance to the banks and inhabitants. I absolutely would like eliminate any use of the rivers by wheeled vehicles such as ATVs or 4-wheel drive vehicles that tear up the river bottom and stir up sediment.	7/29/2009	No			MO	63132

	Again, my goal is restoring the river to a pristine environment, both in the water and on the shores. I'd also like to restrict the size or number of trail rides that result in large numbers of horses crossing the river and adding their waste to the waters, whether by fecal matter, urine, or by stirring up the bottom. (3) I don't feel that any aspects of alternatives that permit motorboat use, ATV or 4-Wheel drive use, or large horse trail ride use should be allowed in this protected riverway. I would like to see a very natural environment for these scenic rivers. (4) For the most part, Alternative A would address this fairly well. (5) The strategies that should be implemented would be to restore the rivers to as pristine and quiet an environment as possible, so visitors would see the land as it is in its natural environment and in addition that visitors would have the least impact on this wonderful wilderness area as possible. I truly appreciate your consideration of my views.					
738	(1) Alternative A is the closest match to how I would like to see these public lands managed. I would like the rivers to be a natural habitat for the native species that live there now, but also for those that may have been living there in greater numbers in previous years, prior to some of the heavier and more motorized use of the rivers. I want the springs that feed the rivers to continue to do so, in an unimpeded way. And I'd like the rivers to remain pristine, clear and unpolluted by the waste or byproducts of either machines (motor boat motors) or touring animals (horses used for massive trail rides to cross the rivers). Overall, I'd like to see the rivers in a very natural state, pristine and quiet. (2) I'd truly like to see minimal or no motorboat use of the river, and where motorboats are allowed that the motor horsepower be restricted to a very low number in order to reduce both pollution from the motors, and to reduce the physical and aural (auditory) disturbance to the banks and inhabitants. I absolutely would like eliminate any use of the rivers by wheeled vehicles such as ATVs or 4-wheel drive vehicles that tear up the river bottom and stir up sediment. Again, my goal is restoring the river to a pristine environment, both in the water and on the shores. I'd also like to restrict the size or number of trail rides that result in large numbers of horses crossing the river and adding their waste to the waters, whether by fecal matter, urine, or by stirring up the bottom. (3) I don't feel that any aspects of alternatives that permit motorboat use, ATV or 4-Wheel drive use, or large horse trail ride use should be allowed in this protected riverway. I would like to see a very natural environment for these scenic rivers. (4) For the most part, Alternative A would address this fairly well. (5) The strategies that should be implemented would be to restore the rivers to as pristine and quiet an environment as possible, so visitors would see the land as it is in its natural environment and in addition that visitors would have the least impact on this wonderful wilderness area as possible. I truly appreciate your consideration of my views.	7/29/2009	No		MO	63132
739	(1) Alternative A is the closest match to how I would like to see these public lands managed. I would like the rivers to be a natural habitat for the native species that live there now, but also for those that may have been living there in greater numbers in previous years, prior to some of the heavier and more motorized use of the rivers. I want the springs that feed the rivers to continue to do so, in an unimpeded way. And I'd like the rivers to remain pristine, clear and unpolluted by the waste or byproducts of either machines (motor boat motors) or touring animals (horses used for massive trail rides to cross the rivers). Overall, I'd like to see the rivers in a very natural state, pristine and quiet. (2) I'd truly like to see minimal or no motorboat use of the river, and where motorboats are allowed that the motor horsepower be restricted to a very low number in order to reduce both pollution from the motors, and to reduce the physical and aural (auditory) disturbance to the banks and inhabitants. I absolutely would like eliminate any use of the rivers by wheeled vehicles such as ATVs or 4-wheel drive vehicles that tear up the river bottom and stir up sediment. Again, my goal is restoring the river to a pristine environment, both in the water and on the shores. I'd also like to restrict the size or number of trail rides that result in large numbers of horses crossing the river and adding their waste to the waters, whether by fecal matter, urine, or by stirring up the bottom. (3) I don't feel that any aspects of alternatives that permit motorboat use, ATV or 4-Wheel drive use, or large horse trail ride use should be allowed in this protected riverway. I would like to see a very natural environment for these scenic rivers. (4) For the most part, Alternative A would address this fairly well. (5) The strategies that should be implemented would be to restore the rivers to as pristine and quiet an environment as possible, so visitors would see the land as it is in its natural environment and in addition that visitors would have the least impact on this wonderful wilderness area as possible. I truly appreciate your consideration of my views.	7/29/2009	No		MO	63132
740	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/30/2009	No		IL	60447
741	1. I support the No-Action Alternative and I would not alter it. 2. I believe the No-Action Alternative should be used for future management. 3. I do not support any alternative that adds additional limitations to boat access or horsepower limitations on the national riverways. 4. The areas surrounding Van Buren, MO and Big Spring Park are most important in maintaining a No-Action Alternative. 5. Improved education of first-time floaters/canoers about the importance of not littering and respecting the national riverways.	7/30/2009	No		MO	63109
742	the current river is our most beautiful waterway. it is unthinkable that it is being ruined by horse and boat fuel pollution. Please limit the number of horse trail crossings by fining the owners of trail rides and ranches who encourage and advertise all these trails. Ticket ATV users by asking some official personnel to work weekends when ATV usage is high and take other days off. Keep the upper river for non-motorized or low horsepower boats. We have been intimidated by boats while canoeing. the canoe consessionaires have said that this intimidation has affected their business. Encourage, with threat of fines, the horse trail concessonaires to keep a maximum on the size of trail rides and encourage the trails to be used higher in the hills by advertising the great views and vistas and wildflowers and downplay the river crossings. Remind everyone that if the pollution continues to rise the river might be closed to anything other can canoes and non-motorized vehicles and trails might be completely prohibited from crossing the river. I love canoeing, watching the birds, enjoy seeing families having safe fun in the outdoors. Thank you. KEEP OUR RIVERS CLEAN!!!!!!!!!!!!!! S.Smith	7/30/2009	No		IL	62236

743	I believe Plan A is the best of these choices. We must protect (or salvage what we can) what little remaining natural beauty left in Missouri.	7/30/2009	No		Franklin County Club	NE	63069
744	To whom it may concern: On Sunday, May 31, 2009, my husband and I with another friend began an overnight float trip on the Current River. We put in at Round Spring about 3:30 p.m., hoping to avoid the weekend power boat crowd. Were we ever wrong! Boat after boat, with their engines roaring, zoomed past us. Not one showed the river etiquette of slowing for a canoe. Before we reached our gravel bar to spend the night, we passed a couple quietly fishing from their johnboat. They warned us of what was ahead. They had passed 39 johnboats tied up on the river. Needless to say we hoped we could find our spot for the night before reaching this point. We were lucky, we found the perfect spot. As we set up camp the power boats sped past. It was like being at Lake of the Ozarks instead of the beautiful Current River. We spent a quiet evening listening to the gurgling shoal and the animals of the night. We rested well. As we paddled on Monday the river remained unoccupied by power boats. To our dismay at the larger gravel bars were piles of trash. At several access points there were trailers parked, as if they'd picked their spot for the summer. Several places looked like a shanty town. I celebrate my 20th year of canoeing on the Current River this year. Never have I experienced the rudeness of power boaters like this most recent trip. Curiously enough I have never seen a park ranger out on the river patrolling. The park is called the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The scenic part of this last trip was not as memorable because of management practices that currently exist. As you consider your management plan I would encourage you to consider the following: 1. Lower horsepower limits for power boats. 2. Limit power boat access. 3. Patrol the river. 4. Allow camper trailers at only designated camp sites. Although it is not perfect, I generally support alternative A. Thanks for your consideration of my letter. Sincerely, Patti M. House P.S. It was with sorrow that I read about the recent deaths on the Current River as a result of a power boat accident. I am sorry to say that it was inevitable.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63701
745	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/30/2009	No			MO	64034
746	Illegal and/or destructive use by any individual or group deprives the rest of us from the intended use of NSRs. Enact and enforce regulations that prevent abuse and misuse from destroying these irreplaceable resources.	7/30/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63112
747	Plan A or B is the way to go To reduce HP futher greatly reduces families from safely using the river	7/30/2009	No			MO	63965
748	Dear Sirs, I would like to add my support to better controlled use of Missouri rivers which would lessen environmental damage, ban motor boats, and control numbers of people. These are very fragile systems that need to be preserved and sustained. We should enjoy their beauty under a sustainable plan described in your alternatives. thank you, David Kemper	7/30/2009	No		nature conservancy	MO	63124
749	1606 Luce St. Cape Girardeau MO 63701 July 29, 2009 Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways Van Buren MO 63965 Dear Reader: My experience with the Ozark Riverways goes back to the early 1960's. I floated the Jacks Fork and rode the Powder Mill ferry before the park was created. In 1968 I took an overnight float trip (my first) from Powder Mill to Big Spring. In 1975 I began mapping caves in the park and surrounding areas. How things have changed since then! I have visited virtually the entire park in one way or the other and the entire park is of great importance to me personally. The NPS has identified reasons of significance for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Included in these are: - Significant river systems, spring systems, and cave systems. -Jacks Fork and Current are two of only three Outstanding National Resource Waters in the state. -The rich terrestrial and aquatic biological diversity. -The rich landscape of historic, archaeological, and Ozark cultural sites. -High quality recreational experiences of the type that was identified in the enabling legislation. I would argue that most of these items of significance are in danger. Following are just a few of the most important issues that are apparent. Horsepower Limits When I floated from Powder Mill to Big Spring we saw one motorboat until we got to Big Spring. This was on a weekend. The boat had a 3½ horsepower Mercury on it – I can remember it well – and it was motivating upstream with no problem. It wouldn't go 40 knots but that wasn't the point. The person using it was fishing, a traditional use. We saw a couple of other motors on jonboats that were tied up near Van Buren, none of which had big motors. The tour boats at Big Spring had 25 horse motors and we marveled at their size. The point is: for the traditional values that the park was created to preserve, small motors are all that is necessary. The Ozark Riverways was not created in order to provide high-speed motorized boating. Nearby lakes are more than adequate for that purpose. The upper rivers should have no motors at all on them; the stretch below Big Spring could support 25 horsepower boats; sections in between could have 10 horse limits. Reducing horsepower limits is absolutely necessary. Canoe and Tube Crowding Limits to use must be established. Permits could be required. This should have been done long ago. It is easy to establish numbers of boats that can be put in on a stretch at a time. Previous documents have indicated that this could be done, but these have never been implemented. Roads There are far more access roads now than there were thirty years ago. This has happened because old traces that were reverting to nature in 1975 have since been used by ATV's or have been widened and "improved" by either NPS or local governments or, in some cases, individuals. Numerous of these "roads" cross the river, causing erosion and stream pollution. Many of these "roads" should be closed to traffic or converted to horse and hiking trails, and virtually all river crossings should be eliminated. This was done at Buffalo National River with great success. Trail use at Buffalo is much greater as a result and many other problems have been prevented. Access Areas and Primitive Camps Streamside access has greatly	7/30/2009	No			MO	63701

	<p>increased and must be addressed. Aesthetic qualities of the rivers are under attack. Today, one can hardly float from one place to another without seeing numerous access points with attendant vehicle traffic, noise, trash, and degradation of the stream bank. The difference today is readily clear: the values of the park have degraded greatly. Many of the so-called "primitive" camps are nothing more than vehicle access points while there are fewer and fewer good locations left for family float camping. The 11 Point National River has converted some of these areas to float camps, primarily accessible by water, but the roads have been left in place – gated and locked – so that maintenance can be easily done. Horses While horses are a traditional use, 500 horses do not constitute traditional use. The present system of trails (which was established initially by private individuals, not the park) is poorly designed, crosses drainages too many times, goes through riparian vegetative areas, and the trails are used by numbers of horses which cannot be supported. These trails should be rethought and redesigned and moved out of the riparian and stream areas. Pollution and degradation of the stream bank are only two of the problems. Recently we tried to camp at a favorite gravel bar and found it dug up by hooves, and decorated with horse feces and the strong smell of urine. Horses need to stay out of the riparian zone. Scenic Rivers In addition to road accesses and "primitive" camps there are other problems with the scenic vistas that used to be along every stretch of the rivers. Cabins on in-holdings have increased in numbers and size. Small, old cabins on scenic easements have been replaced by structures twice the size. Scenic easement land has been cleared of trees and brush; new structures have gone up in violation of scenic easement requirements. Trailers are present at numerous places - many times right at river level (guess where their holding tanks drain). The park needs to reestablish a riparian zone that does not allow trailers or vehicles to be in it. Scenic easements absolutely must be enforced and mitigation measures such as tree plantings need to be undertaken where violations have occurred. Other federal areas have prohibited the presence of vehicles and trailers in the riparian zones which should be at least 100 yards wide. Noise Currently the rivers are very noisy places to be during much of the best times of the year. Measures that should be taken include: -Reducing motorboat numbers and horsepower -Reducing canoe and tubing "jams". -Removal of inappropriate "primitive" camps. -Banning radios and stereos from the river and adjacent banks. -Removing roads and illegal ATV traffic. Wilderness I support the concept of a designated wilderness in the Big Spring area, noting that it does not include the developed areas themselves. Buffalo National River, for instance, has at least two wilderness areas in or along the river. Alternatives Alternative A is not perfect but it represents the best hope of restoring the values that Congress recognized in the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. With attention to the issues noted above, it can once again be a place where families can float and camp, where a fisherman with a small boat can cast a line in the water without a power boat running him over, where floaters can enjoy the sounds of nature without hearing motors and stereos, where a family can swim without worrying about e coli levels being too high, and where the traditional values of the Ozark culture can be expressed and interpreted and learned about all at one time. Scott House</p>						
750	<p>Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have an opportunity to protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! Let's do what it takes to make sure this is done. Thanks for reading my comments.</p>	7/30/2009	No			TN	38133
751	<p>I support Option A, with the caveat that bicycles are not included as 'mechanized forms of recreation'.</p>	7/30/2009	No		International Mountain Bike Association	MO	63038
752	<p>Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren</p>	7/30/2009	No			AR	71754
753	<p>It is becoming very hard to take a family on floats on Missouri float streams. This is because of the crowds and behavior of the majority of weekend renters. This means for families to enjoy the rivers we must boat in cooler weather, which means our kids can not explore and enjoy the water. It is a shame that we must put up with this behavior at the sake of our rivers. Do we want generations to grow up learning the beer barge or respect our water and environment. Please go with some form of action plan based on A;</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63301
754	<p>1. A 2. Create conditions for low impact, family friendly recreation and protect natural beauty 3. closing unauthorized roads, enforcing the current no ATV policy, and closing the many unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. We recommend some stretches of the river be closed to motor boating. Also water quality is hazardous in some areas due mostly to uncontrolled number of horses in the river. We recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails. 4. Special areas need to be protected. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is a major opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. Support Wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract.</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63122
755	<p>1) 2) 3) 4) 5) (affects all intrest areas) My main concern has been based on an experience of rowdy people using these waterways as an extension of their passion for unbridled partying. It seems innapropriate when I put my canoe in at 9:30 a.m. and I hear loud rock music and drunken yelling from the nearby campground. At the take-out, 20 miles later, the same sort of people are falling out of canoes drunk, others are roaring around the site in a passionate drunken stupor. To such people every place is a potential location for noisy, drunken fun-time. The concept of a scenic waterway seems self-evident to me. For those who don't appreciate this, they can enjoy their uncivilized 'civilization' elsewhere; this place is for those who treasure nature. I would ban radios and music players and enforce disorderly conduct laws. I have seen how ATVs tear up paths and</p>	7/30/2009	No		Saint Louis Canoe and Kayak Club	MO	63051

	create erosion channels. I'm sure this is not from responsible ATV operators, but from those who enjoy roaring through nature effortlessly with power and noise. I would regulate a muffling requirement that would render ATVs almost silent on public land. The Johnboat fishermen seem compatible with we canoeists and kayakers, but there are some for whom watercraft pleasure consists in the exercise of massive raw power. I have witnessed them being selfish and dangerous to others. There are plenty of places for those types to exercise their wildness, but they do not belong on a scenic waterway. Summary: I look for a place to enjoy the sights, sounds, smells and contemplative offerings of nature. I opt for preservation of that, and for the exclusion of those who behave as those I described above. Policy: Confiscate gear. Fine and at times arrest those who insist on violating the published purposes of the area. Thank you Terry O'Brien I like having put-in and take-out access and parking as access to						
756	For over 35 years I have been blessed to be able to use and enjoy the our one of a kind rivers we have in Missouri. No where in the country is there such deversity and beauty. I love to float, hike, fish, and cave. I'm not big on motor vehicles in any river, nor horses. I can appricater each one in its proper place and time. There isn't anything worse then to be walking on a trail and come accross some stupid people who drive four wheel ATY's who think its cool to tear up a trai by going off the designated path and have to hear their buzzing moters and smell their exhust. The same goes for those who think just because they have a horse, they have the right to go anywhere they want because they have money and political power, including in the middle of the river to give the horse a drink, which just makes the horse piss and crap. I use to like horses and ATV's, I still do, however I have a big dislike for those who think they are above anyone else or the law! I have reviewed each section of the plan and to be honset, I kind of like some of all four ideas proposed. Each has its own value, however I have found that current staffing and funds over the past twentyfive years has not shownen me that the NPS can not properly manage what is already in place. Grant, they do a good job for the resources they have, but so much else is needed, More man power, stricker laws, laws enforced and agents out in the feild issuing tickets. With better management and current laws inforced, instead of just being on paper and not put into action, any development or new trail, roads, buildings etc, will only be treated with the same disrespect as the trails, land and rivers are now. I would like to see new and exciting things along the river. building more buildings will only give more access to those who don't care about what it is Missouri has. More roads will creat othetr issues such as unlawful dumping, road side pull offs that will creat small unlawful trails and access to the rivers, and not to mention destroy the natural beauty of the land scape by cutting trees and grading, which will cause runoff and errosion to flow into the river sending additional siltand runoff down stream. By developing additional property, I think will destroy what it is that were trying to save and perserve. I could go on about hoe the ATV's and Horses, and the Jet Boats on how they all creat unnatural sounds, cause sediment and bank issues but you know this already because its a problen all accross the country. One aspect I have not talked about is boats, There are just to many boats on the river at anygiven time especially during peak months and weekends. I do not use the river during the weekends anymore because its boat to boat people for miles. There has been too many permits issued to boat rental outfits over the years that has cause the river to become overwhelmed. There isn't any peace and quiet as one would expect in a wilderness setting such as this. There always loud music playing and people drinking to much and abusing the gravel beaches to build fires and destroy natural features, not to mention with all these people, they have to go to the bathroom some place! The enviorment impact is termendious! On top of all that, then comes up stream a jet boat that has to manuver around everybody. Some day somebody is going to get killed inorder to inforce the laws that are already on the books. Motor boats are fine, but they have to be kept off the rivers in certin sections for the safety of those who are floating. I like the idea of Peak and Non-Peak Months of moter boats allowed on the river. Let me get back to the boat issue again. There are simply to many outfitters and boats on the river now, adding more developepment will creat more of a need for additional outfitters to get a pice of the pie. These outfitters only care about how much money the can make in a few short months, and rightly so, but at what expense to the river and land. I think there sould be a hold on issuing permits and adding additional outfitters for the for the next ten years, and then, only if better management has been provided, issue permits with caution to those who qualify and meet the standard set by the NPS. Management could be in some type of manner like the NPS does on the Grand Canyon. I wouldn't like to have to make reservations a year ahead just to be able to float on any Missouri srream of river, but if supply and demand continues to grow and over use is an sdissue, then the concept needs to be looked into and perhaps applies to certian areas of the OSR System. I think you can see, I'm a supporter of making a 10 to 15 year plan on the futuer of the river and the OSR system, but please do not pass any plan if you cannot inforce the plan you currently have in place. So my main comment is to do keep the current system as is until you improve on what you have. You have had plenty of time to fix problems and have shown you are not able to do so in th emanner and leveal needed. Once you show enforcememt of laws and rules there already are, then bring to the table plans on improving and upgrading the system. You can creat the best plans in the world, but if current enforcemrnt lacks support and funds, then new plans are like the horse crap floating down stream next to the ATV who is half submerged in the water trying to cross over to a trail only ment for hikers! THank you for letting me voice my concern. I support your efforts in keeping Missouri the beautiful State it is for many years to come. Lawrence Abeln	7/30/2009	No			MO	63128
757	1) Alternative A is the only plan that sounds like it will attempt to restore the ONSR closer to what it was in 1964 when the law was passed that mandated its preservation and protection. The pristine natural environment of the ONSR is what's always been so special there. Preservation of those riverways in the condition they were before so much damage was allowed to occur should be of highest priority. This means stopping all the illegal activities and putting the emphasis on activities that do little or no damage to that natural heritage. That means emphasizing things like primitive campsites, and non-motorized watercraft preferred. If motorboats are allowed on any parts of the rivers, they should only have very slow and quiet motors, no more than 25 hp. 2) We definitely support federal designation of the Big Springs Wilderness and full protection of all of the natural environment in the ONSR. 3) There should not be non-essential development that caters to bringing people who want city life in a wilderness area. The ONSR should be what it was naturally—a pristine environment where quiet and solitude can be experienced by the wildlife living there and by low-impact visitors who appreciate its beauty and treat it with respect. This means that all the illegal activity that has been	7/30/2009	No			MO	63015

	<p>allowed should be stopped using the full force of the law. This includes but is not limited to: ending illegal roads and trails, stopping prohibited ATV (all-terrain vehicles) and ORV (off-road vehicles) usage there, ending illegal sand and gravel mining in the riverways, and assuring good water and air quality in the ONSR. 4) We value all the areas we've experienced. We would like to float areas of the Jacks Fork, but are now afraid to do so because of the high E Coli bacterial contamination from horse dung. We are afraid it might be life-threatening to at least one in our family, since we often stop and swim when on float trips and understand that is now not safe to do in some areas. We always valued the high water quality in the ONSR in the past and would like to see that restored where it has been degraded—that means preventing horses from contaminating the rivers. One family member has floated these rivers for over 50 years and has been appalled to observe the degradation that's been allowed to happen through the years. 5) Visitors anywhere are expected to be respectful of others and of the place they are visiting. What is allowed should do no harm to the place or the wildlife that live there. Thus, activities permitted should be legal and do no harm to the ONSR. That means very limited development in very limited places. That means using the law to stop all illegal activities that have been allowed to take place for far too long. That means prohibiting lewd and reckless behavior. If people want to have drunken parties, they can do that in their "civilized" areas, but they should not be allowed to do damage to the quiet, natural areas of the ONSR where many come for solitude that can't be experienced in many places like the ONSR.</p>						
758	<p>I am only answering #1. I strongly support Preliminary Alternative A but with additional rangers to police the rivers. I am so deeply opposed to motorized boats and vehicles in that area. A few weekends ago, two people died in a boat collision. It is so irresponsible to allow boats on the Current or Jacks Fork rivers. These boats belong on the Mississippi and Missouri with plenty of room for speed. As I've said to others, and I truly believe, anyone that supports the use of these motorized boats on smaller & high recreation rivers has blood on their hands. As long as these boats & ATVs remain, more people will die in accidents -- including innocent bystanders who simply want to float the river or hike the trails. I am also opposed to off road bicycling, especially on inclines. I would also prefer not to see horses but suppose that they could fit into Alternative A as horses are slower paced and certainly not mechanized. Another aspect that I very much like about Alternative A is the Living History program and the proposed wilderness designation for the Big Spring tract. I also like the development of Interpretive areas. Also closure of illegal roads would be beneficial especially as I've heard that the many unused backroads are great for manufacturers of Meth (could just be a rumor). Although Alternative A appears to be lower maintenance, I do hope that enough staff is available to patrol the area. I also like the monitoring, research and preservation projects of Alternative B. Thank you!</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63011
759	<p>1. No Action 2. No Action is the way I feel. 3. No Action-should not reduce horsepower at the prop to less than 40hp 4. Big Springs area and no action address them adequately. 5. No Action</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901
760	<p>1. No Action 2. No Action is the way I feel. 3. No Action-should not reduce horsepower at the prop to less than 40hp 4. Big Springs area and no action address them adequately. 5. No Action</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901
761	<p>Last weekend I lead a group of 5 families on an overnight trip from Two River to Roger's Field. I chose the Current River within the National Scenic Waterways system, for it's beauty and rich diversity of Flora and Fauna, because of the natural experience it offers. Midway through our first day, I was shocked to meet power boats on the river. Some of the boaters were considerate of our group, which had many small kids paddling solo in kayaks, and some were not. The boats roared past us creating foot-tall wake waves and leaving us in the stench and haze of their exhaust. This continued throughout the remainder of our trip. As we set up our camp on a pristine looking river bend as a light fog crept over the river and the setting sun cast gold and pink light across the water, our evening was punctuated by the roar and stink of powerboats going by every few minutes. I had hoped to hear the sounds of wildlife, particularly the owls. The following day we hiked up to the amazing Blue Spring. I thought it was sad we'd never come to see it again, the power boats made this section of the river too noisy, busy, polluted and unsafe. Just past Blue Spring we stopped to have lunch on a sunny gravel bar. The kids discovered a rope across the river and several began swimming across the river to it. Just then a power boat appeared, tearing upriver toward the kids. Several of us ran towards the boat frantically waving him to slow down. He only grinned, open beer in one hand and gave us a thumbs up. I remembered people have been killed in the park by motor boats. I believe that our National Parks can support many uses, so long as each group respects the rest. Motor boaters rob all other users the ability to enjoy this national park safely therefore allowing motor boats in the Ozark National Scenic Waterway is not consistent with the purpose of the National Park System.</p>	7/30/2009	No		MWA	MO	63119
762	<p>I prefer plan A. I think the ecoli problem and other water quality issues need to be addressed. The protection of the unique habitats contained in this National Scenic Riverway should be a top priority. Personal recreation should still be encouraged, but limited to protect the habitats. Horse riding and motorized vehicles should be limited due to their environmental impact. Although it is difficult to police individual's behavior, an effort should be made to control "lewd" behavior. Thank you for allowing me to express my opinions.</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	65714
763	<p>I strongly feel that motorized watercraft should NOT be allowed on Current River above Van Buren, and motorized watercraft should be NOT be allowed at all on Jacks Fork. While none of the alternatives provided are this restrictive, I think alternative A is the best of those that ARE provided. The Current River and Jacks Fork are excellent places to enjoy the beauty of the Ozarks from a canoe, kayak, raft, or tube. Allowing large, fast-moving, motorized watercraft significantly diminishes the natural feeling of the rivers. Additionally, given the narrow nature of the rivers in many places, fast-moving motorized watercraft often provide a safety hazard to people floating the rivers in smaller, non-motorized craft. I was on the Current River in July 2009 with a group of families with young children in canoes and kayaks. There were times when we were worried for the safety of our children because of motorized watercraft coming up on our group or passing through our group too fast. Additionally, we saw and smelled the oily smoke from the motor boats a number of times. Furthermore, the noise of the motor boats passing us disturbed the calm sounds</p>	7/30/2009	No			IL	62946

	of the riffles in the river and the sounds of the wind and the birds in the surrounding forest. I have no problem with motorized watercraft below Van Buren. But I strongly feel the river above Van Buren should be saved for non-motorized craft. This is not an elitist point of view. The motorized crowd can enjoy everything below Van Buren, and if they want to enjoy the river upstream, they can always do so from a canoe. You don't have to be anything special to let the river take you downstream in a canoe. Let's preserve it in a quiet, serene, non-motorized fashion for our future generations.						
764	#5: We recently did a family float trip on the Current river between Two Rivers and Roberts field. Our group was composed of multiple paddle craft such as canoe and kayaks. Several of these boats were piloted by supervised children enjoying the river. While it is important to share our park resources some points need to be more carefully considered. This area is a narrow river without much depth. This is more suited to paddle craft and family swimming. On this stretch of river moter boats are permitted to operate without apparent limits. This presents a serious hazard to the other river users. This disturbs the fish and wildlife as well as the people swimming and fishing on the banks. These boats were moving fast and thier operators were drinking alchohol. At one point a speed boat was fast approaching unaware that there were swimmers in thier path as they powered around a bend in the river. After frantic yelling and screaming thier careless driving brought them dangerously close to six people swimming across the river. A tragedy was narrowly avioded, that day. It is important to share resources, limits need to be imposed with a managment program. The operation of powerboats on this section of river needs to be banned. There are too many people in the water for the permission of power boats to be considered a safe plan of action. If powerboats are to be allowed a strict limit toward horsepower must be implemented. In small waterways 10 or 15hp is often the rule. This would allow access to fisherman as well keep people safe in this waterway. Thankyou for your time. Sincerely, Byron House	7/30/2009	No		mwa	MO	63119
765	1. Option A 2. Greater emphasize on preserving the natural resources by limited motorized activities such as power boats and ATV's. Also greater emphasis on family-oriented activities and better management of out of control park visitors- lewd behavior, excessive drinking, etc. 3. I feel very strongly that additional construction, including more roads boat ramps, etc should be eliminated from the plan. By increasing access to the area, you will have increased visitors. The park staff can't keep up with the current load of visitors in the area. In the plans that indicate that facilities would be increased, there is no mention of increased staff or training for staff.	7/30/2009	No			MO	65203
766	1) Alternative A is the closest to my ideas about how the Riverways should be managed. I would, however, be more explicit about the maintenance of water quality and about waste disposal. I love to canoe and to ride horseback, but neither of these is as much fun in a degraded environment. Both people and horses are producing waste; few bodies of water in Missouri are free of coliform bacteria. This is all the more reason to manage the Ozark Nat'l Scenic Riverways in a way that decreases waste input and improves water quality (not just maintaining it at today's levels). The plan indicates that user capacity is not necessarily about a "magic number" of users and I agree that limiting use is unpopular and not in keeping with the idea that these are the "people's parks." However, I do believe that maintaining the integrity of natural systems in the park is just as important. Limiting numbers of canoes on the river and horses/hikers on the trails is certainly not a first choice but if it is determined that the density of visitors is so great it is damaging the water quality or the integrity of trails, then limits should be established and enforced! 2)In particular, the rehabilitation of illegal river access points and roads would contribute to enjoyment of the park and the river. In hiking and canoeing in Missouri and in Arkansas one of the big changes I have noticed in the last two decades has been the extreme trail destruction from off-road vehicles. Blocking ATV access to trails/illegal roads goes a long way toward allowing vegetation regrowth, cutting down on erosion, and making trails enjoyable for non-motorized users. The ATVer may be a mile away from the trail or river I'm on but they significantly decrease my enjoyment of state and national parks and forests. 3)The "diverse range of motorized and nonmotorized activities" (ATVs?) and additional boat ramps of Alternative C should be avoided. 4) 5)Be clear about how enforcement of new policies is going to work and provide park personnel to enforce changes in policy. Problems at the Riverway have not been addressed for too long and this just makes it harder to solve the problems. Enforce terms of easements and illegal road use. Please.	7/30/2009	No			MO	64844
767	1. Plan B would be my first Choice. I enjoy canoeing and swiming in the rivers. I would like to limit the number of speed boats.	7/30/2009	No			IL	62025
768	1. I would like to see plan A ideally implemented. Making the area more natural and conserving it. 2. Protecting the river ways, the areas, plant, & animal life around the riverways. Trying to cut back on over crowdedness & rowdiness during the summer months as well as pollution. 3. More building in the area. Some additional trailbuilding or natural structures, but if necessary keep to a minimum. 4. not specifically. 5. not at this time.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63119
769	1) Alternative A. I think that ONSR over the past 40 years has allowed too much development occur along the banks of Current River. Too many former private access roads to the Jacks Fork and especially Current River have been improved and made available for public use. Naturally, this allows for more dense tourist activity on the rivers, as well as off road vehicles such as ATVs, etc. I also object to the development of structures (houses) along the river that are probably illegal but most certainly violate the spirit of the Scenic Rivers Act. In terms of horsepower limits, neither river under ONSR management should be used as a "drag strip" for boats. Boaters wishing to enjoy the speed and power of their vessels can easily find a nearby lake. The "river experience" they are not really seeking, and they often ruin it for others who are. I have no problem with tubers, canoeists, and boaters with moderate size motors, as long as their behavior is civil and respectful of others seeking pleasure from the river. 3. I think we have gone far enough in attracting visitors to ONSR. We don't need more campsites or access points. The rivers can only handle so much "company." My basic point is that ONSR was created to preserve the beauty and quality of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. If overuse by people with their horses, boats, canoes, kayaks, whatever, ends up greatly degrading the quality of these streams (erosion, trash, noise, and so on), then ONSR will have been created for naught -- its mission a failure. And that would be a shame and a great loss for all of	7/30/2009	No			MO	63965

	us, and future generations as well.						
770	1) A 2) stop the jet boat use and close illegal roads 3) anything that encourages or expands the use of motorized boats. Increased development of facilities. 4) It's all special 5) I am a native Missourian who now resides in Illinois but still frequent the National Scenic Riverways. The following comment is how many in St. Louis and elsewhere feel. In my view we need to recognize the unique value of the Riverway and protecting those unique elements should be our highest responsibility. A multi-use, something-for-everybody driven management plan that opens the area to maximum human use and allows nearly unlimited numbers (and group sizes) of visitors and nearly unlimited use of motorized transport would be missing what we have here in the Riverway. These rivers have unique aesthetic features that must be protected including the quiet and the views. The opportunity to fully experience this kind of natural setting with minimal human interference should be a high priority - - it is an increasingly rare resource. If one wants to party and run around on jet ski's then there are many, many opportunities at the big reservoirs and on the major rivers. The natural character of those areas has already been altered through dams and intensive development of roads, houses, condo's etc. There is no shortage in MO of those types of areas. The Riverway is a very rare landscape and should be treated accordingly. Personally, I would urge you to manage most of the area more along the lines of designated wilderness area - - sharply restrict motors, number of visitors, group size, etc. Do not treat this as recreation project where everybody can go and have whatever kind of fun they want to have - that kind of management philosophy completely misses the special nature of the resource.	7/30/2009	No			illinois	62298
771	1) alternative A 2) moderation 3) alternative C 4) upper Jacks above Alley Springs 5) once again, moderation I've been paddling a canoe for over 45 years and enjoy the beauty and solitude of the rivers. I avoid the ONSR between Memorial Day and Labor Day because of the hoards of rental canoes full of out of control paddlers. But I have also had problems in the Fall - unable to paddle through Eminence because horses are blocking the river and during deer season, what are all the hunters doing sitting in lawn chairs with their rifles, facing the river? I had an orange vest and hat on but isn't it illegal to shoot across a river? It sure made me nervous! I am for the Big Spring Wilderness Area, I am a member of the Ozark Trail Association and have adopted the Between the Rivers section near Van Buren. Everyone should be able to enjoy the ONSR - I just think that moderation is needed. thanks for considering my opinion. Liz McCarty	7/30/2009	No		OTA	MO	65483
772	My overall comments about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are that the rivers should be preserved as a pristine natural resource for future generations. By preservation, I mean the nature of the river should be maintained as it was when granted National Scenic Riverway status. Erosion, ecological and development impacts should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary for visitors to enjoy the rivers in a safe and responsible manner. 1) Plan A is clearly the best for preservation of the environment and scenic beauty of the rivers. The situation as it exists now is out of hand with too many power boat, too much noise and pollution degrading the state of the area. It has got to the point where other rivers in Missouri have more to offer in terms of scenery and beauty that many people simply stay away from the Current. 2) Motorized limits on the Jacks Fork, this river is too small for power boats. Primitivization of large parts of the Jacks Fork and upper Cuurent will encourage a return to the natural beauty and scenery that made these rivers special in the first place. Big Spring should be made a wilderness area to preserve it. 3) While I would encourage anybody and everybody to enjoy and experience the river, I think developing more campsites for RVs or large group sites does exactly the opposite, it encourages people to hide away from the river and not see it as a natural resource to be cared for. While I appreciate there are many ways of visiting and enjoying the rivers increased traffic from RVs and large trucks would be extremely detrimental to a sensitive, already degraded natural area. 4) The spring areas of the Ozarks are some of the most spectacular scenery Missouri has to offer. The park already does a good job in protecting these areas and I would encourage it to continue to do so, the proposed Wilderness Area around Big Spring is a good step to preserving this wonderful natural resource. 5) I highly discourage the commercial outfitters from allowing people to take rafts down the Current river, they are not a good way to experience the river, are hazardous for other river users and seem to bring out the worst in people in terms of noise and bad behavior.	7/30/2009	No		Missouri Whitewater Association	MO	63139
773	(1) I feel that alternative A best fits what I think best fits the ozark scenic rivers. I have spent many days and nights floating the local Missouri rivers with family, friends, my son, and by myself. Not being a Mountain state, the ozarks are as close to a wilderness experience many people can have regulary, without traveling far, and within striking distance of major urban areas on weekends. Unfortanatly, motorboats have ruined a lot of that experience, caused noise pollution, and caused more than one scare as children have played in the water. My ten year old son and I have many great memories of over night float trips, playing on the gravel bars, fishing, and swimming. Please help preserve these gems for our future and remember there are plenty of other incredible rivers and lakes close by that motorboat enthusiasts can use.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63301
774	1) Action A I agree with closing roads and trails. I agree with limiting motor boats. 3) I live in Houston, which is 25 miles from the prongs of the Jacks Fork. I get on the ONSR 6 - 8 times a year, from day trips to 10 day trips past Doniphan. The upper Jacks is very special and should be protected. Upper Current should be motor free. Horseback riding in Eminence is out of control. Ecoli, thousands of riders and their horses and total disregard to the National Park has got to stop. Canoeists are out of control, too, Memorial Day - Labor Day. I paddle the Big Piney during the summer. I would like to see a wilderness area at Big Spring. I have adopted a section (with the Dolomighters) of the Ozark Trail that would be next to the proposed area. Thanks for considering this, John McCarty	7/30/2009	No		OTA	MO	65483
775	Response to Topic Questions.. 1. I and my club support option A. 2. I feel strongly about preserving the river and the areas around it, in general. 3. Same as number two. 4. On my map it shows the ONSR to be 105 miles. 5. I think the park service objective should be to preserve the river and the surrounding area to be as natural as is possible and still allow for families to have a quite and safe visit.. Comments to follow.. Note.. One July 13, 2009 at noon, I put in at Baptist Camp and floated in a canoe to my takeout point at Sugar Bush Landing, just below the Arkansas state line.	7/30/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63125

	<p>This was a 14 day trip in an Old Town Discovery canoe rented to me by Two Rivers Canoe Rental. At the end of the first day, I camped late and had to accept a small gravel bar area that was also a horse trail. There was lots of horse manure around the area.. Just as I was near finished with setting up my tent, three young men and their female riders came roaring down the horse trail on their ATVs, near ran me over and went off into the river. There they stopped and washed the dirt off their ATVs. They then drove in and out of the water and did the donut type spins in the water. Eventually they raced off on another part of the horse trail. This does not seem like the thing that should be happening on the river. Then for the next several days I was cleaning fire rings of broken and melted glass, plus lots of beer and tin cans, etc.. The people who were camping or doing the party thing were making a real mess with their trash. The worst of which was the glass in the fire areas. The the next thing that took away from the relaxing mood of the outdoors was the invasion of the Jon Boats. Some would nearly run me over.. I think there were only two that slowed down and let me pass without doing the big wave thing. Lucky for me I am pretty good with a canoe so I managed, but for beginners and families trying to enjoy a bit of quite and safe outdoor fun, the Jon Boats were killing that.. I could hear them coming a mile away, I had to fight their waves, then smell the fumes, then listen to them until they were a mile or two past me... Was like canoeing on an interstate highway.. What I can say that was a plus for the Jon Boat people, the areas down river from were the canoe people are, is much cleaner. There was nearly no trash on the river once I got past the areas where the canoe people generally go. Then the next thing that got my attention about the river system is the build up of houses along the river... What are houses doing in a National Park?... It is beginning to look like the Lake of the Ozarks. Somebody it slipping big time on protecting the park.... What next? On the 18th, a Jon boat passed me with a Yamaha 50 on it.. I thought a 40 was the limit.. On the 19th, just north of Roberts Field, at around 11 AM, , a few hundred yards upstream and on the same side of the river, as I was looking down river, I saw water fly up at one spot in the river, then I heard the gun shot. This was followed by nine or ten more shots into the river... Since when is shooting into the river allowed???? When I arrived at the place where the shooting took place, I could not see the people who did the shooting, but there was a Jon Boat there. It was a WeldCraft with a Yamaha outboard Jet Drive. The boat number was MO 6148 EC. At one point near here, I found an arrow stuck in a tree!! This place is wild!!!!!! I do not know what all is going on here, or who is doing all the crazy stuff, but it really is crazy for a national park. I tend to think that much, if not all of the crazy stuff is from the locals. Given that they seem to like to have loud parties, do wild things, make a mess, play their stereos loud and shoot, etc,,, I would like to suggest an exchange program for Missouri.. It works like this. There are lots of us who work in very loud environments, like St. Louis, and we pay taxes to have some quite country places preserved to get away for a few days. One the other hand, there are the country people who have to live in a quite country place and are starved for loud sounds and fast moving objects... I have the solution, the MEP, Missouri Exchange Program.. On the weekends, we the city people will go to the quite country and listen to nothing and enjoy it... On the other hand, the country people who are starved for loud sounds and speed, can bring their Jon Boats to St. Louis, put them on the Mississippi River and have great fun making as much noise as they want by screaming, running their boats at full speed, and playing their stereos as loud as they want. They will feel great going down the Mississippi River, fighting the waves from the river boats, and they can play Buck Owens song "I've got a Tiger By The Tail", just as loud as they want... This would be perfect for all of us!!!!!!!!!! Please make it happen!!!!!!!!!! Note, once I left the park, it really got nuts.. Jet boats that were bigger than I could have guessed... I saw one Jon Boat with a 300 Horse Mercury on it... And, when I crossed the Arkansas state line, I was greeted by a white cow and the smell of cow manure.. Later I found the water super dirty and gravel bars covered with hoof prints and piles of cow manure.. Being in the park is better than being outside the park, but I hope the park system will do better to serve the people of the state and not just the wild desires of the few who feel the need to get wild and crazy without regard for anyone else or the park. The meanest animal I encountered on the river was a mouse that ate two holes in one of my space blankets, but I am not suggesting we start a mouse control program, the other issues are much more important.. Thanks for reading all this. Hopefully you will learn from what is written here.... One Jon Boat or one person shooting into river, or one person creating a lot of trash, may say they have their rights to enjoy the river, but just one person like this can destroy the joys for hundreds of others who seek a little relaxation in the outdoors with their family.. Why let one, or a few, ruin it for so many others...</p>						
776	<p>July 30, 2009 Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, P.O. Box 490, Van Buren, MO 63965 Dear Superintendent, This letter is about the GMP - I am a member of the Stream Team so I care VERY much about the health of our wonderful waterways. To start I think every river in Missouri should have the protection that the Current & Jacks Fork has, like no beer bong, Jell-O shots, beads, etc. etc. I also think that "NO GLASS" should be enforced - maybe the outfitters could say it when people are on the bus. I also think that there should not be ANY jet boats on ANY rivers that are floated by canoe or kayak. It erodes the banks of the rivers and only 2 jet boats in the past 20 yrs that I have been floating have throttled down for canoes, kayaks or swimmers. But if it stays the same then you should lower the horsepower limit. I also think that if anyone has a personal boat, canoe or kayak they should have to pay a small fee to be able to use the rivers, the outfitters have to don't they? Collect the money when you buy and/or register your ski boat, pontoon, canoe, kayak, etc. In turn that would create revenue to pay for more water patrol which I think we need a lot more of. If you have coin operated showers there would be no wasted water and the money would help maintain them. I don't think that there should be more ATV or horse trails, there are enough! I have been on both sides of this coin, 25 yrs ago I went to my 1st CCTR there were about 300 horses there and the trail rides were 3 to 4 times a year. Now there are 3000 to 4000 horses every weekend. Can you tell me how that many horses crossing the rivers don't hurt the river? How could it not? Everyone that I have seen on horse back has a beer can in their hand and a cooler strapped on the horse – I know it wasn't like that 25 yrs ago – also were are all those beer cans? Did they really take them back out with them? So I know my letter said nothing about A, B, C or "no action" but I hope you will count it. Please keep the rivers protected and clean so that our kids, kids can enjoy the beauty! "ONSR finest canoeing rivers in the Midwest" lets keep it that way!! Thank you for your time Lesa Urban 6966 Colonial Woods Drive #61 St. Louis Mo 63129 Cell 636-633-6444</p>	7/30/2009	No		Stream Team	MO	63129

777	I believe Alternative A is the best alternative for both Current and Jack's Fork (or even stronger limitation on motors on Current if possible). These are Missouri's wild and scenic rivers and they should be respected and kept pristine now and for future generations.	7/30/2009	No		Missouri Whitewater Association	ME	63123
778	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: * Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! * Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails * Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! * Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring * Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/30/2009	No			IL	60680
779	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren I was stunned and immediately fell in love w/ the Current River in this Scenic Riverway. It's a truly valuable outdoor resource and should be protected from uncaring abuse.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63042
780	1) Alternative A is close to my ideal. One learning education center might be appropriate. 2) I feel strongly only non-mechanized forms of recreation should be allowed on the Current above Big Spring. 3)More access points and boats, etc. should NOT be allowed. There are enough other places in Missouri for people to have that type of "fun". 4)I am most concerned about the upper Current, above Big Spring. The caves and springs along here really are unique and should not be allowed more degradation through more access, more motors, etc. 5) Curtailment of excessive partying would be good.	7/30/2009	No		Ozark Fly Fishers, Missouri Master Naturalis	MO	63025
781	1)"A" is closest to my idea to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In addition, I would exclude Jet-boats and motorized off-road vehicles from use of the managed areas. 2) Protection of native Plants and animal habitats, Ranger programs, and designation of Big Springs as Wilderness ARea. 3) New Trails, learning centers, and increased numbers of boat ramps, incl. provisions for community gatherings.	7/30/2009	No		Stream Team	MS	63025
782	I'm not sure that I like any of the listed alternatives. If I understand, the rivers are national scenic riverways and I don't think they've been managed as such. They are overused by too many canoes and motorized boats and easements have been violated over the years. Locals make their own access points with ATV's and trucks. Access points were originally to be limited I believe to maintain the wilderness experience of the river. And there are too many horses! That most definitely is not good for the river and its ecosystems. I floated the Jacks Fork a couple of years ago and found out about possible e-coli contamination after the fact. I was appalled at the number of horses that were going to be on the river during some big trail ride that was coming there - in the fall I believe. This is NOT good stewardship of these rivers. I believe we should manage them the way they were originally intended to be managed. As scenic and wild locations here in Missouri. Too bad that our neighbor to the south, in Arkansas, has to set the example for us with the Buffalo. Stop waiving easement agreements.....close illegal access points.....eliminate the horses & motorized boats.....and limit the number of commerical canoe operations going forward and definately limit the number of canoes allowed on the river of existing operations.	7/30/2009	No		Southwest Missouri Fly Fishers	MO	65803
783	1] i believe NO ACTION is required to manage the ONSR 2]	7/30/2009	No			MO	63961
784	July 30, 2009 Over 50 years old now, I've been paddling canoes on Ozark streams since I was toddler. For nearly twenty years I have directed an outdoor education program for John Burroughs School: among other activities, my program routinely conducts overnight float trips on the Current and Jacks Fork, leads team-building and biology field programs at our camp on Sinking Creek, cuts trail in the Pioneer Forest and on U.S. Forest Service land (our program has received at least four certificates of commendation from the Superintendent of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for our work on the Cave Spring/Devil's Well trail; this past spring we began to cut a link between Big Spring and the Ozark Trail) and participates in cave restoration projects at Onondaga Cave State Park. Given the history of our relationship to the riverways and the sweat labor we have invested in its preservation, I cannot accept the influence of those whose principal relationship to the National Scenic Riverways is marked by destruction, disruption and pollution. I reject the notion that those whose practices tend to scar the landscape, pollute the water and shatter the tranquility of a national park should receive any accommodation or be granted any political weight when deliberating the future of the park. I am particularly appalled by the obvious discrepancy between the stated "purposes of the national riverways"--[to] "preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers", to take one example--and the practice of actively developing a gross number of access points to the river, indulging the obnoxious traffic of whining motorized traffic and failing to curtail the polluting practices of ATV and horse traffic. While I once felt secure camping with my groups of young paddlers on the pristine gravel bars of the park, my peace of mind and sleep are equally disturbed by the possibility if not the fact of some intrusion by motorized traffic. For the past several years, the orienteering treks we have organized for our students have been pushed into ever more remote and declivitous hollows due to unhindered ATV traffic along the Current River corridor. More often than not, the operators of these vehicles are belligerent, scary and intoxicated. Of your three alternatives, alternative A comes closest, of course, to my wishes, although the conditions governing motorized traffic are far too vague. I really do not understand this compulsion to protect the interests of motorized craft when vast river lanes and reservoirs exist already for these purposes (indeed, some of the best whitewater in this state has already been covered to accommodate them); the same is true for those who wish to ride horses. Please keep in mind that this park is part of our commonwealth: those who speak the loudest or with the most influence are not necessarily representing the interests of the silent individuals in the	7/30/2009	No			MO	63130

	<p>future. With this interest in my mind, I recommend that you revise alternative A to exclude all motorized and horse traffic. The health of the landscape and the humans who occupy it would both improve. Whatever plan you choose to endorse, your convictions and practices simply need to match the terms of your stated purposes. At this point, your stewardship of this precious resource is embarrassing, your authority feckless. However appealing the notion of compromise may be to you, compromise in this regard will just lead to more despoliation. Sincerely, Michael Dee</p> <p>The Farm River Left Below 6232 McPherson Avenue Cedar Ford on the Meramec River St. Louis, MO 63130 Steelville, MO</p>						
785	<p>I was not able to find an explanation of plans A, B, or C. Please keep ALL motorizedboats, motorcycles, motorbikes and ATV's out of the parks COMPLETELY. These vehicles cause a lot of damage to the environment; the soil, the air, the water and the plant and animal life. People who use these vehicles are only interested in the thrill of the minute, not enjoying and loving the natural habitats. Let them destroy their own property. If these people really loved the parks as I do, they would not even consider using their destructive motorized thrill rides there. I realize motorized houseboats do not fall in the same category, but, if 1 motorized vehicle is allowed, the thrill riders would find a way to include theirs. Houseboaters can remove their motors or lock them up, or something similar. I can imagine living on a houseboat tied up to the shore of a great lake, it would be beautiful. Thank you. CMI</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63136
786	<p>I'm going to comment on the questions above with one large body of text. Having read the proposed management options previously, I'm somewhat familiar with them. However, I'm typing from a remote location where I'm unable to open the Horsepower document. Anyway. Let me state emphatically that I'm opposed to any further development on the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers. I have canoed these rivers for the last 40 years, having learned how to canoe on the Current between Cedargrove and Aker's. I now currently canoe these and other area rivers with a group if individuals, mostly high school and college friends, every spring, summer, and fall (and sometimes winter). We have done this without fail since the spring of 1980. But I can also state that we now typically focus on the Current and Jacks Fork. The reason for that is simple. These two rivers represent the best of what Missouri has to offer in terms of a wilderness canoeing experience. In the 80's we had canoed the Eleven Point several times, and it used to be a great trip, until the boats took over in the '90's. Below Greer, you're often within earshot of the boat engines most of the day. There were times when we could here the same boat for a half-hour. One in particular fished the same rapid over and over, and guys never got out of the boat. They drifted from the top of rapid to the bottom, then powered their way back to the top. They did this dozens of times. On another trip, a couple in a jet boat "dogged" us the better part of an afternoon, basically joyriding the river, carving turns in rapids, flats, you name it. And the driver seemed to relish in the fact that he was bothering us. He wouldn't move up or down stream very far, despite our pleas. Because of situations like these, we have chosen not to return to the Eleven Point. I'd love to go back. It's a beautiful river, and the fishing was always great. But when deciding on which river to canoe, the first comment about the Eleven Point always ends with, "not there, too many boats." I have also canoed the Black (all forks), the Big Piney, Little Piney, Gasconade, Niangua, North Fork, Meramec, Courtois, Huzzah, and probably a few others, and there's no question the Current and Jacks Fork are the best of the bunch. But I will say this. I've seen encroaching development on both of these rivers. The Modot Hwy 17 bridge is a travesty. Way too much "manipulation" of the landscape to suit a National Scenic River. I've seen the campground at Aker's come (and thankfully go). I've seen several power lines added across the Jacks Fork above Alley Spring. On a nice weekend at Cedargrove, it's almost impossible not to experience a mile of car camping with the requisite stereos, campers, trucks, cars, etc. I can remember shortly after the Current was designated a National Scenic Riverway, there was no development along the river. Akers was there of course, but the was a field across the street. Cedargove was not a campground. And even during the summer, you seldom saw other canoeists. Now, I'm not suggesting that we somehow legislate a return to those older, more primitive conditions. But what I'd love to see is an attempt to remove the illegal access roads. Limit car camping such that no vehicles are visible from the river. Make driving on the gravel bars illegal. And prohibit boats above Akers and Round Spring. As for more development, I say absolutely no way. No boat ramps, campgrounds, or any other man-made areas anywhere along the rivers. Ideally, these rivers would trend in the other direction, which an emphasis to more primitive rivers. There are plenty options out there for those people who want river access by boat, campgrounds, etc. Let's leave the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers alone...scenic in my mind means primitive.</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	63017
787	<p>These comments follow the format of the 5 questions presented for comments: 1) Alternative A is close to my idea of the best way to manage the Riverways. One change I would make would be for the nonmotorized river zone on the Current River to include the stretch from Round Spring to Two Rivers. 2) Parts of Alternative A that I feel strongly should be included in future management include: - having extensive river stretches with no motor boats; - seclusion; - closure of illegal roads and trails; - maintenance/restoration of biological communities; - having a large percentage of Primitive, Natural, and Nonmotorized management zones. 3) Parts of the preliminary alternatives that I feel strongly should not be included in future management (from Alternative C): - more developed sites - more boat ramps - higher levels of visitor use 4) An area special to me is the stretch of the Current between Round Spring and Two Rivers. This is mainly because it seems to have a lower density of major access points. I think the mouth of Big Creek is a particularly beautiful spot. I am concerned about the damage Shannon County has done to Big Creek. Also of concern to me are the ATV trails in the area. 5) Important strategies or approaches that should be included: - educate public about proper human waste handling; i.e. burying #2, burning or packing out toilet paper, etc. - maybe having a permit system for canoes for the summer season to reduce crowding. - stop stocking trout until they can be positively excluded from leading to hellbender decline. - Illegal ATV use is out of control, and one of the biggest issues. Confiscate them if they are illegally used off-oat. - If there are too many horses to maintain water quality, their concentrations should be reduced. - eliminate all access points except the major ones (those shown on the park brochure). - have decibel and speed limits on motor boats. - prohibit 2-cycle boat engines that exhaust hydrocarbons into the water.</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	65101

788	<p>The Ozark National Scenic Waterways have fallen into neglect and pollution and this is a wonderful opportunity to change that to a positive and healthy environment. The trails should not have any ATV's or other off-road vehicles and the number of horses should be limited until the pollution is under better control. The use of methods already proven to cure the problem of erosion and deterioration of the river banks should be put into action.(these have greatly helped some waterways in Illinois) Motor boats were found to cause a lot of damage to Illinois waterways as well and are limited in significant areas. This has encouraged the use of sailboats and recreational canoes and kayaks. The greater quiet without all the motors whining away has enhanced our parks for campers. All of these actions are very important and can be addressed right away. Repairs to the trails and the camping and other facilities can come later once the environment has stabilized. We are at a window in time when we can save some of our critically neglected areas before it is too late. It is imperative that we take action for the future. I appreciate the opportunity to give my remarks on this matter. Liz Costello-Kruzich</p>	7/30/2009	No		Sierra Club	IL	60201
789	<p>1. I am in closest agreement with the Land-based management of plan A coupled with the River-based Management of plan B. 2. I personally think that a large emphasis on keeping the rivers & land of the park safe from pollution and disease is the foremost thought. Primitive land areas coupled with seasonal & mixed use rivers would best draw & reward patrons of the park. 3. I believe that the entire idea of resource Based Recreation should be discontinued. I think the areas that are currently if any designated as resource based management zones should be placed under Natural management Zones. 4. I have grown up in Missouri all my life and for all my travels I always find myself coming home. I love its Lands, Rivers, History, and some of the people. I thank and respect anyone involved in the preservation of its Beauty & History. I think all involved in these pursuits should work closer together to minimize waste & help balance all of our interests. While also remembering to give a larger voice to the concerns & needs of the indigenous creatures to exist peacefully. 5. I think Green technology should always be in the forefront with the national park service & anyone involved in maintenance or development of the parks. We are a great and beautiful nation help keep it green and clean. More attention to point source pollution on high flux weekends by area. Educate and incentivize land owners in the park to help them positively interact with the NPS. Sincerely, Justen Allen Dyer Shinecouch@yahoo.com</p>	7/30/2009	No		Self Advocate	MO	65807
790	<p>I am originally from Arkansas and a number of years ago had the honor to do a lot of floating on the Buffalo River which was designated the first National Scenic Riverway. In those days the entire area was so pristine and you could float all day and see no one. I am in favor of all policies that would protect the river, the river banks and the pristine forest lands. I would definitely ban four wheelers as people who use them have not concern for the environment. I think it is a shame to let a few people ruin such a beautiful area for so many people now and in the future.</p>	7/30/2009	No			TN	38117
791	<p>The ONSR is the most beautiful place on the face of the earth. It means a lot to my family, friends, and myself. To make drastic changes altering the way people are allowed to enjoy this resource scares me. Drastic changes, I feel, would not be in the best interest of the ONSR. I'm all for the preservation of everything in this area and hope my grandchildren and their grandchildren can grow up to respect, love, and enjoy the ONSR. Some changes probably do need to be made. One of the ONSR's reasons for change is the lack of a family atmosphere. I agree with this to a point. There are some problem areas, but the biggest of these are the "Van Buren Gap" and the Doniphan area. It is my understanding that the ONSR rules and regulations don't cover these areas. Therefore, any changes made wouldn't affect these areas. Because of this, if a family came to the Current River and floated these areas there would be a good chance they would go home with negative memories. If I were planning a family outing I would steer clear of these areas. But, there are lots of other spots to visit in the ONSR. One of the biggest problems we face no matter where we go is disrespectful behavior by people. No matter which group a person belongs to: canoeing, hiking, tubing, boating, camping, or simply driving to the river to swim, there will always be someone who doesn't respect the privileges they have. All of the changes in the world won't change the behavior of someone who wasn't taught to be respectful. The only way to correct these problems would be more enforcement of the existing rules and regulations. I have heard some of the complaints have come from the various outfitters on behalf of their customers, the canoers/tubers. I believe that the lack of a family atmosphere is mainly caused by the canoers/tubers. From my experience, when you encounter tubers they are generally in the 20-30 year old range. They will have 5-10 tubes and one tube, in the middle, designated for the cooler. I have no problem with people drinking and enjoying themselves, but drunk, disrespectful people can ruin a good time for everyone. To me, the biggest problem in the ONSR and everywhere people go to enjoy nature's beauty is littering. It seems that the areas that have higher numbers of tubers also have a lot more aluminum cans on the bottom of the river. I have always tried to express to my son and friends to take out more trash than you came in with. I've cleaned up campsites along the river where you just have to ask yourself, "What were these people thinking?" The only way to correct the littering problem is by education and encouragement of all the different groups of people. Another area that concerns me is the possible changes in Jet boat regulations. The size restrictions as they are now seem fine to me. The only problems I have is with motors above 40 hp. We were in the Doniphan area on the 4th of July weekend. We camped 12-15 miles above Doniphan for 2 days and avoided most of the crowd. When we came downstream on Sunday, July 5th, it was pretty tense running the boat. There were 100-250 hp boats everywhere and several of them didn't really bother to take other boaters into consideration and were seemingly unsafe. 2 hours after we left, 2 people were killed in a boat wreck. I currently own a 40 hp, 16 ft. boat and prior to this a 25 hp, 16 ft. boat. The 25 hp boat wasn't strong enough to do some of the things I wanted to do. To take 2 people and their camping equipment, a 25 hp boat just wouldn't cut it. The top speeds of the 2 boats weren't much different: a 25 hp would go about 20-23 mph, while the 40 hp would go about 25-30 mph. The only real difference is in how much weight they would haul. To restrict all motors to 25 hp would cause many families to not be able to enjoy the ONSR as much, possibly even eliminate camping trips like the one we had on the July 4th holiday weekend. A 40 hp boat with a family of 4 and all the supplies needed for a days stay would probably have a top speed of about 20-25 mph. The areas where 40 hp boats are allowed now are areas where there is ample water to run these boats. Overall the ONSR aren't in good shape. Some things do need to be done and everyone in the decision making process is tasked with a big job. If the creation of natural and primitive zones are a goal it would seem the Jacks fork River could be used to cover both. For the most part the Jacks fork doesn't have enough water to run boats safely. I ask that when you make the final decisions, please consider the people: the people</p>	7/30/2009	No		United States Postal Service	MO	65775

	that love and cherish the ONSR the way my family, friends, and I do. If big restrictions are put in place lots of people won't be able to enjoy a truly wonderful place. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Jim Huff Jr.						
792	<p>The Current River and all of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are a place where I have grown up to know as a home away from home. My family, friends, and I go to the river all the time; we are very big into camping, fishing, floating, gigging, and pretty much anything you can think of. I am 18 years old, and have spent nearly all of my summers and every other vacation you can imagine camping on the Current River with my father and friends. My dad just finished his comment and I wanted to send my own in. First of all, I believe that any major changes imposed on the regulations of the ONSR would do much more bad than good. There clearly are things that need to be changed. For instance: littering is a major concern. I don't know how much could be done to help this problem, but if there was a way to fix it a little, it would be a good thing. If there's one thing I don't like it's when I go to a beautiful place and there is trash everywhere. When we float we really do our best to pick up what we can, even if it's not our fault it's there and it makes a little difference. The second thing that comes to mind is the deal about the limit on the hp jet motors. Now, I'm all for perhaps eliminating the extremely high hp motors, but to eliminate even 40 hp would be too much of a change. My dad has a 40 hp jet boat and its just right for what we need. For example, we've went on a 4th of July weekend float the past few years and this year we put in at Doniphan and went up several miles. We stayed 2 nights and had quite a bit of supplies, and the 2 of us, and the 40 hp was just enough to do the job. We used to have a 25 hp one and it was a struggle to get upstream when there was alot of weight in the boat. The reason I believe that maybe the really big motors could be eliminated is because they really aren't needed on the Current, at least in the areas discussed in this proposal like the Doniphan and Van Buren areas. While we were on our 4th of July trip we left from Doniphan that Sunday afternoon, and the way back downstream was kinda hecktick. There were tons of 200 hp boaters and really it seemed to me they didn't really consider others and sped through there without a care in the world. That day, 2 hours after we had left, 2 people were killed in a boating accident right where i'm talking about: probably a mile or 2 up from the Doniphan put in area. That's really scary to think we could be dead if we had been maybe 2 hours late in picking up camp. The last reason I wanna talk about is my dad. He has a passion for the Current River that i can't even explain in words. Every chance he has we go, and everytime you can just tell there's no other place he'd rather be. Like I said, he has a 40 hp boat and it really is just perfect; he loves it, and it's always been everything we could need on any trip to the river. To take away the ability to have a 40 hp jet boat would take away a good majority of the things we could do, such as the 4th of July trip that I've mentioned. Thank you for your time in reading this, and please consider the points i've made. If nothing else, please consider my dad. He's been the most influential person in my life, and we've had such good times on the Current River. I wouldn't trade any of them for the world and i'd like to think there are many more to come. Thanks again. Jimmy Huff</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	65775
793	Dear Superintendent Detring, Not too long ago, I went on the Current River on an overnight float trip. The first day, our group paddled about seven miles. As we were on the river, there were constant motor boats. Some of them slowing down when they passed, but some still making a wake. As well as that, when they passed you could see the exhaust they left. The smell was terrible; the sound was disturbing and you couldn't listen to to the nice sounds of nature. I think you should still let non-motorized boats and motorized boats on the Current River, but the boats should go without making a wake or just a small wake because it disrupts nature. And just to make sure, you should have more river police on the river because we did not see any river police. Sincerely, Danielle Sartori Age 11	7/30/2009	No		MWA	MO	63017
794	Dear Superintendent Detring, Last weekend I kayaked the Current River. I saw tons of motorboats and I didn't like it at all. You could even smell the pollution. I think there should be battery-operated motorboats, but they should still slow down when they go past paddlers. And there should be more river police on the Current River. Sincerely, Josh Sartori Age 8	7/30/2009	No		MWA	MO	63017
795	1) Alternative A is very close to what I feel would be the ideal management approach for the ONSR. I am interested in preserving / restoring pristine wilderness areas. IN PARTICULAR, I am interested in restricting / minimizing the use of motorized vehicles (boats / jet skis / ATVs, etc.) to minimize the destructive intrusion of the noise and of the land damage they cause. 2) am interested in restricting / minimizing the use of motorized vehicles (boats / jet skis / ATVs, etc.) to minimize the destructive intrusion of the noise and of the land damage they cause.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63131
796	I'm a lifelong user of the Current and Jacks Fork and author of the book, "Two Ozark Rivers" that is a natural and human history of the streams. I especially appreciate all of the thoughtful consideration that the NPS is giving to the 20-year management plan and offer these comments, numbered as requested. 1) By nature, I gravitate toward alternative A. But years ago I had a long discussion with Alex Outlaw - a brilliant guy - about access to the rivers, and he told me that I was an elitist for wanting to keep the rivers untouched, an attitude that would make it impossible for many people to visit. He was right. The Riverways is an accessible, gentle wilderness and resilient enough to accommodate some development. Alternative B is therefore closest to my current idea of proper management. Doing nothing is not an option, and Alternative C would be a disaster for the environment. 2) But ATVs must be kept out of the rivers entirely. By their nature, they are destructive. And Americans must be restrained from loving their wilderness to death, so limits on canoes, jet boats and especially giant horseback parties that send coliform counts soaring must be established and enforced. I'd limit jet boats to below Van Buren rather than Round Spring. Their operation is incompatible with paddle craft and damaging to the narrower river. The mud on the bottom is, I believe, directly attributable to their wakes washing the banks. The clarity of the water no longer takes your breath away as it did 30 years ago. 3) I would not add development, encourage more motorized travel, build additional facilities, add boat ramps, or encourage more horseback riding. Good grief - MORE horses? 4) The designation of Big Spring as a true wilderness is an inspired idea. Welch, Pulltite, Blue, Gravel and the other springs are unique and deserve equally careful protection — watersheds included. 5) The Ozark Trail is an underused gem that might take some pressure off of other elements if it were better known. Perhaps motorized vehicles could be limited to selected access points, with other gravel bars closed to them except in emergencies. For a model	7/30/2009	No			MO	63628

	of how incompatible usages can be effectively segregated, see Land Between the Lakes' North/south Trail. Thanks again for your efforts. Steve Kohler						
797	1). Alternative A comes closest to the alternative I would pick. 5). I would try to manage the upper river with more limited access. Perhaps a lottery (as is done for Western US wilderness rivers) to allow access for floating that would limit the number of people/boats floating per day. Decrease or limit commercial boats between Cedar Grove and Akers. I don't believe motorized boats should be allowed on the river above Two Rivers except for search and rescue. Would increase stocking of trout and consider changing trophy area to allow keeping trout up to 12" but not over 12".	7/30/2009	No			MO	63105
798	I've had memorable experiences canoeing the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I first floated the Current in 1973, but now I'm alarmed by the changes to the river. Alternative A corresponds most closely to my vision for the ONSR. Motorboats, ATVs and other motorized vehicles have no place in the ONSR. Their use should be restricted; I'd prefer that it be banned. Horses have their place, but not at the price of water quality and human health. Their numbers must be controlled. E coli is a real threat to anyone on the rivers. Some of the damage to the rivers and overcrowding are caused by the proliferation of unauthorized access points. The NPS needs to enforce against these to the best of its ability. Thanks for taking my comment. Henry Robertson	7/30/2009	No			MO	63139
799	I was not able to open the attached documents on your pages, however, I am hoping you will be addressing any issues related to invasive species of the waterways, and keeping the waterways trash and waste free. Addition public education and increase awareness is definitely needed in these areas.	7/30/2009	No		SLAG	IL	62221
800	Lets keep are environments safe and keep life on earth as long as GOD lets us. Lets turn over a better environment for people after we are gone.	7/30/2009	No			IL	60008
801	Alternative A seems the closest to my idea of Scenic Riverways. Limitations on horsepower of boats should be addressed. No motorboats above Two Rivers, and lower horsepower motorboats only between Two Rivers and Powder Mill. Motorboats belong in lakes, not a thriving river already crowded with non motorized(tubes and canoes)visitors to the riverways.	7/30/2009	No			MO	65793
802	1) I believe that alternative 'A' is closest to what I believe is best for the future of the Riverways. I still remember my first float trip forty years ago. This is an area that I have grown to love but have become more concerned about in recent years. We all know that the purpose of this park is to preserve this unique area but it seems that this is an increasingly hard thing to do. I don't believe the Park Service has the funding, staff or support of local and state agencies to adequately run a more developed park. 2) If funds presented themselves, it would be nice to have more of an educational/visitor center presence on the upper Current. Van Buren is a long way from some of the most visited areas. 3) I would not add facilities to accomodate further encroachment by horse riding enthusiasts or ATV users. We're not building special lanes on our highways for drunk drivers just because we know they are there. 4) My favorite areas are the Upper Current and the Upper Jacks Fork. I was happy to note that most of these areas seemed to be slated for some protection under all the plans. 5) I'd like to see cooperation between the Park Service, visitors, local population, politicians, state and federal agencies. Yeah, I'm a dreamer. The Park Service takes heat for not doing enough to protect this area. There may be some truth there but they can't do it alone. If laws are broken, people need to be prosecuted. If polices are made, they shouldn't cater to special interests who just want to make money off the park. And vistors and locals who just plain can't control themselves - find another place to be an idiot - not a national park, it belongs to all of us. In the end, it is the Ozark Riverways that suffers from all of this.	7/30/2009	No			MO	65202
803	Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/30/2009	No			MO	63103
804	question#1 "No-action" is my preferred alternatives. We do need the rangers to come out of the woods and shadows to teach,and educate the visistors at the accesses where the venders put the floaters in the river. Most of the visistors don't know they are in violation of regulations when they get on the river. They should not be hiding in the woods. They can not help people that get hurt or assist them or let them know were the dangerous spots are. They are not undercover agents, they are public servants that our tax dollors pay for. We camped at Big Springs only to catch the park ranger using night vision to spy on us. Our dog alerted us to his presence and we found our nice fireside exsperience intruded on by someone stalking us. Question #2 Going along with what I was saying in Question#1 the rangers when I was a child in Yellowstone,Rocky Mountains, Tetons,Grand Canyon,etc were are friends and were very educational,informative and helpful. I am highly infavor of the educational prgrams on the wildlife,vegetation,heritage lifestiles of our ozark mountains. This was done in group activities and around the campire when I was a child. Question #3 I strongly feel that the limitation of horsepower other than what is inplace now is wrong,and goes against the original intent and mandates of the congressional act that set up the ONSR. It states that "the Current river is to be used to its fullest recrational ability." this could lead to lengthy litigations as did the conoe wars of the early 1980's Limiting the horsepower more would prevent famimlies of 4 or more from going up river to thier favorate spots on the weekend. The river has been a source of relaxation,fun,and entertanment to the people of this area and visitors as far back as the native Indians. Question#4 Errotion of the land around the river that ends up filling the river is a concern and interest of mine. In the last 5-10 years the depth of the water in the river is decreasing. Water depth on the lower Current from Waymyre landing on down is getting so shallow that you can no longer run a prop engine. For 20 years I ran the Current with a 20hp prop and a jack plate(a device that lifts your	7/30/2009	No			MO	63010

	<p>boat motor up when your go through the sholes). Nowdays you can not navigate the river without a jet. I saw nothing in thealternatives that address this. I also feel if we can stock lakes and ponds with fish we should be able to help the fish population by stocking the river with native fish. I have caught goggle eye and small mouth but to catch a 12" keeper to cook on the gravelbar at camp at night is next to impossble. Question#5 The act of Congress that established the ONSR'S mission was to "PROVIDE A FULL RECREATIONAL EXSPERIENCE". Bringing the park rangers out of the woods and out on the putin,landings,the river and at dangerous section (or have signs indicating rough or dangerous areas) would greatly inhance the visistors Recreational Exsperience. Three weeks ago I saw a couple get hurt on some rootwads and no one to help them except the jet boat that they offered to pay \$75 to take them off the river. After talking to them they informed me that they were not warned of ANY danger and that they could not have glass on the river! They wanted to know where the park rangers were and how could they get help. If the park rangers are hiding in the woods in non dangerous sections how can can they address the needs and safety of our visitors who many of them are there for there first time! They should let the Mo. State Water and the Mo Concevation agents make sure the Laws and Regulation of Missouri are abided by. Inapropietate behavior would be greatly reduced by the visual presence of the park rangers and maybe they could help visitors and teach them and tell them of the ozark ways and heritage. In closing I feel of all the alternatives the "no-action" better fits the intent of the congressional act that established the ONSR and would avoid any lengthy ligations. The pressent plan can continue to provide a full quality recreational experience and allow the river to be enjoyed as it has been for generation and generations to come if more effort and interest was put into it by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways park rangers and employees,the Missouri coservation,the concessioneers,voliteers and the local people of the region.</p> <p>Thank You Daniel o Senf</p>					
805	<p>1) Plan A is closest to what I would like to see for the Current River, but is actually less stringent than I would like. I had an opportunity to paddle in the Quetico Provincial Park of the Boundary waters Canoe are wilderness and the protection provided there for wilderness and paddlesport was ideal. 2)Protecting habitat and providing motorboat free paddling are important. With so many areas available to motorboats, I would like to see the Current be a motor free river. I would be in favor of strong measures to protect water quality, including the streamside degradation from horse trails, ATV, 4WD etc. The National Scenic Rivers should be preserved as pristine wild natural areas. 3) I am strongly against any plans that would continue to degrade the habitat. I am against overuse and misuse. I travel 10 hours to visit the area and will not continue to do so with continued deterioration. 4) I am concerned about the entierey of the system. The alternatives as presented are very general and I am not confident that they address my concerns adequately. 5) I would like to see the utmost in protection of this precious and heavily used environment. The BWCAW is a fine example of a paddlers paradise that I would love for the National Scenic rivers of Missouri to be.</p>	7/30/2009	No		TX	75963
806	<p>1) Alternative A is close to my ideal. One learning education center might be appropriate. 2) I feel strongly only non-mechanized forms of recreation should be allowed on the Current above Big Spring. 3)More access points and boats, etc. should NOT be allowed. There are enough other places in Missouri for people to have that type of "fun". 4)I am most concerned about the upper Current, above Big Spring. The caves and springs along here really are unique and should not be allowed more degradation through more access, more motors, etc. 5) Curtailment of excessive partying would be good..</p>	7/30/2009	No		MO	63119
807	<p>Like many members of the Friends of Ozark Riverways, I reject both alternatives B & C. I support alternative A provided the Park Service also adopts management policies that control the use of the rivers under its control. The number of floaters on the river should be limited and recreational power boats should be banned in manuy areas. In addition, the power boats MUST obey speed limits on the rivers/streams used by non-power boats. I believe that the following actions on the part of the National Parks Service will make a start on restoring the degraded natural conditions on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. Eliminate excess river access points to preserve native communities of riparian birds, mammals, insects, reptiles, ampnhibians and, indeed, the plant community itself. Redesign horse trails to move them away from the banks of the rivers, creaks and sinkholes. This will dramatically reduce the pollution of the rivers -- which will, in turn, increase the opportunities for swimming. As a rider, I do NOT want to contribute to ecoli contamination or damage fragile aquatic habitats on river bottoms. Ban operation of ATV's, dirt bikes and similar vehibles from the park, except on legally designated state and county roads. Mobile campers MUST be restricted to official park campgrounds, which are specifically designed to accomodate them.</p>	7/30/2009	No		Friends of Ozark Riverways	MO 64131
808	<p>Thank you for accepting comment from the public on your General Management Plan and Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As a Missourian whose family has enjoyed all parts of the ONSR prior to, and since, its inception (especially the Current River), my family and I believe that Alternative A comes closest to meeting the goals of the original legislation that established the ONSR. However, rather than commenting on specific features of the various alternatives, we suggest that the following goals be pursued in your final 20-year management plan. a. Re-establish, then maintain, "fishable, swimmable" water quality throughout ONSR, including portions of the Jacks Fork that have been classified under the Clean Water Act as an "impaired waterbody." This will necessitate greater limitations on motorboats. I urge you to ban motor boating on the Current River above Two Rivers and on the Jacks Fork above Rt 19 Bridge. In areas where motorboats would be allowed, they should be limited to 25 hp motors, in order to reduce water and noise pollution. Maintenance of water quality would also necessitate limiting the use of ATVs in and near the rivers. Water quality maintenance might possibly even require new limits in the future on the sheer numbers of non-motor-based recreationists who are allowed access at any one time. Even more critically, the maintenance of water quality in the ONSR will necessitate limitations on horseback riding (e.g. the number of horses allowed to cross streams, how often they're allowed to cross streams, whether they wear "diapers," and how close to the rivers their trails are laid. The management plan should also specify a system for monitoring water quality. b) Evaluate the approximately 100 official and unauthorized access points and the roads and trails leading to these access points to determine which approximately 20 points could be authorized or re-authorized in order to preserve the natural character of the rivers, and to achieve the highest level of water quality, reduce erosion, allow wildlife to move around their natural territory, and to more easily enforce the law regarding where ATVs can be operated. c) My family and I very much support a wilderness designation for the back-country portion of the Big</p>	7/31/2009	No		MO	63124- 1130

	Spring tract. d) The management plan should specify the importance of voluntary scenic easement agreements and the National Park Service's plan for enforcing all such easements. The NPS should ensure all easement holders – and the public – that all such agreements will be honored. e) If the new management plan focuses on the standards it intends to achieve, and carefully monitors its achievement of these standards, it may need to remain somewhat flexible as to how it will achieve these standards. Its primary goal should be preservation of the natural character of the ONSR for current AND FUTURE generations. Therefore, all policies should be geared to sustaining the natural character of the area. Sincerely, Virginia Harris						
809	1) Alternatives A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The ability to have a quiet, peaceful canoe trip and enabling protection of natural wildlife (plants and animals) are my top priorities for this public land. 2) Non-mechanized, people-powered recreation should be encouraged. I support wilderness designation to a large area around Big Spring. 3) I am strongly against allowing louder, bigger motors and more roads, more horses, and more (or any) ATVs to be in the park. Enabling and encouraging them causes terrible impact on the health and natural qualities of the ONSR, and drives people like me away. 4) I am very concerned about the spots where ATVs and horses have damaged the banks and stream bed, and spots where unauthorized trails for ATVs exist. I am also concerned that by enabling people to "discover" more remote places, particularly caves, you may contradict and ruin the spots' un-replacable and special qualities. I realize this is a delicate balance, and perhaps by exposing special places you can protect them better, and engender greater appreciation for and therefore the protection of them. 5) Marketing is going to be an essential component, helping people understand and welcome the changes, so they are inspired to visit, support and protect the ONSR. While a "float camp" sounds fun and interesting, it may be difficult to get more people interested in that than a weekend party floatillas.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63130
810	1) I prefer alternatives A as the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The ability to have a quiet, peaceful canoe trip and enabling protection of natural wildlife (plants and animals) are my top priorities for this public land. 2) Non-mechanized, people-powered recreation should be encouraged. I support wilderness designation to a large area around Big Spring. 3) I am strongly against allowing louder, bigger motors and more roads, more horses, and more (or any) ATVs to be in the park. Enabling and encouraging them causes terrible impact on the health and natural qualities of the ONSR, and drives people like me away. 4) I am very concerned about the spots where ATVs and horses have damaged the banks and stream bed, and spots where unauthorized trails for ATVs exist. I am also concerned that by enabling people to "discover" more remote places, particularly caves, you may contradict and ruin the spots' un-replacable and special qualities. I realize this is a delicate balance, and perhaps by exposing special places you can protect them better, and engender greater appreciation for and therefore the protection of them. 5) Helping people understand and welcome the changes, so they are inspired to visit, support and protect the ONSR is going to be an important, big challenge. While a "float camp" sounds fun and interesting, it may be difficult to get more people interested in that than a weekend party barge.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63110
811	1) Alternatives A is close to my idea of the best way to manage the ONSR. The ability to have a quiet, peaceful canoe trip or hike, and enabling protection of natural wildlife (plants and animals) are my top priorities for this public land. 2) NON-mechanized, people-powered recreation should be encouraged. I support wilderness designation to a large area around Big Spring. 3) I do not want loud, big motors and more roads, more horses, and more (or any) ATVs to be in the park. Enabling, encouraging or merely allowing them to be there causes terrible impact on the health and natural qualities of the ONSR, and drives people like me away. 4) I am very concerned about areas where ATVs and horses have damaged the banks and stream bed, and spots where unauthorized trails for ATVs exist. I am also concerned that by enabling people to "discover" more remote places, particularly caves, you may contradict and ruin the spots' un-replacable and special qualities. I realize this is a delicate balance, and perhaps by exposing special places you can protect them better, and engender greater appreciation for and therefore the protection of them. 5) Marketing is going to be an essential component, helping people understand and welcome the changes, so they are inspired to visit, support and protect the ONSR. While a "float camp" sounds fun and interesting, it may be difficult to get more people interested in that than a weekend party floatilla.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63130
812	Our club has members that like to visit these waterways in canoes and kayaks. This is a popular destination for many groups who use personal powered craft. We would to see minimization of the fast moving motorized craft. Currently there are motor boats that move through groups of canoes and in kayaks. We would alternative A on Current River and alternative A or B on the Jacks Fork.	7/31/2009	No		Ohio Valley Paddlers	IN	47712
813	1) Alternative A is close to my ideal. Adding one learning education center might be appropriate. 2) I feel strongly only non-mechanized forms of recreation should be allowed on the Current above Big Spring. 3) More access points and boats, etc. are NOT necessary and should NOT be allowed. 4) I am most concerned about the upper Current, above Big Spring. The caves and springs there are unique and should not be allowed more degradation through more access, more motors, etc. 5) The excessive partying is disturbing. The reinforcement of enjoying this area quietly and more naturally would add a lot.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63104
814	Dear Mr. Detring, Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinion regarding the management plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My wife and I have had the pleasure to experience the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for 24 years. In fact, a float trip on the Current River was part of the impetus that originally brought us to Missouri. We enjoy float trips that include leisurly paddling, fishing, and gravel bar camping. We both treasure the solitude that can be experienced on the river and support a management plan that maintains our ability to get away from the "rat race" and feel that we are completely alone with nature. As you know the Ozark National Riverways is a very special environment and one worthy of special care. Over the course of our 24 years of canoeing the Current and Jacks Fork rivers, we have seen them in all seasons from mid-summer to New Years eve. Each year we manage at least 3 to 5 outings to the area and our trips have ranged from one day floats to 4 day extended trips. We have covered every river mile from Baptist Camp to Logyard on the Current and from Buck Hollow down to Two Rivers on the Jacks Fork. One of our more memorable trips occurred one winter when an ice storm began during an over night trip from Pullite to Round Spring. We found a	7/31/2009	No			MO	63090

	<p>gravel bar to pitch our tent soon after the sleet started and then spent a restless night wondering how bad things would get. In the morning we zipped opened the door to find a wonderland where everything in sight was covered with a layer of ice. Trees were slick and shiny from top to bottom on both sides of the river and we floated out through the most beautiful sight you can imagine. This experience and many others have shaped how we feel about the Ozark National Riverways and we would like to see the resource preserved so that generations to come can have the same opportunity. Given the unique beauty of this area it is not surprising that many people take advantage of the park. With heavy use, there is the potential for damage and abuse. Some of the problems we have observed include over use, litter, obnoxious behavior by unruly floaters, and motor boat operators who steer dangerously close to canoeists or who fail to yield or reduce their wake. All of these issues could be avoided if resource users would practice responsible camping methods, exhibit a measure of restraint, and be considerate of other users. Unfortunately, this does not always occur and thus it falls to the NPS to develop and execute a management plan to preserve the resource and maintain a presence that will encourage good behavior. We support the NPS in this effort and applaud your efforts to this point. The recent changes designed to restore a more family friendly atmosphere appear to be having a positive affect. Our comments on the proposed management plans are included in our response to your posted questions copied below. 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? We support option A for the upper sections of both rivers extending downstream to their confluence at Two Rivers, in particular we believe that motorized use should be limited or prohibited in this area. The upper sections of the river are narrow and not appropriate for motorized use of the kind we typically witness. There are many rivers in Missouri where boaters can freely use their motorboats and we feel that there should be opportunities for more primitive experiences. The current horsepower limits above Round Spring and Alley Springs have minimized the interactions between motorized boats and canoes and should at a minimum be maintained, expanding the limits downstream to Two Rivers would give canoeists the opportunity to experience extended multi-day trips without encountering the noise and disruption of motorized travel. Higher horsepower limits below Two Rivers would still offer many opportunities for boaters to enjoy their preferred mode of travel in an area where the wider banks allow enough space for boaters and canoeists to coexist more safely. Option B provides a reasonable management plan for areas below Two Rivers. Maintaining the area in a natural or primitive state is our preferred option since it is much easier to preserve rather than restore conditions at some later time. We feel that Option C is not appropriate for any of the areas due to the damage that can result from heavy use and more extensive development and this does not meet the stated purpose of the National Riverways system to "Preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition...". 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? The opportunity to experience primitive camping and less crowded conditions. This is likely to require a reduction in the amount of users that the commercial outfitters are allowed to put on the river. Your "No-Action Alternative" section mentions that there are 23 outfitters currently operating in the park. On numerous occasions I have spoken to staff who state that they have put 300 canoes on the river on a single day. Given that more than 2 or 3 outfitters use a particular put-in, this leads to very crowded conditions on the river. Moreover, from my experience, the users who tend to be the least responsible are typically "one dayers" who rent their canoes. I am not suggesting that the outfitters are irresponsible; they have no control over how people who use their service conduct themselves. The sheer numbers of users is the problem and solving that problem is not going to be easy. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Extensive development or expansion of horsepower limits above Round Spring or Alley Spring should be avoided. The river in these area is simply not large enough to safely allow mixed-use at levels above those currently defined. Additionally, there should be no increase in the number of outfitters operating on the upper sections of the river or in their daily quotas for allowable canoe launches. The volume of human waste and toilet paper deposited within a very narrow band on either side of the river is directly proportional to the number of folks paddling down the river. Any real effort to control that water quality problem must either reduce the numbers or offer other toilet options (see #4). 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? As stated above, we are regular users of the upper sections of the river extending upstream from Two Rivers. We have floated lower sections but did not find the solitude there that we seek. Alternative A adequately addresses the concerns we have for those areas and would likely maintain the natural state for future users to enjoy. We are not suggesting that all progress or development is bad but there should be places that are preserved in as natural a state as possible. The unique nature of the Ozark Natural Riverways system makes this an area where such protection is warranted. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? One very good idea the plan mentions is to create a demonstration float camp. Exposing users to paddling techniques, safe packing practices, responsible camping methods, and helping them to experience a safe and positive wilderness immersion would help to ensure that more people see the value of maintaining the resource in a</p>						
815	<p>In general I feel that the NPS does an excellent job with the budgetary constraints and local conditions that impact day to day operations. More funding must be sought to prevent further degradation and reverse past damages and facilitate enforcement of regulations. The riverways and watersheds must be protected for future generations and because they are a unique and valuable resource beyond measurable value. All other uses and demands for exploitation should be secondary to preservation and protection of the fragile biological and physical resource. No user group should be allowed to love the rivers to destruction, regardless of how much right or passion they feel they have to do so. It is a national resource that belongs to everyone in the United States and is unique on the planet as well. The local population and political entities should certainly be considered but absolutely not allowed to run rough shod and have long term negative impact that they presently have been given. All illegal access and roads should be vigorously pursued and closed and strictly prevented in the future. These should never have been allowed and only a dedicated effort requiring a special force and legal action will enable these to remain closed. ATV's should be absolutely banned from the</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65738

	Park drainage area, beyond bluff to bluff. This is NOT an ATV park. I own an ATV and four wheel drive vehicle, but this is not the place for them to be allowed. These uses have unlimited areas elsewhere they can be enjoyed. Horses should be treated the same as ATV's. I own a horse stable and nearly twenty horse and know how destructive they are to a fragile environment. There is no way this is a compatable use to the original intent of the Riverways. It would be different if there were only one or two occasional riders. The thousands in the watershed is unacceptable and horribly destructive. There are unlimited trails and acreage to ride horses outside the watershed. Damage and pollution in the "gap" on the Jacks Fork degrades the ONSR downstream. Horsepower limits should be as restrictive as possible and somehow limited in number of boats ripping up and down the rivers. Back in the 1960's we did not have these large motors and numbers of pleasure cruisers that merely joy ride as fast and far as possible. Back when the NPS established the ONSR the only motor boats were local fisherman for the most part. We did not have the recreational cruisers with huge motors. Many lakes are in the area if people want to go fast in big boats. I feel the only course of action that should be taken is to return to the original intent of the Congressional mandate to preserve and protect the resource itself. Alternative A comes the closest to doing this but should be taken further in order to prevent further degradation for the Riverways. Wilderness character must be protected and promoted. Other conflicting uses should be discouraged to prevent the loss of diversity to this world class resource. I can go to Whitewater Park, Six Flags or Disneyland if I want to have that kind of experience. Less development, more protection. Anything else would be against every intent of the original plan proposed for the ONSR. Thank you. David Stokely						
816	1. No Action 2. No Action 3. Limiting access to the Park or its resources. Further restricting outboard motor horsepower for boats. 4. No Action 5. No Action	7/31/2009	No		Voice of the Ozarks	MO	65588
817	1. No Action 2. No Action 3. Stopping People from accessing the river, and imposing further horsepower restrictions on outboard motors. 4. No Action 5. No Action	7/31/2009	No		Voice of the Ozarks	MO	65588
818	1) My closest pick would be alternative A. We critically need areas to be divided to protect the resources that we have. If we continue as it currently happening, our resources and ecosystems will become jeopardized through overuse. I would add to that, I would like to see the requirement of waste management systems for overnight campers. We need to eliminate the extra strain being put on the river by humans. We do camp overnight and current bring our own waste management systems. 2) Motorized vehicles need to be excluded from being in the waterways. Reduce the number of "unauthorized" access's to the river. These promote illegal access to the river with motorized vehicles. Additionally, the horse access needs to be limited to area's outside direct contact of the water. The horse trails through the river disrupts the ecosystem various ways. Of course their fecal material adds to the bacterial load the river must handle. 3) I do not feel strongly that any part should not be included, however, I do believe that area's for each part of recreation should be addressed. Wilderness areas, motorized vehicle area's, equestrain areas and then water usage areas. But they do need to be separated. 4) the water is special, it is the life to everything around it....lets not destroy it by exploitation of the resources. 5) I think developing a human waste management program can be very beneficial....the "land" bombs left by people are disgusting not to mention a health hazard.	7/31/2009	No		Ozark Mountain Paddlers	MO	64834
819	1. No Action 2. No Action 3. Limiting outboard motor horsepower, and shutting off access to the river. 4. No Action 5. No Action	7/31/2009	No		Voice of the Ozarks	MO	65588
820	1.No Action 2.No Action 3.Limiting boat horsepower, and shutting off the roads to the river. 4.No Action 5.No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65588
821	Alternative A is the best of the proposals but does not go far enough to protect the Riverways. Any and all action must be taken to reverse the destruction of people loving the rivers to death. ATV's, horses, large motors, illegal roads and access must be strictly banned to protect the Park from more damage. Biological diversity is being lost at a rapid pace under these incompatable uses. Please return to the original basis for the creation of the ONSR of protection of the Riverways for future generations in their original form. Wilderness character should be maintained and high impact uses should be reduced and eliminated. We go to the river to escape civilization and stress of modern life. This is the last place in Missouri to do so. This is a national jewel that should be treated as the unique resource that it represents.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65738
822	Of all the choices, Plan A (in question # 1) seems to be the best.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63017
823	1. Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 2. Gas motors should be eliminated on all stretches. Electric motors may be acceptable on some stretches. 3. No effort or funding should be used to develop history programs or interpretative sights. These are contrary to the wilderness experience. 4. Gas motors and vehicular access in areas other than government controlled access points are the biggest detractors to enjoying pristine wilderness experiences.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63130
824	1. No Action 2. No Action 3. Blocking roads off, and stopping motor boats. 4. No Action 5. No ACtion	7/31/2009	No			MO	65438

825	1.No Action 2.No Action 3.Shutting down roads to the river and old home places, and further limiting motorboat use areas or restricting horsepower. 4.No Action 5.No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65588
826	1) Alternative A is close to my ideal. A learning education center might be appropriate. 2) I prefer only non-mechanized forms of recreation on the Current above Big Spring. 3)More access points and boats, etc. should NOT be allowed. There are enough other places in Missouri for people to have that type of boating experience. 4)I am most concerned about the upper Current, above Big Spring. The caves and springs along here really are unique and should not be allowed more degradation through more access, more motors, etc. 5) Curtailment of excessive partying would be good.. 6) Floating the river should be a calming experience... quiet and serene. Motor boats in general disturb this experience and should be used for safety patrolling.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63122
827	I moved to Southwest Missouri because of the unspoiled natural environment and the Ozarks. I'm concerned about allowing ATVs, motor boats, and other encroachments into wilderness areas. I support Alternative A to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My family also enjoys the rivers and want to see that they are maintained and pollution free. Alternative A and the designation of a Big Springs Wilderness Area seem to offer the best ways to protect and sustain the natural beauty of this area. Dr. Barry Barnes	7/31/2009	No			MO	65663
828	1) I feel that No-Action is a good option since the current management plan clearly outlines sufficient protection of the rivers. This option plus increased enforcement would be best. 3) I strongly feel that options B and C should be rejected because they will cause further degradation to the park. 4) I float a 15-mile section of the Jacks Fork River by Jamup Cave every year in spring. This is dear to me though all of the Scenic Riverway should be covered under the same protection.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63089
829	2. Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have	7/31/2009	No		Ozark Fly Fishers	MO	63017
830	1) Alternative A is closest to me ideas of the bestway to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As I understand it, A has the most natural, primitive, and nonmotorized emphasis. I would make it even more natural and less motorized if possible 2)I think that we need to provide wider and wider buffers between the rivers and the surrounding human dominated spaces. Making the Big Spring area a Wilderness area is a great start. Another important element of the best plan is getting rid of motors. Motorized vehicles and boats are bad for the rivers. Horses are so great either. 3) Any plan to increase human traffic and roads is bad. I hope that the plan can provide for professional ecological managers who can both do research and work to maintain natural ecosystems and species, especially with climate change. 4) I find the upper reaches of the Current the most beautiful, the area around Baptist Camp and Cedar Grove. It is essential to make this nonmotorized and primitive. 5) A lot of National Parks have limits on how many people can go into the park in a given time. I would suggest gradually reducing the number of permits for rental canoes on the Current River especially. There are hordes, unruly hordes, of people on the river now. Cut down the canoes and eliminate the motors.	7/31/2009	No			MO	64110
831	1) No-Action is perhaps the best option since the current management plan clearly outlines sufficient protection of the rivers. This option plus increased enforcement would be best. 3) I strongly feel that options B and C should be rejected because they will cause further degradation to the park. 4) I float a lot of rivers in the Ozarks and the Jacks Fork is by far my favorite. I float a section along Jamup cave annually and I am disappointed by the volume of off-road vehicles along this river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63108
832	I prefer no action taken, leave the rivers as they are with LESS restrictions, not more.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65066
833	Please take NO ACTION. Leave the rivers as they are now.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63066
834	Topic 1) No action alternative is pretty close to my idea of the best way to manage the Riverways. Topic 2) I strongly feel that the horsepower limit should remain at 40 below Round Spring. Topic 3) I strongly feel that changing the horsepower limit below Round Spring to 25 should not happen. Topic 4) I visit and float (kayak and canoe) all of the river between Montauk and Big Spring regularly. But the part between Round Spring and Two Rivers is the most special to me. I have a cabin near Williams Landing (about halfway between Round Spring and Two Rivers.) I am in that area frequently (year round) and plan on living there year round when I retire in 3 years. Please, please, please do not change the horsepower limit below Round Spring from 40 to 25. It would have a drastic impact on my life. My wife and I use our boat in that area to fish and just spend time. The river has many shallow spots that would be much harder, if not impossible, to navigate with a 25 HP motor. A 40 HP motor is enough to get a boat with two or three adults on board and over the shallow areas but 25 HP is not. I do understand the need to allow jet boats and canoes to co exist along the river. I canoe and kayak a lot myself on Current River and always slow down and pull over to allow canoes to pass when I am in my boat. If you feel you must change the horsepower limit to 25 below Round Spring please make it a seasonal change (Memorial Day to Labor Day) during the summer only and allow 40 HP the rest of the year.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65401

835	<p>Topic 1) No action alternative is pretty close to my idea of the best way to manage the Riverways. Topic 2) I strongly feel that the horsepower limit should remain at 40 below Round Spring. Topic 3) I strongly feel that changing the horsepower limit below Round Spring to 25 should not happen. Topic 4) I visit and float (kayak and canoe) all of the river between Montauk and Big Spring regularly. But the part between Round Spring and Two Rivers is the most special to me. I have a cabin near Williams Landing (about halfway between Round Spring and Two Rivers.) I am in that area frequently (year round) and plan on living there year round when I retire in 3 years. Please, please, please do not change the horsepower limit below Round Spring from 40 to 25. It would have a drastic impact on my life. My wife and I use our boat in that area to fish and just spend time. The river has many shallow spots that would be much harder, if not impossible, to navigate with a 25 HP motor. A 40 HP motor is enough to get a boat with two or three adults on plane and over the shallow areas but 25 HP is not. I do understand the need to allow jet boats and canoes to co exist along the river. I canoe and kayak a lot myself on Current River and always slow down and pull over to allow canoes to pass when I am in my boat. If you feel you must change the horsepower limit to 25 below Round Spring please make it a seasonal change (Memorial Day to Labor Day) during the summer only and allow 40 HP the rest of the year.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65401
836	<p>1. Alternative A best meets my ideal, with the exception that I would add some trails that have universal access so people with disabilities could also enjoy these areas. 2. Restricting equestrian activities that have a negative effect on water quality and destruction of land areas due to the riders creating their own "trails." Also exclusion of certain motorized vehicles such as ATVs. 3. Motorized boats in the Upper Current, increased use of any areas by equestrians, and addition of commercial businesses such as stores. 4. No specific opinion. 5. There seems to be a need for more controlled management in the entire area. Numbers of horses at any one time should be limited, use of ATVs strongly enforced, and increased general oversight. Since "preservation of the national riverways resources" is the mission, all activities that are detrimental to that goal should be eliminated.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65804
837	<p>1) I like the Alternative A which is already close to my idea. 2) Being able to return the river use to low impact activities allowing it to stay in as close to natural state as possible. 3) Too much commercial development - minimize this. 4) I like the whole riverway - see below. 5) I feel minimizing the use of motors and water contamination (sewers, horses, etc.) In summary, I would like to see the following things in the plan: • substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails • limit motorized vehicles to official roads • reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats • enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations • limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination • designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area • monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat • reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generatio</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65203
838	<p>1)I support alternative A totally. 2)Eliminate Jet boats totally. They are not in character with the park. They were never a part of the traditional Ozark culture and they destroy the river experience. Severely limit the canoe rental business. They cater to a crowd that is destroying the river experience. Drunkeness and nudity id common amongst those who come for the weekend to rent canoes, tubes, etc. 3)Zones for power boats. Power boats are not part of the river tradition. 4) They are all special to me. That is why I supported development of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to protect the river. 5) Remove the structures that have been built along the river in recent years, such as the outlandish cabin just downriver from "Two Rivers". You are supposed to be protecting the park, not those who think that they have special privileges.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65588
839	<p>1. Alternative A is closest to our idea of how we at CCFF would like to see the Riverways managed and protected for future generations. 2. Removing unauthorized accesses to the rivers would be a good start. By limiting access, that would keep the destruction caused by 4-wheelers and the extra trash left by partiers to a minimum. 3. Increasing the number of accesses to the rivers would have a devastating effect on the rivers. In effect, we would love it to death. 4. All 134 miles is important. That's why it was set aside and protected back in the '60s. This area should be different than other rivers. If people want a party river, float the Gasconade. These rivers need protection. 5. We believe that by eliminating the unauthorized roads to the rivers and limiting accesses all along the river would be a good start and at least catch up on current regulations. Shutting down the river is not going to be popular or practical. However, if a sufficient and already predetermined amount of space is reestablished and protected between authorized accesses, the floating outfitters and the public will adapt to it. In fact, it may increase guide work in the areas and provide a replacement income for the area as they lose the party groups. This will take some work, a little money, and some manpower, but in the end we believe this is the best course of action to ensure that these rivers return and remain in an almost natural state for our children and their children to enjoy. In the early 1900's Teddy Roosevelt recognized the need to set aside areas of this country to save for future generations to know what this country was like before colonization. This is one of those areas that needs to be saved. Jim Farthing, President Capital City Fly Fishers</p>	7/31/2009	No		Capital City Fly Fishers	MO	65101
840	<p>Ultimately, we will be judged by future generations on how we have managed our natural resources. This simple concept should be the guiding principal in determining future use of the ONSR or any other natural resource that we are charged with managing. I have devoted my entire 34 year career to parks and recreation in various government settings. The value of recreation cannot be overstated. However, that value should be secondary to protecting and preserving our rich natural heritage. If we are someday judged to have erred in managing our natural resources in an overly restrictive manner, that is preferable to allowing short-term or long-term degradation of the resource. Thank you for this opportunity to comment and good luck.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63038
841	<p>2) I feel the complete 134 mile long ONSR should be kept as primitive usage as possible. Thank you</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65203

842	1) Plan A is our very strong preference. We have floated and camped the ONSR rivers for 30 years, summer and winter, seeking tranquility, relative solitude, and the opportunity to experience natural Missouri at its best. What can compare with following a Great Blue Heron down the river, watching Kingfishers jostle for territory and mates, spotting the gorgeous Green Herons taking flight, and, on winter floats, the rare magnificence of a Bald Eagle on a snag 25 ft above us! The swiftness of crawdads, sound of amphibians, antics of water-bugs, beavers and snakes swimming silently, turtles (lines of 10-12 perched on a downed tree trunk) basking in the sun, fawns coming to drink at dusk... where will all this go in the face of noisy disturbance? The binoculars and guide books for identifying flora and fauna would be pretty useless in the disappearance of subject matter! 2) Big Spring wilderness designation. No mechanized traffic above Big Spring or on the Jacks Fork. 3) Please, NO ADDITIONAL access points. The Current already is a canoe parking lot. Plan C SHOULD NOT be implemented. 4) Plan A is closest to addressing our concerns. We would strongly urge no motorized traffic on the Upper Current above Big Spring or on the Jacks Fork. 5) Discouraging pollution, including noise pollution, would be welcome. Overused Western rivers have adopted lottery systems and/or waiting lists to control impact on the river. Perhaps limiting the size of groups or spacing put-in times would help.	7/31/2009	No		Sierra Club (M), Coalition for the Environment (M), Nature Conservancy (M)	MO	63130
843	Topic 5 - Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	7/31/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63031
844	Hello, Recently I was listening to a talk by the president of a large museum in St. Louis and he expressed how important wilderness areas are to our cultural and psychological well being. His viewpoint is that, even if we don't use these areas, it is important to know they are there. They are an important link with our past and our future. Quiet areas, where nature is the dominant force, should be available to everyone in quantities far greater than what is currently available. Today, on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the solitude and quietness that were envisioned by previous generations of nature's stewards is all but gone. Additionally, due to other abuses, the outstanding natural quality of these areas is being degraded at an alarming rate. Everyone deserves the right to places free of noise, things, and society to enjoy in truly traditional ways. This is not possible today on in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. While most of the recreational activities that take place today on the Riverways can take place and be less destructive in other locations, it is alarming that the Park Service continues to cater to and tolerate the abuses that run counter to the original mission of the Riverways. ATV riders not only have their own parks but this is an activity that can be done anywhere. An old quarry, for example, could be opened to ATVers who aren't fully satisfied with the parks they already have (some of which are larger than some of Missouri's Wilderness Areas). Even horseback riding, which, when done en mass, has an incredibly negative effect on the ecosystem of the Riverways (and doesn't pay for the destruction it causes), is an activity that could take place in other areas. Motorboaters have any number of lakes to choose from if they wish to play with their speed boats and fish in this manner. The Riverways is not the place for such activities. Activities on the Riverways should be limited to those which offer experiences unique to the nature and landscape of the area. Activities, such as those listed above, have many other homes and many other vehicles for enjoyment. However, they have no place in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; which was created to offer humans access to the serenity of the natural world and to foster an understanding of our relationship with nature. The current state of management on the Riverways and the easement violations that exist thereon need to be addressed in a serious way that not only involves foresters but also the local community who seem to be exploiting this precious resource. For centuries we have taken as we wish from our surroundings all the while purporting to wish more protections for the natural world. Isn't it time we actually began to protect the areas as we claim to be interested in doing? Regards, Eric Wilkinson	7/31/2009	No			MO	63110
845	Prefer alternate "A"	7/31/2009	No			MO	63126
846	1) Thank you for the opportunity to have input. I reject Alternatives B and C because I believe they would lead to long term degradation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I prefer Alternative A in an attempt to preserve and protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We must repair and restore the areas eroded by ATV use and contaminated by horse trails and droppings. My family has been enjoying the use of these rivers by canoe and kayak for three generations. Any long range use plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should have buffer zones for springs, creeks, rivers, fens, caves, bluffs, and all other ecologically sensitive areas. Please preserve and protect our Missouri treasures for use by three more generations...and three more after that!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63105
847	Comment on ONSR General Management Final draft... Alex Primm, Mountain View, MO... 31.7.09 1. Choice of suggested alternatives. First I must say the full planning document, which I received in the mail as a result of attending earlier meetings, is helpful, well designed and a bit intimidating. So many issues are covered well, at least I feel inspired to get out and see the Riverways more, learn more about it especially now that my wife and I have moved to the Greenwood Forest Land Trust, a virtual in-holding on the upper Jacks Fork near Jam Up Cave. Though I have only lived here a year I have floated most parts of the two rivers over the last 30 years and knew one of the founders of the park, Leonard Hall, who I am sure would be proud to see the park as it is now managed. While I appreciate some aspects of all three alternatives, the B choice in general seems better to me for the Riverways at this time in its history. While I am sympathetic to the wild lands preservation aspects of A, I feel more needs to be done to interpret the park's resources and encourage increased visitation and appreciation of its widely dispersed resources. I say this in part because when I walk down to the Jacks Fork from our cabin or go floating, I rarely see people. From my point of view, this is great, but it's sort of sad too. I feel more should be done creatively to encourage increased use and appreciation especially of remote areas in this great park. 2. Parts of alternatives to be included in future management plans. Looking over the various alternatives, I feel the No-Action choice is	7/31/2009	No		Greenwood Forest	MO	65548

	<p>helpful in that it describes current management, which I believe in general is excellent, especially considering the current budget situation. I have known several employees over the years whom I feel do an incredible job. But I feel a few improvements could add to the Riverways overall excellence, which is why I choose the B alternative. One current aspect I have noticed is a new ONSR official brochure. While it is an improvement in many ways, I wonder why it is not titled 'Ozark Riverways' as was the past version, why there are no captions for the neat B&W photos, why adjacent MDC [esp. the Twin Pines center near Winona], DNR and other significant sites are not indicated on the expanded map, why so few trails shown? I feel the 'how to float' section on the previous brochure should have been retained in some way and safety aspects of floating given more attention. [I saw a near drowning of a teenager whose swimming suit got caught on a snag and he couldn't get his head out of water, only a foot deep there, until an adult noticed his peril.] S.N. Patricia's illustration of karst is unusually good as are the nearby text especially the material on the landscape. Why is nothing included on volunteering and organizational partnerships? In general I feel hiking needs to be pumped up along the riverways. I will not comment on the website as, living in the backwoods, we have slow Internet so print materials are still a primary focus for me. So the brochure could well be redone as a result of this planning process in a few years... As for the A alternative, I feel the Big Springs wilderness is probably a good idea, though I do not know this area well. As for the upper Jacks, I tend to support the idea of primitive as opposed to natural management as described, with one exception—I believe that eventually both rivers should have hiking trails with camping in a few huts or maintained sites alongside their entire lengths within and beyond the Riverways. More on this later. On the B, I most like the idea of more interpretation, partly because I have a background in oral history and have done work for the ONSR in this area. I think it is important to enhance the regional history in various ways and get people involved in understanding the changing uses of natural resources. A living history farm, peckerwood mill or tie hacker camp within the park would be great. On C I am comfortable with allowing 25 hp. motors seasonally on Jacks Fork as gigging is cool, but not with all those high-powered engines and lights that are getting too common. I think Alley Spring could use some new development as suggested, but it should be geared to hiking and history, not commercial fluff. 3. Alternative aspects not supported for the future. On A I favor more primitive areas except at Devil's Well, which could use interpretation and a hiking trail to connect to the river, but maybe there is already one there, I don't remember. On B I question what kind of increased development would be allowed at Welch Cave and Akers. On C, I would not like to see a whole lot more development of campgrounds at Round Springs. It is so close to the highway and Schwagfest that campers should be encouraged to find other sites. Also, I question the proposed development to be allowed in the park south of VanBuren on 103. Visitor facilities other than basic campgrounds generally should be outside the Riverways and done mainly by private contractors I feel. In general I know the Riverways is having a problem with unauthorized use of ATVs. These are truly annoying devices because they are so damn noisy and destructive to plants and soil. However I can understand how people enjoy them. Maybe there could be an ATV trail developed that would have no impact on riparian resources in some out of the way place. But I think law enforcement efforts and fines should be increased to discourage these uses. I do not favor closing all locally maintained access points to the rivers. Many of these have long-standing local use and should be allowed as long as they are not used by ATV riders to access unauthorized trails or logging roads. Also, I have read that horses are a problem in the park because there are so many clustered around trail rides in Eminence. I have not experienced any problems with horses myself and would encourage equestrian uses that are more dispersed around the Riverways. I have nothing against horses and believe that most hikers would tolerate using trails with horses provided they are not paved with pasture patties, eroded gullies and other signs of overuse. 4. Places of special concern. The one place I know best is the general area around Jam Up Cave. It does receive maybe an average of 100 or so visitors a day over the summer but shows no sign of degradation that I can see. Plants growing by the huge entrance show no sign of erosion or being beaten down. There are other nearby geological and historic features that are amazing, but perhaps it is just as well that most visitation comes from passing floaters. [A metal sign to encourage floaters to remove their own trash from the huge gravel bar there and to bury their poop in a hole well up into the forest would be helpful.] I think in general it is a good idea to keep signage on the Riverways to a minimum as it is now. However designated Natural Areas should be identified by signs so floaters or hikers know these are special places. I think it is part of the fun of a park to discover special places without a lot of direction or handholding. Another area I know a bit is the Riverways north of Doniphan. I have floated and gigged that reach in historic johnboats with the Murray family and others and know this is a really different river than the Jacks. I also helped on an historic tie raft recreation with Joe Ray Hastings and the Current River Museum crowd a few years ago. I think anything that can be done to encourage historic preservation and traditional uses in that part of the river would be well received. I read about a recent accident involving two jets on the lower river that involved several deaths of young people. My gut feeling is that a lower than 40 hp. limit on motors would be good, but would be highly unpopular. Maybe some other ways would be better to limit big jets on this section would be better, such as limiting the number of power boats on the</p>						
848	No Action is needed. To futher reduce HP levels will only create a dangerous situation. Families use boats to transport themselves and their stuff. A loaded boat is on the edge of safty with a 40 HP motor. To run a 25HP motor means leaving people at home (smaller boat less capisity). Floaters don't have to leave people at home, all they leave is trash in our river. What's needed is to enforce floater number limations in the river, and better acess for boats in areas that let boaters and floaters use different parts of the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
849	I choose the no-action plan. It would be nice if the park service had enough personal to keep things up better and enforce the present rules.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466
850	I think the present plan is a good one. There could be more help to keep things up better and enforce the rules. So the no-action plan is my choice.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466

851	<p>Dear NPS: I grew up enjoying the Current River on at least annual float trips with my family. These trips which usually came near my birthday in August were one of the highlights of the entire year. For someone growing up on the outskirts of St. Louis and more accustomed to the muddy Missouri River and expanding subdivisions, seeing the crystal clear water and expansive forests was a memorable experience. These qualities are what makes the ONSR unique, i.e. what sets it apart from almost all of the rest of Missouri. Moreover, they are qualities that the park service has been charged by Congress with upholding. In recent years, I have become aware of disturbing information about lax management by the NPS and abuse by some visitors to the park. Some of this is simply inappropriate behavior with temporary effects, but some is doing long-term damage. The park service must do more to protect the resources that make the ONSR so special. Here are my recommendations for your management plan revision: --Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help restore and maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. --Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. --Have a better policy and practice of monitoring and enforcing the scenic easements that are intended to protect nearly 9,000 acres within the ONSR. --Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the Rivers' health comes first. --Recommend designation of the Big Spring tract as Wilderness.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63144
852	<p>1) Alternatives A is close to my idea of the best way to manage the ONSR. The ability to have a quiet, peaceful canoe trip or hike, and enabling protection of natural wildlife (plants and animals) are my top priorities for this public land. 2) NON-mechanized, people-powered recreation should be encouraged. I support wilderness designation to a large area around Big Spring. 3) I do not want loud, big motors and more roads, more horses, and more (or any) ATVs to be in the park. Enabling, encouraging or merely allowing them to be there causes terrible impact on the health and natural qualities of the ONSR, and drives people like me away. 4) I am very concerned about areas where ATVs and horses have damaged the banks and stream bed, and spots where unauthorized trails for ATVs exist. I am also concerned that by enabling people to "discover" more remote places, particularly caves, you may contradict and ruin the spots' un-replacable, special qualities. I realize this is a delicate balance, and perhaps by exposing special places you can protect them better, and engender greater appreciation for and therefore the protection of them. 5) Marketing is going to be an essential component, helping people understand and welcome the changes, so they are inspired to visit, support and protect the ONSR. While a historical "float camp" sounds fun and interesting to do one time, it may be difficult to get more people interested in that than numerous weekend party floatillas.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Earth Share of Missouri	MO	63139
853	<p>July 31, 2009 On behalf of our 315,000 members, the National Parks Conservation Association is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. NPCA commends current park leadership for understanding that this park has experienced abuse and neglect for many years and for developing some avenues – through this GMP – to reverse the damage that has been done at this wonderful national treasure. There are, however, critical issues that are not addressed in the GMP that must be dealt with if the rivers are to be protected as Congress intended when authorizing America's first National Scenic Rivers more than 40 years ago. NPCA commends the park service for its approach to public input on this GMP. By holding public meetings in many locations, a wide range of park supporters were able to learn about management alternatives and make comment on the plan. It is evident that current park leadership has prioritized working with park supporters to achieve a new vision for the park. This GMP provides a tremendous opportunity to forge improvements to the park, make provisions for enforcing current National Park Service policy, and develop strong partnerships that will benefit this park and its visitors for many years to come. Change will not come easily, but park management must change if the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is to survive. 1. Is one of the four alternatives already close to your idea of the best way to manage ONSR? Of the three Alternatives proposed in the GMP, Alternative A comes closest to management of the site according to the guidelines Congress set when establishing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 2. Which parts of any of the preferred alternatives should be included in future management of the riverways? Critical components of Alternative A to include in future management are: - Greater opportunity for traditional, non-motorized forms of recreation - Management would close roads and trails that have been illegally developed - Commercial services might be limited or modified along portions of the rivers - Enhance visitor awareness of people's cultural heritage in the area - Big Spring wilderness tract is proposed The above provisions are all consistent with the very purpose and significance of the National Riverways. Especially important to consider in all management provisions at this site is this purpose statement: "Provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the national riverways resources." NPCA recognizes that "a manageable mix of traditional recreation activities, such as floating, boating and horseback riding," as described in Alternative B may be compatible with the desirable goals set forth in Alternative A. If this balance of recreational use is well managed by the NPS and respected by all river users, it could be consistent with the purpose and significance statement above. But in order to achieve a manageable balance of recreation activities, there must be limits set on horsepower, number of canoes/kayaks, and numbers of horses allowed on the river. And a well-funded, aggressive educational component with measureable results must be adopted to educate river users about the importance of preserving the park's critical resources. 3. Which parts of the alternatives should not be included in future management of the riverways? Nearly all of the provisions in Alternative C should not be included in future management of the riverways as they are inconsistent with the purpose and significance statements of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. Specifically, the park service should NOT allow: - More motorized activities of any type on the river: this will compromise visitor safety, and be inconsistent with good stewardship of park resources - Additional boat ramps and trails for horseback riding: with the recent proliferation of access roads to the river, causing severe damage to the riverbank and water quality, there are already many more access points than park plans originally intended - Higher tolerance for resource impacts in more heavily used areas: higher tolerance for impact could cause additional development along the river, and development – especially in the gap – already causes resource damage and water quality issues 4. Are there some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about? Do the alternatives address them adequately? 5. Are there important strategies or approaches to management of resources or visitor experience that should be included? If so, what are they? Specifically, NPCA encourages the park service to: - Set reasonable limits on the numbers of horses allowed on the riverside</p>	7/31/2009	No		National Parks Conservation Association	IL	60603

	trails at any one time - Reduce the number of equestrian river crossings - Permanently close all unofficial river access roads. If a new road and trail plan is necessary to achieve this goal, one should be undertaken immediately - Enforce the ban on ORVs within park boundaries - Implement the ORV education campaign, and if necessary, seek partnership support to initiate - Set horsepower limits for power boats as follows: 10 hp limit between Two Rivers and Van Buren; 25 hp limit below Van Buren - Set limits on the number and control the frequency of non-motorized crafts on the river. This will alleviate crowding on the river - Preserve the 3,400 acres at Big Creek as primitive wilderness NPCA encourages the park service to maximize partnership solutions by working with a variety of groups and individuals to solve management issues. The park service and its friends groups and partners, like NPCA, must make an effort to educate park visitors about the importance of resource protection and good stewardship practices. When necessary, the park and its partners must step up and halt illegal activities and unauthorized land uses. In a publication by Will Sarvis in the University of California Press, the paradox of this site is well described: "On the one hand, the NPS would accommodate hundreds of thousands of tourists. On the other, it would struggle to protect the area's sensitive habitats, which, because of the increased recreational visitation, would create greater human impact." This is a challenge to the NPS and its partners at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as it is at many national park sites. But these are America's first National Scenic Rivers and they need a bold new vision to survive for future generations. Lynn McClure Midwest Regional Director National Parks Conservation Association 8 South Michigan Ave. Chicago, IL 60603 312-263-0111						
854	I would like to write in support of Alternative A. I believe that this will allow for planning that will most likely preserve the Rivers in their natural state. I feel that in the past that the rivers have been imperiled by the impact of large horse groups . I feel strongly that this form of overuse should be strictly controlled. I also feel that all unauthorized roads should be eliminated - and that All-Terrain Vehicles should be removed from the ONSR park, and that these controls should be backed up with enforcement. I also would like to see the Big Springs area preserved as a federal wilderness area. I have visited and camped and backpacked many times , and have always been drawn to the Rivers and the land surrounding because of the wildness of the area. This park is a relatively small area, and the rivers themselves are but narrow slices in the region that we call the Ozarks. I feel that more development than currently exist would destroy the sense of wildness that I find there. Please take care of this treasure! With Regards, Timothy A. Pekarek	7/31/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63106
855	Comments on Jacks Fork and Current Rivers Some of my comments are responses to the Friends of Ozark Riverways (FOOR) "campaign to Save the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers again". First I belong to a Stream team, MRRRA, forest keepers, I float, bike, hike and camp. But I also hunt and fish. I am a conservationist. I believe we must be good stewards of the resources we have been given. I also believe the public resources are for the public to use and enjoy. I also believe that God gave us all things to enjoy. I agree with some of the FOOR point, but disagree with some of them also. I will primarily focus on where I disagree. I do not own an ATV. I don't have a problem with ATV's in general or even in the park. They should not be inside the rivers proper or on the immediate banks if they are steep. I think shallow banks are fine and many gravel bars don't have vegetation anyway. Correct me if I am wrong, but ATV's can't be banned to official roads if they are not licensed and not allowed on state and county roads as FOOR argues. A possible compromise is to limit ATV's to areas where motorized boat are also allowed. Still, keep them out of the streams. I do not own a horse. I don't have a problem with horses in general or even in the park. They do beat a large wide muddy swath where they are used. I have had problems hiking trails where horses are allowed. No one ever picks up their droppings. The riders also have a tendency to wide trails to go around mud puddles. They also should not be in the river for long periods of time or so close to the bank that they are contaminating the river water with their stools. They should not be in the river at all if enforcement is not available or if violations occur. I think having a large number of accesses to the river, both public and private is good for several reasons. 1. It helps those of us who do our own shuttling for canoe trips and more access points gives us the flexibility to determine how long of a float we want to have. We also need to be able to park fairly close to the river to get ingress and egress. So I disagree with FOOR's position of banning vehicles to only official roads and accesses. 2. It spreads the number of people using the river and cuts down on congestion at a few access points. This would actually help one of FOOR's goal of decreasing congestion. I would strenuously oppose limiting canoers to the river. This would have a negative impact on the local economy already hurt by all the other things going on. They rely on the summer months to make their whole year. 3. Increases the number of places emergency vehicles can gain access to the river. And probably more I have not thought of. Some of the comments I have seen are exaggerations. I.e. "There may not be a single gravel bar left" or "No other National Park tolerates abuse like this". Exaggerations don't help a cause and actually lose credibility. I don't know if it is a pervasive problem with ATV's driving at night and scaring campers on gravel bars. Which, by the way is not a good place to be in the case of a flash flood. A simple curfew is all that is needed to deal with the so called noise problem. I have never heard anyone complain that they have "seen" other people also enjoying the river. Just because someone has a camper and not a tent does not make them an abuser of the river or detract from the beautiful scenery. I don't have any problem with someone 'roughing it' without the benefit of electricity or running water if they want to camp on the river in their camper as opposed to a tent. Banning mobile trailers, mobile homes and popups would be excessive regulation. Conclusion. I believe that we have sufficient acreage in this country set aside as wilderness where we can't do anything. We need to have parks and greenways that are open to public use and enjoyment. Proper balance between use and protection is vital. Too far either way either destroys the ability to use and enjoy our public assets, or destroys the very thing we want to enjoy. At the same time, I would not be opposed to a portion(s) of the current being designated as wilderness or primitive. This would include the Big Spring area. I think Alternative C comes as close to my views of all the alternatives. I confess that I am writing this on the last day and did not review in detail all of the charts and maps.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63123

856	<p>July 25, 2009 Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverway General Management Plan The "federally-protected" National Scenic Rivers known as the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers, sadly are not. The soil, gravel and vegetation that were loosened on the South Prong of the Jacks Fork five years ago by the Pierce Township (Texas County) road crew, the Shannon County Commission on Big Creek on the Current River earlier this year and currently by the Roberts Sawmill of Mountain View in Flat Rock Creek (major tributary of the Jacks Fork are all well on their way downstream to the Gulf of Mexico. Delayed response to emergency situations is no response at all. Regretably, ONSR and NPS do not adequately address behaviors like this, in their proposed Management Plan for the next 20 years, or the rise of destructive activities like ATV use and abuse by existing horse trail rides and future abuse by more trail ride businesses. All these activities are horrendously destructive to the water quality of the ONSR and the quality of the low-impact experiences of floating, fishing, hiking these rivers. What part of "preserving and protecting" these rivers are allowing the loss of riparian soil and water quality? The ONSR and National Park Service have failed miserably in their attempt to protect the Current and Jacks Fork. The proof of that failure is the fact that the Jacks Fork appeared on Missouri's Impaired Waters List. It is an embarrassment! What's more, it has taken citizen lawsuits, in many instances to force ONSR to do its job. Congress and the Interior Department also can take credit for failures at ONSR by treating these premier National Scenic Rivers like they are the last stop on the bus, They are perennially underfunded and understaffed. All too often, the superintendents appointed here are a year or two from retirement and don't want to make waves or their subordinates are allowed to run roughshod over the law and spirit of why these rivers were singled out by Congress for protection in 1964. The latest faux pas by ONSR was the limiting of public meetings on the ONSR GMP to five sites in Missouri. Three of those sites were local. Only two included the urban centers of St. Louis and Columbia. Springfield and Kansas City were totally ignored. These rivers belong to ALL Americans, not just the people in Dent, Shannon and Carter Counties. Yet the ONSR allowed themselves to be bullied by local citizens and skewed the process. Perhaps if the people in the Interior Department and the National Park Service (six months into an Obama administration, the NPS still doesn't have a director!) took this park seriously, their laxity would not contribute to the lawlessness in the park. What would happen if the ONSR were fully funded for education, management and enforcement? What would happen if the Watershed Partnership, set up by former ONSR superintendent, Art Sullivan, was more than just a debating club and feel good society? What has ONSR and NPS done to further the education of the local children as to the water quality and karst topography of the watershed? What has the ONSR and NPS done to help local people protect water quality rather than ignorantly destroy it? ONSR has deferred these issues to a handful of environmental and conservation groups rather than demonstrate leadership. A true partnership would enlist other state and federal agencies to help accomplish true protection of these rivers. Federal and state protections for these rivers should work in tandem inside and outside the park to protect water quality. Good points in Alternative A: · Closing of roads and trails that have been illegally developed · The emphasis on traditional non-mechanized experiences. · Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks · Restoring the river corridor and protecting the ENTIRE WATERSHED! If further legislation is needed to accomplish this, then that should happen. · The proposal for wilderness designation for the Big spring tract is a no brainer and should happen. · The motorboat use needs to be restricted to below Two Rivers · Horsepower limits should be strictly enforced. Motorboat etiquette should be strictly enforced. Non-motorized boats should always be given deference. Two recent deaths of motor boaters on the Current River punctuate this need. Good points in Alternative B: · Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks · The network of small learning centers with facilities would include classrooms. New trails should be limited and anti ATV devices should be installed · Restoring the river corridor and having a focused program for research, monitoring and preservation · The proposal for wilderness designation for the Big spring tract. Concerns · the increase in motorboat horsepower and range should be strictly limited and enforced. · primitive camping experience should be increased Good points-Not many in Alternative C: · This Alternative is very vague. The public needs more specific information on how you plan to accomplish the goals. · It doesn't deal with the ATV problems. Federal law supercedes state law! ATV's shouldn't be allowed in a National park... let alone one that is statutorily required to preserve and protect the watersheds of the Jacks Fork and Current River. If further legislation is needed to accomplish preservation and protection, so much the better. ATV's did not exist when ONSR was created! · It doesn't define the expanding problem of horse trail ride businesses along the Current and Jacks Fork. Increasing the trails for horses proposed in Alternative C just adds to the problem. The trail rides need to be controlled better than the canoe concessionaires are. There needs to be strictly enforced limited river crossings and a method devised to identify the horse and rider. · Easement land needs to be better enforced. Too many landowners with easements restrictions have violated the legal requirements and no enforcement has been done. "Do what you want because the Park never enforces the restrictions" mentality is what predominates in the absence of strong management, enforcement and education. This needs to stop!!! · Immediate and swift enforcement of counties/cities that violate the clean water act and who decide they can do as they please on Park Service land. Preservation of the river channels, stream bank and riparian zones ought to take precedent over recreational enterprises. Private individuals and representatives of cities and counties who destroy the integrity of the nature of these rivers ought to spend the successive months restoring that integrity or paying for proper restoration and remediation of their offenses. Confiscation of all equipment involved in such activities should be immediate and permanent. Re-arranging the channels of these rivers and their tributaries should never be acceptable! . Sincerely, Tom Kruzen, President Ozark Riverkeepers Network 213 East 3rd St. Mountain View, Missouri, 65548 417-934-2818 kruzen3@hotmail.com</p>	7/31/2009	No		Ozark Riverkeepers Network	MO	65548
857	<p>1. The structure of these alternatives is awkward. The emphasis on zones seems to complicate the alternatives. Zoning just does not have a history of having much to do with park management. When the rubber hits the road on resolving issues, how does zoning play a significant role? As the brochure says, not all the issues are even listed, so it's not clear how alternative ways to address issues relate to the alternatives. Issues should drive the alternatives. Many of the issues could be resolved in any one of the alternatives regardless of the zoning. It seems artificial and divisive to put some of the resolutions in one alternative and not in the others. 2. The park ought to include quiet and secluded areas. Particularly along the river. The only quiet places along the river during the summer when the rivers are most attractive are found very early in the mornings</p>	7/31/2009	No			VA	24073

	<p>and after dark, or where the Jack's is too low to float. Closing and repairing some of the worst eroding trails would be important. Just replacing them with trails that are just as subject to creating problems ought to be avoided. One of the things not mentioned is the lack of enforcement of the CFR off-road vehicle regs. Placing a portion of the park into a zone, does not protect it from illegal use. Protecting the backcountry near Big Springs under wilderness designation might help protect that area against proliferation of ATV trails. Horse and ATV trails should be on sites like ridges and roads that can handle traffic with minimal erosion. 3. Putting a lot more structures in the park seems silly, since the maintenance backlog is a constant complaint. Don't build more stuff without first deleting some of what is already dragging down the budget. 4. Water clarity is important, so eroded areas are special-fix them, please. Don't let new ones get started. Bottomland forests are relatively rare and rich even under pristine conditions, but most have been cleared for agriculture throughout the Ozarks. ONSR offers a chance to have such forests, but many have been sliced up with multiple, parallel, eroded trails. Caves and springs are not really addressed (Certainly not by the zoning, as described.). None of the issues have been tied into them. Keep and improve the monitoring efforts. 5. Be open with the public. Use NEPA to make informed decisions. Enforce the enabling legislation, regulations and stick to plans - the public puts a lot of effort into providing input for such documents. Park managers have a history of post-modern interpretations of the enabling legislation, regulations, scenic easements and planning documents. They nearly always find the wording in such documents to be open to infinite interpretations, some of which happen to be more convenient for the managers. A lawyer told me the Committee Report is used to interpret enabling legislation, and establish Congressional intent. Go the House Committee report and read (without post-modern "sophistication") the paragraph that begins "In short..." That paragraph summarizes Congressional intent. Follow it, please. Thanks for the chance to comment.</p>						
858	<p>I choose A over the other alternatives. I support the Big Spring Wilderness designation. The Jacks Fork should be completely primitive ("primitive" should NOT exclude well-planned and well-built hiking and backpacking trails), with the exception of Alley Spring, Bay Creek, Rhymers, Blue Spring, and Buck Hollow areas, which should be maintained as they are now with no additional significant development (again – good trails are still needed in these areas). All ATV use should be completely eliminated, except on designated roads, throughout the entire Riverways. Every single illegal access point throughout the entire Riverways should be shut down. It is out of hand – ATVs, jeeps, and trucks are on every single, solitary gravel bar these days. Close illegal roads, do not build any more roads. Designate more primitive areas and have more hiking and backpacking trails, especially where they can be tied in with state lands. This would help make the park more inviting for year round use, which would be better for the local economies. Increase funding for rangers, and hire backcountry rangers. There should be no motorboats anywhere above Waymeyer, year-round. Stop all of the illegal construction occurring on the scenic easements. Limit developed areas to those that exist now, and ensure they are maintained at the highest quality level the Park Service can and should achieve. Restore natural areas where appropriate. Limit the ridiculous amounts of horseback riding that occur now, without eliminating this completely valid recreation that should only occur on well-planned and well-built trails. Just get it back down to reasonable levels, and only in appropriate areas. Get the Park back on track – preserve the streams and surrounding lands first and foremost. Make it a place where visitors can enjoy natural, primitive, low-impact, high quality outdoor experiences, along with preserving valuable historical/cultural areas and providing a select few developed areas. All of this should be maintained at the highest standards that we citizens expect out of the NPS. The Buffalo River National River is MUCH closer to how ONSR should be managed. There is no excuse for what ONSR has become.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65440
859	<p>I highly and strongly support Alternative A. I have been involved with parks & recreation at the city (Clayton, MO), county(St. Louis county), state (MO State Parks) and federal level (US Forest Service - Granby CO)for nearly thirty years. I have been an avid floater and sometimes white water kayaker for greater than 45 years. I have been involved with these specific rivers for the entirety of my experience. I have seen the rivers in all seasons and under most forms of use and abuse. I strongly suggest Alternative A to minimize or even eliminate motorized use of the the river and put the common use back to a more traditional/historical sense. I fully support the expansion of the wilderness status to Big Spring and other acceptable areas. Vehicular access to the rivers must be minimized and/or eliminated - those areas restored to native conditions. I fully support a marked and drastic decrease in outfitter/guide capacities to offer the user a more pristine and historical view and experience on the rivers. If a permit system is necessary to control and limit the rivers' use then I support fully its implementation and would also include permits for private (non-commercial) use. I fully support the great reduction in horseback access and use. I do not see the need to allow horses access to the river to raise pollution levels and disturb fish nesting sites. The trail ride system is grossly out of control and a great detriment to the overall user. Even though this Plan addresses only those under NPS I strongly support the same plan for the US Forest Service along the Eleven Point river. I will send a similar comment to the USFS. The rivers have played an important part of my life and those of my family and friends. I wish to see the rives preserved, use limited, and wilderness status expanded. Thank you for your decades of inspiration and dedication.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63119
860	<p>Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways We have frequently floated and camped along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers for 30 years. It is one of our favorite spots in Missouri. We are fortunate to be retired so we can avoid using the ONSR on summer weekends, and therefore, the huge problems don't personally affect us, THANKFULLY. 1. We are most in favor of Alternative Plan A. Besides the need for better and vigilant resource protection, there is also a greater need for better managment of visitor activities on the ONSR that tend to create conflict between user groups. 5. Our three biggest concerns are the thousands of horses trampling through and near the rivers, the congestion of rowdy canoists on summer weekends, and the use of ATV's and dirt bikes going everywhere but on designated trails. Sincerely, Joseph E. Walsh Lois M. Walsh</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63026
861	<p>1. Alternative C is my "preferred" alternative, with some slight modifications. I think we have more than enough campgrounds, access points and facilities for the park visitors. If anything the park should be spending time and money maintaining what we have, instead of creating new ones. How about improving some of the campgrounds, access points, boat landings and parking areas. All of the campgrounds need new lantern posts and bulletin boards, and some of the restrooms are in horrible condition. 2. Interpretation and education is a key element in helping to protect the park resources. I think the park is doing well in this department, but could improve in areas where the lack of education or communication about a</p>	7/31/2009	No		OZAR	MO	63965

	<p>specific resource or park activity might be creating an issue. For example the park should be doing a better job of educating the public about off road travel (motor vehicle and horses) and providing the public with a map showing the approved roads they are allowed to drive on in the park. One user group that needs the most attention is the horse back riders. The Upper Current Section of Current River needs designated horse trails that are not on county roads where motor vehicles are driving. The two should NOT be mixed. Once trails are established, a map should be developed and provided for the public. If someone is riding off the designated trail or in the river, they should be cited. Strict enforcement from LE Rangers will be an important key in managing the riders in this area. Horses have become such a controversy that I think the park would benefit from a Horse Patrol program, with at least two LE Rangers assigned to patrol the Riverways. Horse patrol would not only help combat issues we are facing with off road "riding", but they could also focus on enforcing off road "travel" violations. Assigning two rangers to horse patrol would also demonstrate to the public that the park is attempting to try other types of law enforcement tactics other than hiding in the bushes on the river. ATVs (all terrain vehicles) and UTVs (utility vehicles) have no place in any national park as far as I'm concerned. Let them go to an Off Road Park and tear up that land. ATVs are responsible for a considerable amount of resource damage throughout the Upper Current and Jacks Fork Districts. These vehicles create a lot of unnecessary noise which can hinder the quality of a visitor's experience. They should be banned and prohibited from operating inside park boundaries.</p> <p>3. The Big Spring Tract should not be designated as a Wilderness area. This tract of land is already well protected from ATV's, off road travel and hunters. Opening this as a Wilderness area will allow hunting. A favorite tradition of not only local residents but also park visitors is to drive through the park to view the wildlife. If hunting is opened the opportunity to see a white tail deer will be far and few between. Opening the area to hunting will increase theft, vandalism, littering, off road travel, poaching and numerous of other violations that are not currently an issue. There is a firearm range located within this tract of land that is routinely used by law enforcement rangers. Motor vehicles and roads are prohibited from operating in a Wilderness area. Will this range have to be moved? If so, then the Rangers would have to drive an hour to another range in order to qualify. If motor vehicles aren't allowed then how will Rangers patrol this area to check individuals who are hunting or operating ATVs illegally in the woods? Hunters will access the area from U.S. Forest Service property by ATV. It will be impossible for Rangers to enforce regulations if they are unable to patrol through the tract to detect violations. A large section of this land is within a prescribed burn management plan. In order to safely complete a burn, motor vehicles are used on the fire line to patrol for spot fires, snags, etc. The inability to use the proper equipment on a prescribed burn could have drastic results.</p> <p>4. I grew up in Van Buren and worked 12 years as a field Ranger at Big Springs so I do show favoritism toward the Lower Current section of Current River. As a child I remember boating with my grandfather and spending the day with my family on gravel bar. Jon boats are apart of the culture and traditionally have been used for decades. I would hate to see the park prohibit Jon boats from the river and take that recreation opportunity away from the locals. The river is the main reason that most people from our community, including myself, decide to spend their entire lives here. One decision that I have always disagreed with was horse power limitation that was placed between the park boundaries near Terry's Chute to the Big Spring Landing. I will tell you what this accomplished. Park visitors with large motors cannot put in at the Van Buren Bridge or Watercress Landing and go downstream because they cannot motor through the prohibited area. Therefore, they ALL launch at the Big Spring boat landing, which increased the parking and use of this area. IF this section of the river was re-opened to any HP motor, boat owners could launch at any of the three locations and this would take some of the pressure off of Big Spring. The other option would be to lower the HP limitation from Big Spring down to Gooseneck. However, with this method we are pushing away a specific type of visitor use rather than managing it. The size of the motor boats on the river below Big Spring is not a problem because there is not any floater traffic in this section. Boats become a problem with you mix them with other user groups; tubes/canoes/rafts/kayaks. The Waymeyer area is in dire need of an improved, designated boat landing. This landing should not be located at the same location where the concessionaires operate. Again, you are mixing user groups and that creates conflicts. Once the landing is developed the traffic jams, some of the parking issues and disputes at the Waymeyer gravel bar will decrease.</p> <p>5. The issue management should be addressing is the quantity (number) of boats that are on the river AND the number of floaters (tubes/canoes/rafts/kayaks). The river is overcrowded between the months of June thru August; and if this type of pressure continues, it will deplete the resources. The number of permits allowed for concessionaires needs to be lowered and there needs to restrictions placed and permits issued to private tubes/canoes on the river. Due to the economy, I've seen a large increase this summer in private tubes/canoes. They need to be managed as well or before long everyone will be floating on private vessels. I wish I had a good solution on how to manage the number of motor boats, but I don't. The park could require a daily or yearly permit for boats to operate within the park. Parking fees could also be charged at designated landings. This means the park would actually have to designate specific landings for lunch areas and eliminate the primitive landings that have been traditionally used, but are not approved. This revenue could go toward the maintenance of these areas and also pay the salary of an employee who would be required to oversee the parking/permit program. There are parking issues at several of the major access points such as: Cedar Grove, Alley Spring and Waymeyer. There is not enough LE staff available to schedule Rangers to baby sit these areas. This is also a short term solution and doesn't actually fix the problem. Parking spaces and signs should be developed in these areas to direct the visitors where they can and cannot go. Motor vehicles are blocking the landings and concessionaire buses because they have no where else to go. They need direction. Last, but not least. Almost all the issues that the park is currently and will continue to deal with are related to alcohol</p>						
862	<p>PO Box 145 Fayetteville, AR 72702 July 31, 2009 National Park Service Denver Service Center – Van Huizen, DSC-P Ozark National Scenic Riverways Planning Team 12795 West Alameda Parkway PO Box 25287 Denver CO 80225-0287 Dear Planning Team: I wish to offer comments on behalf of the Ozark Society on the "Preliminary Alternatives" to your General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As you may know the Ozark Society is an organization based in Little Rock, AR that was formed in 1962 with the initial purpose of stopping planned dams on the Buffalo River and promoting its designation as a free-flowing, protected stream. With the help of other organizations and individuals this effort was successful, culminating in 1972 with the designation of the Buffalo as the Buffalo National River, the first national</p>	7/31/2009	No		Ozark Society	AR	72702

	<p>river in the United States. Our current mission is to work to protect the streams, forests, and other resources of the Ozark and Quachita Mountains with a focus on conservation supported by educational and recreational activities. Before I comment on the Preliminary Alternatives I would like to state what we believe to be the most important principles for consideration. The first of these is the statement in your Newsletter #3, Spring/Summer 2009 that a purpose of the National Riverways is to "Preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins. The second of these, as stated in the National Park Services' Management Policies 2006 is the underlying requirement of the Congressional Organic Act of 1916 that impairment of park resources and values will not be allowed, and that these resources and values will be passed on to future generations in a condition that is as good or better than the conditions that exist today. Finally there is a mandate, as upheld by the courts, to ensure that conservation will be predominant when there is a conflict between the protection of resources and their recreational use. These principles are inviolate and cannot be altered or overridden by public comment or by park management actions. Our Preferred Alternative Our preferred alternative is "Alternative A" but with extensive modifications. Our comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The excess of river access points must be closed and the banks restored to their native vegetative cover. • Operation of ATV's, dirt bikes, and similar recreational vehicles must be banned in the park except on legally designated state and county roads. • Mobile campers must be restricted to official park campgrounds designed to accommodate such camping units. • Overcrowding by all users is a problem at times. Through some means such as a float permit system, both the frequency and number of floaters (canoes, rafts, tubers) must be controlled so that a better experience of solitude can be enjoyed. Noise control measures must be enforced. The carrying capacity of the park for all types of users must be determined and control or access to that level must be accomplished through a variety of measures including permits, limiting size of campgrounds, and limiting size of parking areas. • Enforcement of all park rules and regulations is essential. If enforcement resources are not available for all of the park's carrying capacity, this further reduction of visitors must be accomplished using those means mentioned above. • Power boating should have no place on the park rivers except for rescue and monitoring operations. The noise of outboard motors is objectionable; seals on motors are never perfect and there will always be leakage of oil into the water; and power boating and canoeing, rafting, and tubing are not compatible. While our position is that outboard motors should be banned completely, at the very least only 10 HP motors should be allowed in those areas where motors are designated in Alternative A. • The 3,500 acres back country portion of the former Big Springs State Park should be recommended as a designated wilderness area. The Park Service should work closely with the Mark Twain National Forest and the Missouri Wilderness Coalition to do everything possible to insure that the part of the Big Spring region in the National Riverways along with the 4,500 acres in the National Forest are both recommended to Congress as a wilderness area. • The great springs of the National Riverways are fed by karst areas that reach well beyond the boundaries of land owned by the NPS. The General Management Plan should include a project to work with communities, landowners, and other organizations to protect this extensive recharge area. • Conservation easements held by the National Riverways should be responsibly monitored. • Education of the public to the park rules must be provided through signage, visitor center videos and information sessions, and ranger talks. • The problem of the number and frequency of trail rides by horseback riders is immense. See the separate section below. The Horse Problem In 1998 a 5 river-mile section of the Jacks Fork was listed as impaired due to the high fecal coliform level. This was expanded to 7 miles in 2002. A TMDL, "total daily maximum load", of a geometric mean of 25 colonies/100 milliliters of fecal coliform bacteria was set in 2004. To determine the source of the contamination a joint USGS/NPS study was carried out in 2003 and 2004. It was determined that the primary source of fecal coliform was horses and that the significant increases in densities in the Jacks Fork were associated with cross-country horse-back-riding events. ("Assessment of Possible Sources of Microbiological Contamination in the Water Column and Streambed Sediment of the Jacks Fork, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri—Phase III," Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5161, U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey) It is our position that what should have happened at this point was the closing of the National Riverways to horses with the putting in place of a program to study the problem and to seek a solution. Instead trail riding continued unabated. After the TMDL was approved, the Jacks Fork was administratively removed from the impaired list and a volunteer group began working on the problem. This work is ongoing. The group is currently working on problems related to septic fields even though sewage was not identified by the USGS/NPS study as a source of contamination. They have just now begun to look at re-designing the horse trails. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources still considers the Jacks Fork to be impaired. On a large trail riding weekend there may be up to two thousand horses in the park and there are several hundred on many other weekends. Along with fecal coliform contamination there is almost certainly contamination with other organic matter that would decrease the dissolved oxygen level of the river and increase the nitrogen load. Trail erosion at crossings and on trails is almost certainly a problem. This overall problem must be addressed in a major way in the General Management Plan. We would certainly recommend that horses be banned from the park until a solution is found, the limit to the number of horses to be allowed is determined, and adequate monitoring is in place. Thank you for your consideration of the above suggestions and comments. We have a further suggestion that since the Buffalo National River is just now starting the development of their general management plan, that you partner with them to develop the best management practices for the whole Ozark region. We are ready to help in any way that we can. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Robert Cross President, Ozark Society Phone: (479) 587-8757 E-Mail: racross@uark.edu 						
863	<p>My name is Steve Coates. I am President of the Ozark Trail Association. I represent a volunteer base of 500 members and an additional 1,500 volunteer contributors that collectively make up the volunteer base of the Ozark Trail Association. Our mission is to develop, maintain, preserve, promote and protect the rugged natural beauty of the Ozark Trail. On behalf of the OTA, I'd like to provide comment on the Preliminary Alternatives being proposed as part of the General Management Plan / Wilderness Study. Response to Topic Questions 1 and 2) The OTA has reviewed the Preliminary Alternatives as presented in the General Management Plan / Wilderness Study. Regardless of the alternative selected, the OTA would like to stress that the NPS address the need to increase the amount of trails on NPS-managed lands as the OTA feels that there is</p>	7/31/2009	No		Ozark Trail Association	MO	63664

	<p>a shortage of trails. There is a wonderful opportunity to open up more of the wonderful NPS-managed land to park users through the development of trails. The No-Action Alternative would appear to not adequately address the OTA's desire to develop more trails. Since the OTA is represented by a diverse group of people, it is difficult to say which of the Action Alternatives (A, B or C) is best suited to the OTA mission; therefore, we aren't recommending a specific Action Alternative for selection. Rather, the OTA feels that all of the Action Alternatives meet the need to develop more trails on NPS land - particularly, the proposed Current River Trail (see response to Topic Question 4 – below). However, the OTA would like to stress that the development of the various Management Zones be done appropriately with respect to existing natural and cultural resources and in a manner that respects the existing and prospective trail users as well as other park users. Response to Topic Question 4) As you may be aware, the OTA, along with the LAD Foundation, submitted a plan to the National Park Service in June 2008 for the proposed Current River Trail from Round Spring to near Bee Bluff. This plan was co-authored by Mr. John Roth of OTA and Mr. Greg Iffrig of LAD. The plan calls for the development of approximately 12 miles of new backcountry trail along the Current River between Highway 19 at Round Spring to the Brushy Creek Loop Trail on Pioneer Forest property near Bee Bluff. This new trail would provide linkage between the Ozark Trail, Blair Creek Section via the Laxton Hollow Trail and the Brushy Creek Loop Trail in Pioneer Forest. The western portion of the proposed Current River Trail lies primarily on NPS land, and the eastern portion lies primarily within the Pioneer Forest. Eventually, there could also be an extension further upriver to the new Current River State Park, which could serve as a gateway for trail users into the Current River valley. Tragically, John Roth died on July 3, 2009. Unfortunately, he will not get to see the development of this trail, but the OTA is committed to advancing his work in his honor and would like the NPS to take this into consideration as well. John worked tirelessly to advance the mission of the OTA. He could very well be considered one of the best backcountry trail developers Missouri has had. The proposed Current River Trail was envisioned, planned and scouted by John. The OTA would like the NPS to prioritize the Current River Trail project for 2010-2011 as we consider this one of our highest priorities – and to honor the friend we lost in John Roth. On behalf of the OTA, I thank the NPS for the opportunity to comment on this General Management Plan / Wilderness Study. Steve Coates President, Ozark Trail Association www.ozarktrail.com</p>					
864	<p>1)The No-Action Alternative is closest to our family's idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We enjoy the rivers and the current access that we have to them and feel that no change is needed. We hope that our daughter will be able to grow up having the opportunity to enjoy the rivers the same as we have. We also have grave concerns about the devastating effects your Alternatives A and B could have on the local communities surrounding the rivers. 2&3)The parts of the preliminary alternatives that we feel most strongly about are the access to the rivers and the use of jet boats on the rivers. We do not feel that access to the rivers should be limited any further than it currently is or that jet boats should be limited on the rivers any further than they currently are. We strongly feel that no action is needed. We believe that the river is in good shape and that there is no need to fix problems that do not exist.</p>	7/31/2009	No		MO	63631
865	<p>Please prioritize enforcement of standing policy; off-road vehicles are miserable to be around and degrade the soil stability. Horses should be kept out in wet conditions and the number and material (require dust-free?) of access roads should be regulated. Big Spring is in good shape; please preserve this state! Power boats are a terrible bother. Please get them off the river or at least drop the speed limit?</p>	7/31/2009	No		MO	65203
866	<p>Mr Superintendent July 31, 2009 These are my comments on the Preliminary Draft Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have been swimming, camping, picnicking, and floating the rivers since 1981. I attended the Salem informational and comment meeting in June 2009. These rivers and the land around them are truly exceptional national resources. Their recreational qualities are outstanding both for local residents and regional and national visitors. Some may say the user conflicts and resource impacts we read about in the media during this comment period, and experience on the ground, are overstated, (depending on the perspective of the user,) but it is doubtless true there are some harmful activities occurring that need to be addressed. The drafting of the differing alternatives acknowledges this. Alternative A comes closest to addressing my vision of the Parks' resource conservation and protection mission, as well as addressing the expectation of the recreational experience of most users, which is also part of the Parks mission. I understand that you are in a delicate situation, balancing the various user groups expectations. Add to that the budget considerations that limit personnel to manage user groups compliance with National Park regulations, and it is a challenging situation. Tasks like closing user-created roads, stopping ATV use in the rivers, and reducing massive commercial horse-ride impacts to water quality are formidable. But the Park has been successful in reducing rowdy behavior on the rivers by educating users and enforcing existing regulations (while also creating some new regs where needed.) This approach can continue to be utilized. Equestrian access to gravel bars and river crossings should be reduced. The large commercial horserides have become a part of the economy of the Eminence area, but their impact on the rivers can't be overlooked. (Do the ride organizers/operators pay a license fee? Perhaps a damage deposit could be collected.) Motorboat vs. floating is an age-old dilemma, but given the nature of this resource, particularly the relatively narrow Upper Current and Jacks Fork, it does seem floating should have the upper hand. Alternative A does the best job here, although perhaps a more implement-able approach would blend horsepower limits, utilizing Alt A's Upper Current horsepower limits with Alt B's Jack Fork limits. (Gigging season is another story and this cultural practice should definitely not be discouraged. Gigging season doesn't conflict with peak user times.) Although I do appreciate being able to drive to, or near, the rivers for swimming and picnicking, I also think that the access points have proliferated, and some are causing resource damage. I can see why some user-created access points have been accepted by the Park (ie placement of trashcans,) but not others. There should be gradual closure of the most damaging roads, (those damaging to both the resource and the primitive natural experience.) To address some, but not all, of these negative impacts it seems perhaps there is a need for more personnel out there in the field keeping track of what's going on and moving to correct abuses. Another approach, particularly with horse-rides, is to work more closely with the ride organizers and operators. I look forward to participating in future public comment opportunities. Sincerely, Hank Dorst</p>	7/31/2009	No		MO	65464

867	<p>1) Alternative A is by far the best of the alternatives. It best approximates the way the Buffalo River is now managed. In general the management practices of the Buffalo should be studied and duplicated on the Current and Jack's Fork. On all of Jack's Fork and on the Current River above Van Buren, the rivers should be managed for natural and wildlife values and for the rivers' beauty and appreciation. On the uppermost sections this means no boat motors and no horses, and strictly enforced bans on ATV's and motorbikes and trail bikes. All illegal access roads should be permanently closed and enforced. It should again become possible to camp on gravel bars and have solitude - and have solitude while floating. Any businesses that rent ATV's should be liable if their patrons trespass on public land. I understand that easements along the river are being abused. The easements should not be expanded and no development allowed. The numbers and concentrations of horses, particularly from commercial operators should be strictly controled. Large trail rides should not be allowed. The boat horsepower and speed limits and noise limits on the lower Current should be lowered so all can better appreciate the river. Speed and thrills have no place in a National Scenic Riverway.</p> <p>2)The Big Spring tract should become wilderness. Manage for nonmechanized recreation. Close roads that have been illegally developed and rehabilitate native vegetation. 3) Omit the development of an interpretive "float camp". A brochure or website piece would do just fine and not mar the landscape. 5) Just manage the Jack's Fork and Current for their beauty. Build no more intrusions. Point to the way the Buffalo River in Arkansas provides wonderful and always peaceful visitor experiences. Stress that motorized recreational opportunities abound elsewhere in Missouri and that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is unique in its ability to offer a natural river experience.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63104
868	<p>1) Alternative A. I strongly believe this is the best option. 2)No mechanized forms of recreation should be allowed on the Current above Big Spring. I have seen the devastating effects of motorboats on teh Meramec River. 3)Do NOOT allow more access points and boats. Again, I have seen first hand the bad effect these have on waterways. 4)The Upper Current and Big Spring suffer from proposals B and C. 5)As in the West, limiting the number of canoeist, and curtailing excessive partying would help keep our streams as great natural resources.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63088
869	<p>I attended a camp along the Ozark Scenic Riverway as a child, and I have fond memories of boating and swimming in its waters. Along with other experiences, the camp gave me a lifelong appreciation of rivers and riparian ecosystems, and I plan my summers around river trips. I hope that remaining primitive stretches of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway will be maintained, as nearly as possible, in a wilderness state, to remind us of its original natural beauty and our place in nature. Specifically, 1. and 2. I hope the ONSR will adopt Alternative A, with the added provision that motorized travel along the rivers and streams should be limited to small craft with 10 horsepower or smaller motors. I would prefer prohibiting motors altogether, but I recognize that there must be some compromise. 3. Equine activity along the river must be restricted, and a buffer zone must be established along the river so that horse and other livestock do not impair soil and water quality. Similarly, ATVs, dirt bikes and motorized camper access should be restricted. Soil compaction from such vehicles, gas spills, despoilage of natural vegetation, and road rutting all degrade aquatic habitat. Finally, ONSR should reduce the number of river access points. Though unpopular, limiting the number of visitors may be the only way to preserve the rivers. The level of impact to an ecosystem is directly related to the density of human visitation to the area, particularly during the growing season. 5. It is important that the US Park Service collaborate with private property neighbors to manage their properties in a manner which will help restore the ecological health of the ONSR community. The USNPS should take the lead in watershed restoration of the Current and Jack's Fork region, working with its private neighbors and educating property owners on the basics of river care. Thank you very much for considering these suggestions, and thank you for your stewardship of this national treasure.</p>	7/31/2009	No			CO	81641
870	<p>1. Alternative A 2. Limiting motorized vehicles esp. ATV's and motorboats. Continuing to limit the daily rental limit for concessioners. Limiting access by horses. Closing illegal roads and trails. Protecting habitats and water quality. 3. --- 4. My concerns for the upper portion that gets heavy use for floating and fishing get addressed by Alternative A. I would like to see the lower area of the river protected from motorboat use. 5. Although costly, I have wondered about the effects of greater laws and law enforcement. I have never seen any park service nor water patrol when I've been canoeing although I understand they can be undercover. I'm surprised there are not more drownings considering the alcohol consumption. I have been floating Missouri's streams for over 40 years and wish to see this nature experience and these resources preserved and protected. I avoid going to ONSR on the weekend due to past experiences and my awareness of the amount and kinds of activities that occur. My husband and I recently enjoyed a fabulous trip on the Jack's Fork from Hwy. 17 to Alley Spring including two nights of camping on a gravel bar. We were smart and went Monday thru Wed. I appreciate the work of the park service at ONSR and enjoy traveling through the country visiting many of the parks. Thank you.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65714
871	<p>1. No action is closest to my idea of how to manage to ONSR. 2. I feel strongly that usage opportunities for visitors should be included. 3. I am adamant that visitor usage should not be limited. The idea of restricting HP for boats is upsetting. The park is for all people and one of the primary ways that "locals" use the river is through jet boats. To forbid or limit them is prioritize one group over another. 4. Yes, the current laws do. 5. The laws are in place to make the river a family friendly place. The money to fully fund the park may not be. If any change is need it is to better enforce the laws in place. I am a stay at home mom of 3 small children. I disagree on moral basis with "wild partying" on the river. We own a boat and in my considerable experience on the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, I think more could be done to promote a more family friendly atmosphere. The problem is from drinking in excess, often in canoes. But the law is already there to discourage that behavior.... so why restrict others? Also, boating boosts the local economy and we desperately need that. Thanks!</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65438
872	<p>1-5 No action. I really like going to the river with my family in our boat. It lets my parents take me to nice places on the river. I like to fish and swim.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65438

873	1. Plan C or no action are both close. I am strongly against limiting HP on jet boats or anything that restricts recreational boating. 2. Visitor usage is most important priority in all alternatives. 3. Restricted river access, particularly in prioritizing one user group over another. 4. The entire Ozarks are special to me, and as an avid outdoors man, I feel that it is the individuals responsibility to maintain the area, making it better for future generations as they use the resource. This is the way my father taught me and I am passing this legacy of environmental stewardship on to my son. For me and many of the locals, laws restrict rather than enable us to do this best. 5. Most of the problems on the river could be controlled better by more park personnel -- increasing ranger numbers during peak usage months.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65438
874	See comment submitted directly to the park superintendent of the ONSR, submitted July 31 prior to midnight.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63117
875	1. A 2. make Big Spring a wilderness area 3. motorized behicle use off of paved and legally designated roadways; high speed motorized boats on rivers; more boat access ramps; larger groups of river users and greater frequency; equestrian use that harms the river habitats and wildlife 4. all free running natural rivers in this state are essential and must be protected from polution and all other adverse use and conditions that harm the wildlife and health of the water 5. encouraging use in a controlled, limited way; governing use according existing restrictions and regulations	7/31/2009	No			MO	63117
876	1. I support, in general, Alternative A. The current "No-Action" alternative is unsustainable and is the basis for both conflict and degradation of the Riverways. Alternative B is incoherent, and Alternative C would only accentuate the worst characteristics of the current situation. To modify Alternative A, I would propose actions which would not only return the character and experience of the Riverways to its "historic" condition, but which would meet the primary purpose of the Riverways--to preserve the characteristics which made it worthy of its designation decades ago. These modifications would include banning ATVs and other land vehicles from the Riverways, except for roads on which they are legally permitted; closing illegal access points and roads from the Riverways; controlling the number of non-motorized craft (canoes, kayaks, tubes, etc.) and their access locations (to reduce overcrowding on weekends); banning motorized craft on the Riverways; restoring banks to their natural condition; significantly restricting and re-routing horse trail riding, so that it largely occurs in far smaller numbers than at present and is conducted largely away from the rivers; banning alcohol consumption in the Riverways; and rigorous enforcement of those activities that lend themselves to abuse of the Riverways (namely, those that the suggestions above would address). 2. I would include all parts of Alternative A, along with the modifications suggested in "1" above. I would emphasize the value of recommending Big Spring for Wilderness designation. 3. I would exclude any portions of the alternatives that create increased access to and development of the Riverways. The Riverways are special precisely because of their natural values, and these are best protected by allowing them to remain or restoring them to their natural condition. 4. While I have my favorite stretches of the rivers, all of the Riverways is special and should be given the full protection intended and authorized by Congress. None of it should be left available for abuse. 5. I suggest that the Park Service utilize a strategy done with success elsewhere (the Buffalo River in Arkansas is a nearby example) in which they actually enforce their current regulations and attempt to fulfill the purpose of the park. This would mean standing up to local interests (concessionaires, county commissions, etc.) and clearly setting out the rules that all users must meet. Attempting to accommodate all possible users and appease local commercial interests has not worked--and it never will. There are plenty of locals who would appreciate stronger, enforced guidelines (but who don't court retaliation from blowhards and commercial interests), and everyone would benefit from straightforward and clear rules and enforcement. It's time for the Park Service to show some guts and do its job to protect the Riverways and make it a place that non-consumptive users can enjoy.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63130
877	1. I grew up in Sedalia, Missouri, and a lot of the best parts of my growing up since age 9 (I'm now 55) was on canoeing trips with family, and the Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club, on the Missouri and Arkansas Ozark rivers. Most of our trips were 2 or 3 days, sometimes more, with a lot of camping on the gravel bars. Those were great times, and great growing experiences, and certainly helped to enhance my appreciation and experience of the natural world. Alternative A clearly fits the best with my ideas, but a lot of alternative B also seems probably acceptable. There clearly needs to be significant opportunities for relatively undisturbed non-motorized boating and other forms of recreation. The potential solitude of these rivers (particularly in the off-peak times) are one of their best features, and this really is disturbed if there is too much motorized activity. I very much appreciate having some areas, such as Big Spring, that are truly managed as wilderness. 2. and 3. Pretty much as stated above. 4. The upper Jacks Fork is very special. It would be good to have significant non-motorized stretches in that area. Portions of the Current and Jacks Fork, particularly Akers Ferry and Alley Spring (and likely others), would be likely areas to preserve and capture the feel of the traditional Ozark heritage and lifestyle. 5. In some ways this was probably easier before these areas were part of the National Scenic Riverways, because they were less well known, but, of course, without the Scenic Riverways designation they were much more susceptible to other types of threats. On balance, I believe that creating the Scenic Riverways for these rivers has been a good decision. Again, I would say to provide opportunities and encouragement for people to be able to experience the natural world and to enjoy solitude and traditional, typically non-motorized recreation and other activities. Other types of more "social" and motorized activities also need to be permitted and have opportunities provided for pursuit in some areas, but they should not be allowed to dominate or exclude the other more quiet and solitary pursuits. I think that a good balance can and needs to be struck that should be able to provide the various opportunities that will meet most people's reasonable needs.	7/31/2009	No			UT	84047
878	1. A would be the best, I started floating the river with my father back in 1955, and thankfully it is now a protected park, but the motorized use needs to be reduced. I was on the Current three years ago Labor Day and the amount of traffic and activities above Van Buren are not appropriate and are overuse of the river. 2. A, limit and reduce developed areas. 3. D, the entire River to below Big Springs needs to be protected, but especially the Big Springs area and the area of both rivers above Powder Mill. 4. See 3 above. 5. I have floated the Current several times in the bast three years, including twice with my son's scout troop, and the facilities are well maintained, the rivers appears healthy, the local community	8/15/2009	No			MO	65809

	appears to have reasonable access to use the rivers for swimming and gathering, but the fishing appears to be soft compared to 50 years ago, but that is probably a result of my memory and a lot of traffic. Protect the rivers, their watersheds and limit powerboat use to below Big Springs, or at least reduce the horsepower. why do you need a big motor on the river and the resulting wakes which I assume does some shore damage?						
879	1) I prefer alternative A. I think the park should be closed to ATVs and there should be limited motorized boating with small engines. My view is that the park should be a serene place without extensive motorized access. I think the illegal access points along the waterways should be shut down. I also think that there needs to be better management and control of the horse trails. Mobile campers should also be banned in the flood plain.	8/15/2009	No			KS	66205
880	no action keep power boats and atvs off the scenic riverways!	8/15/2009	No			MO	63017
881	Comments for above ONSR Management Plan. 1) Change Preliminary Plan to alternative (B). need less motorized boating but understand local population should have opportunity/right to access. More popular areas from Montauk to Two Rivers including Jacks Fork should be changed to non-motorized. All other below can be motorized. Dont have any other major concerns regarding other questions as I feel ONSR is doing adequate job maintaining these areas for the people. Thank you, Chris Handley..	8/15/2009	No			MO	65738
882	My wife and I have been visiting this area for over 40 years. This area is one the most beatiful and peaceful to visit of all the parks in Missouri and the U.S. We favor plan a for the use of the rivers. The less motor boats on the rivers the better to floating. Also the less ownership of the access gravelbars along the river the better. They should be considered as part of the riverways managed by the National Park Service and open to all. This should include the area along the river in Eminence, MO. Especially by the cabins and hotels in Eminence. The limit palced on beer and liquor allowed along the river was long overdue. Please keep this limit in place as it makes it a more pleasent eperience to float and swim without all the drunks disturbing the peace. Keep up the great work in managing this beratiful water system and Federal Waterways. Sincerely, Charles and Yvonne Large	8/15/2009	No			MO	63303
883	1) Alternative A best meets my standards. I live in California but grew up visiting Current and Jacks Fork Rivers all my life. I still go back to Missouri to visit my folks and always make a trip to the river. I remember when the Scenic Ozark Riverways was formed as some of my friends' family land in Emminence and Winona was taken from them. They would be sorely disappointed to discover that the land is not being cared for as originally planned. 2)Too many motorboats! Limit them to john boats and what part of the river(s) they can be used. It seems that many ATV/dirt bike/horse trails are now littering the shores and disrupting the land surrounding the rivers. Limit this and perhaps disallow the ATV/.dirt bikes altogether. Limited horse trails would be okay. I understand that man power is scarce because of financial funding cuts but the river is looking trashier than ever. Become stricter on littering by handing out more fines, substantial fines to make people aware. 4) Big Springs. Years ago we could climb on the rocks above the Springs which isn't allowed any more. That's a good idea to protect the environment around the Springs.	8/16/2009	No			CA	95033
884	1) Action A is the only viable option. the areas are already over-used and over-abused. We desperately need to restrict motorized traffic, eliminate illegal trails, and restore natural vegetation and environments. If any additional changes were to be made to the plan it would be to reduce the motorized use even further. 2) The main pieces of Alt A that are key in my mind are reducing the use of motorized boats, and restoring natural vegetation and environments. 3) No comment 4) No specific areas, I think the plan should include the entire stretch of the rivers equally 5) I think it important to reduce the rowdy behavior, public intoxication, etc. in order to present the river as family friendly and a place those interested in the natural environment rather than a flowing frat house could enjoy the Missouri outdoors. There must be a balance of course, but currently the river is not family friendly and there is little regard to the natural environment being given by the majority of users on the river	8/16/2009	No			MO	63701
885	1) Alternative A with the following modications. Allow "seasonal use" (Labor day to Memorial Day) of outboard motors (max 25 hp)on Current River from Welch Spring to Round Spring; and on the Jacks Fork, from Buck Hollow (Hwy 17) to Bay Creek. This will allow traditional sucker gigging during a time that will reduce user conflicts with floaters and river campers. 2) Whatever alternative is choosen, traditional uses of hunting, fishing, gigging, and trapping should be allowed. These uses can be commensurate with all Alternative, including Alternative A where primitave uses are emphasized. Also, a stronger emphasis on water quality issues should be included, particularly the effect of horse traffic in and around the river, on both ONSR and private land. 3) None 4) I just want to have a choice of experiences. If I want to take my jet boat and enjoy a part of the river, I have no problem with restricting my use to a certain section. Then again, if I want to canoe or float in a section where I will not be over run by mobs of canoes or motor boats, I think I deserve to have that choice also. 5) It may come to a "permit" system like many western waters. There is nothing wrong with having a section of ONSR where users can expect to have a true wilderness experience with very limited contact with other floaters. Fot this to work, ONSR would need to get better control over the "illegal" ATV roads that access the river.	8/17/2009	No			MO	65775
886	1. yes I believe the no-action alternative is the best one for several reasons. The people who live near the Current and Jack Forks rivers are extremely conscious of their beauty. We try very hard to keep the waters clear and the land clean. We welcome visitors from the outlying cities, and do not complain when we get groups together to clean up after they leave our area. It is a valuable asset for us to share with those who aren't blessed with our natural terrain. Why do you want to put everything in the hands of someone who doesn't even live here? We would appreciate your help in allowing us to maintain our beautiful rivers and landscape. We have been doing it for generations. The pristine quality of our waterways reflect the wonderful care we have given them throughout the years. The fact that it is still so beautiful and clean is a tribute to our fathers and forefathers. Why change that? When a group of people come to our rivers and leave big messes, we get together and see to it that it is cleaned up. We have never complained to to the park service about this, and I am not complaining now. We just do it. I believe no-action should be taken. Thank you C. Groves	8/17/2009	No			MO	63638

887	1. A The more "wild," the better, and the less horsepower on the rivers, the more wild. 5. Simply stated, the riverways should be maintained to be as close to their natural state as possible. That said, there should also be a balance to permit humans to appreciate the natural beauty of the area. I would recommend keeping motorized traffic on the roads that already exist, never upgrading the roads, not allowing ATVs in the park, limiting motors on the rivers, and, if necessary, limiting the number of boats on the rivers on summer weekends. (I never visit the rivers on summer weekends, reserving my visits to the off-season, so I don't know how bad it really is---but can imagine.)	8/17/2009	No			MO	63021
888	1. I prefer the No-Action Plan. While I would prefer that the "Park" (which it really isn't) be turned back over to the State of Missouri, this plan is the lesser of the evils. I think that there should be no restrictions on horsepower limits for boats. Many of the camping sites that used to be primitive now have park rangers lurking about and harrassing campers. Just let people enjoy the river and recreation that is here. 2. None 3. Definately no further horsepower restrictions on boats, no restrictions of time when boats can be used. Also, do not close access points to the river. 4. Do whatever you want in Alley Springs Campground, but leave the open land and river alone. 5. One strategy would be to train the park rangers to RESPECT people and to drill in their heads that they are there to SERVE the public. In the past the Rangers were from the area and they had respect and treated people decent. The new crops of rangers they send in now have chips on their sholders about something and think that just because you are a local you should not be there. Also if you are camping they think they can sneak around and look in your vehicle and other things. They apparently are not trained on the 4th Amendment. After an officer such as this has many, many run ins (Chris Mason) they are then just "transferred" to another park to do the same thing there.	8/17/2009	No			MO	65588
889	1. No Action. Do not limit horsepower on motorboats. Do not close roads or access to rivers. Do not limit camping. Do not limit ATV's. Also, I want to know how you all justify extending this comment period. The press release issued says that local interest has effectively conveyed their opinion, ie maintaining and preserving the right to use the river, but apprently you all don't like what has been said, so instead of just accepting those comments you all are extending the deadline and encouraging "all users" to comment so their opinions are not "overshadowed." That sounds like the most self serving load of crap I have ever heard. Is this whole comment exercise just a facade? Are you going to keep asking for comments until you get what you want? If so, why do it? Oh yeah, you are required by law to seek public comment. You just don't like what the public has said. Well, guess what, the public has spoken!! It's time to follow the law and the legislation that formed the ONSR. Do not restrict recreational use of the riverways and other public land.	8/17/2009	No			MO	65438
890	1. The no-action plan. I don't want horsepower limits on the river at all, but definately no more restrictions that are already in place. 2. None 3. No further horsepower restrictions on current river. 4. Current River. The alternatives look to take away the right to boat safely and in some cases the right to boat at all. If horsepower is limited to 25 HP we can't get to some of my favorite places. A family could not ride safely. I definately don't want to be restricted to just winter use. 5. Keep canoers from bringing drugs on the river.	8/17/2009	No			MO	65588
891	There are too many gigantic houses being built on the riverfront that are ruining the scenic aspect of the riverway. Furthermore, those that are built should not be allowed to take down all the vegetation that they do, as these trees and plants hold the riverbank in place. With a grass lawn going all the way up to the river, erosion will occur at a greater pace and much sediment will be placed in the river, reducing its cleanliness. There are too many illegal access points, allowing people to drive their cars to most every gravel bar. There should be more horsepower restrictions on the boats allowed on the Current. People are trying to turn Current river into the party spot that the Lake of the Ozarks is. It is too beautiful for that to happen.	8/17/2009	No			MO	65201
892	I would like for no further development to take place along the Riverways. My preference is to keep this area in is's natural state as much as possible and prohibit the use of ATV's.	8/18/2009	No			MO	63015
893	Alternative A is the closest to my alternative, but the emphasis should be on floating. I belong to a group of kayakers (24 of us) who vist the national park nearly every month, floating the Current and Jacks Fork. Our biggest concern is the ATVs that roar up and down the gravel bars (and into the rivers, especially in the area around Eminence), the jetboats (which should be banned from the rivers) and Jim Smith's Trail Ride, which has grown from 300 riders to more than 3,000. Illegal roads and trails should be closed to cut ATV abuse. Horsepower limits should be strictly enfored on powerboats, with a ban on jetboats, which scour the gravel bars and erode the banks, and the trail rides have to be curtailed. I know his house is within the Eminence buffer zone, but what Jim Smith was allowed to do on the riverbank is a sacrilege. He built his ridgetop mansion, and clearcut all the trees to the river to improve his view. For some reason, he cut the trees to leave six-foot stumps. The trail rides provide a boost for the Eminence economy, but for years have ignored efforts to keep the manure (human and horse) out of the river. A horse's natural reaction to enterting water is to defecate. And they do that quite readily. We have seen trails in the national park after 3,000 riders have gone through, and they are a muddy mess, with pools of fly-infested urine. How one operation can be allowed to abuse a natural resource that belongs to everyone is unimaginable. The Current and Jacks Fork are the jewels of the Ozarks, providing leisurely floating like no other rivers in the United States. They should be treated like the gems that they are.	8/18/2009	No			MO	63122
894	1. I strongly favor Alternative A. The national riverways should be "family friendly" and remain free of any type of jet boats. They were intended to be preserved in a natural state, and jet boats were not a part of the plan. I have a cabin on the Gasconade and frequently kayak on this river, which allows jet boats. The jet boats make it a scary, unpleasant activity, especially during the weekends when the jet boats are out in full force, and the Gasconade is even a larger river than most of the ones you are relating to. Jet boats are extremely noisy and dangerous, as it is difficult, to nearly impossible, to get out of their way fast enough, when you are in the water swimming or in a canoe. Allowing jet boats on these smaller rivers is a disaster waiting to happen, and once someone is hurt or killed, it will be too late. The NPS is leaving itself open to law suits, because I can guarantee a victim's family will sue NPS for allowing a dangerous situation. Jet boats and canoes do not mix. Fast moving jet boats need to go to	8/19/2009	No		Missouri Master Naturalist	MO	65401

	the lakes where there is room for them. They have lakes available to them, whereas many lakes are not available or suitable for canoes; we only have the rivers! People on the rivers are there for a quiet, peaceful experience. More monitoring of lewd and unruly behavior should be instituted, as well. The rivers should be maintained as they were when they were first opened to the public, as was promised to the land owners who had to surrender their adjoining land. Jet boats, other than possibly slower moving fishing boats, should not be allowed anywhere on the 134 miles, and the fishing boats should be restricted to certain areas.						
895	1. No Action. 2. No Action 3. None of the A B or C plans. 4 The whole river is special to me and my family. We have taken care of by helping canoeist, tubers, cleanin up trash after the visitors have left . The river is great just the way it is, government control has not made it what it is today, the local folks that live here and use it weekly have watched over it and enjoyed it for decades, before the park service ever decided to start controlling it. 5. I repeat myself in saying, leave it as it is. If you want to stop some of the minor problems, stop drinking of alcohol on the river, that is the only problems I have seen for years.	8/20/2009	No			MO	63638
896	1) I wholeheartedly agree with the approach taken in Alternative A. For the park and rivers to succeed and be sustainable in the long run, things need to be ratcheted down a notch from their current levels. The rivers are naturally very beautiful and calming but run the risk of being overrun by too many people doing things that gradually take their toll on the environment. Many of the recommendations in Alternative A are strong - I particularly like the idea of harkening back to a lost era along the river, where modern conveniences take a back seat to enjoyment of the river in its most natural state. 2) I very strongly agree with the emphasis on non-mechanized forms of recreation and an emphasis on a quieter, slower-paced experience. I definitely recommend designating Big Spring tract as wilderness. 3) I recommend leaving out even lower horsepower motor traffic and stressing a purely natural, human-powered experience along the river. I definitely disagree with the emphasis in Alternative C on providing more facilities for users than what is currently available now. 5) As a general rule, when it comes to preserving the unique character of Ozark NSR, I think the less footprint the better. I was struck by how easily you could lose yourself in certain sections of the river during a trip last summer, but I was also struck by the pressure on the ecosystem exerted by the number of people wanting to experience it. I would recommend that motorized water traffic (ie. motorboats) should be curtailed as much as possible on the deeper stretches of the river, if not banned altogether. I would note that the Boundary Waters wilderness area of Minnesota has done this with hundreds of thousands of acres of waterways and continues to draw significant patronage. And while I don't want to hurt the numerous hard-working vendors along the river who make their living from it, I would recommend some kind of policy and perhaps stricter enforcement that targets trash and general detritus that spoils the paddler's experience. I was there on a weekday and I still saw numerous boatloads of kids with coolers in their canoes drinking the day away, and I can't help but wonder if a concerted effort can be made, through park policies, of discouraging that kind of recreation as much as possible. I know people have to be free to enjoy themselves as much as possible while on the river, but constant exposure to recreational drinking, trash, and loud/obnoxious behavior will inevitably drive more families away. That would be a sad outcome for such a special resource in southeastern Missouri.	8/20/2009	No			IL	62220
897	1 No Action 2 No change in current plan, especialy HP limitations. 3 A B C. 4 Powder mill to Van Buren. The no action plan would work. 5 No comment.	8/21/2009	No			MO	63638
898	I grew up on the current river and firmly believe the QUALITY of the river has diminished since there is so much traffic. If anyone can tell me the fishing is as good as it was 20 years ago, then I would have to laugh in their face.	8/21/2009	No			MO	63965
899	1. I am in favor of Alternative B. 2. I would like to include the Wilderness Area definition, add some trails, maintain activities but also to provide for wildlife and forest. This is especially important due to the increased destruction of Missouri forests by pulp mills. 3. I would not accept the No-Action Alternative.	8/22/2009	No			MO	63701
900	I have been canoeing Missouri Streams for over forty years. In that time I have seen many changes, few of them good ones. What helped change them was the simple fact that sensitive areas can't support very many people and still stay the same. It just doesn't work. The very qualities that brought you there, clean water, air and getting back to how it was thousands of years ago are negatively impacted as soon as you put your foot down. We have all seen it happen over and over again to beautiful parts of the world. Lots of Missouri streams have suffered this fate. Hoards of weekend canoers come in on Friday night, get drunk and carry that over to their day on the water for Saturday. I have seen it when you could practically walk across the stream only stepping on canoes. They scream and shout and throw their beer cans in the water and generally act like the irresponsible people they are. Throw in some ATV people plowing up the gravel bars and you have a scene any idiot would truly enjoy. For those of us who would like a nice quiet, quality adventure on a perfect Missouri stream, we are out of luck. Doesn't anybody realize that these streams are too valuable a resource to waste this way? The upper section of the Jack's Fork River is the best water in the state. It is somewhat protected by the fact that it is difficult to canoe in just one day. Most people that canoe aren't prepared to stay the night on a gravel bar, thank God. If I had my way, I would strictly limit the number and location of the access roads for the portion of the Jack's Fork river above Alley Springs. That measure would automaticly restrict it to two day floats and that would get rid of most to the people that don't care about the quality of the river. No motors would ever be allowed here. No fish of any size could be kept. It would be catch and release only, a real trophy area. No horses would be allowed to crap in the stream. No ATV's could ever use this area! Commercial operators would have a very low limit of clients per day to use this part of the river. Clients would sign a pledge to leave everything as it was and even help pick up what trash they find. Past events where organized groups picked up trash along the river would be expanded if possible. These measures aren't unrealistic. Can't there be some areas of our precious rivers where it was in the good old days, before people? Does every part of every river have to be open to anything goes? Please try	8/22/2009	No			KS	66212

	to "save and protect" this part of the Jack's Fork before it's too late. Thank You for what you are trying to do. Wayne Smith						
901	I agree with the comments submitted by David Stokely. I was on the Current river also and our group was almost swamped by boats with enough horsepower to obtain 30 to 40 miles an hour. It is getting scary to see how much erosion is being caused by misuse of the environment. I am horrified to think that we could lose such a gift do to the misuse. I agree everyone has the right to use the river but the abuse has to stop.	8/23/2009	No		OMP	MO	65738
902	B	8/24/2009	No			MO	65742
903	<p>Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best management practice for this area. I have been boating on the Current and Jack's Fork for 20 years. During that time, the experience has been degraded in numerous ways. First, horseback riding. I believe that horseback riding is a traditional way of enjoying the outdoors and should not be eliminated. However, this activity is incredibly destructive in a riparian environment. Horses foul the waters and damage the banks of the river. Horseback riding should be limited to existing official trails, and the trail system should be structured to avoid excessive river crossings and damage to the riparian borders. While most horseback riders are conscientious and respectful, some "cheat" off the trails to enjoy crossing the river in new locations . . . causing damage to the banks, adding excrement to the river, and changing the vegetation on the banks. To avoid these problems, riding trails must be placed where damage to the river is minimized, and measures should be enacted to compel riders to stay on the official trails. Second, and more importantly, vehicular travel near the river MUST Be limited. Currently, there seem to be miles and miles of unofficial roadways. In some areas, nearly every gravel bar hosts a 4X4 or ATV party. Each and every one of these unofficial roadways damages vegetation, degrades water quality, and assaults the peaceful beauty of this area with the noise of motors, radios and drunken behavior. In the past, it has seemed that law enforcement coddles the motorized vehicle crowd, and "looks the other way" when illegal trails, roads and crossings are used. I was shocked a few years ago, after a day of watching ATV riders cross and re-cross the river directly in front of or behind my canoe, to see federal agents stealthily sneaking up on an older couple to make an arrest for marijuana possession, COMPLETELY IGNORING THE ATV RIDERS. An off-duty Shannon County Deputy helped run my shuttle that day, and told me that it's "just too hard" to catch the ATV riders, because if an agent doesn't see them in the river, they can't take action. I don't feel much sympathy for the drug arrestees, but there is no doubt in my mind that the ATV riders that day were (a) ruining my enjoyment and (b) causing irreversible damage to the river and riparian areas, such that their actions degraded the river experince many times more than the two individuals sitting in lawn chairs on the bank were causing. Yet enforcement efforts seemed to be aimed more at sneaking up on potheads than on preventing severe environmental damage. This needs to change, or we will have no natural river areas left to enjoy. Third, motorboats. Again, like horseback riders, most motorboats on the river are respectful and responsible. Still, the loud motors, big wakes, and constant motion on the river completely degrade the experience of motorless paddling. I understand that small, jon-boat sized motorboats have a long tradition on the Current river, and accommodations should be made for those who enjoy the river in this manner. However, I believe that the upper reaches of both rivers should be completely motor-free, with perhaps a middle zone limited to smaller motors and boats. Those who wish to operate higher-powered boats should be limited to the larger segments of the Current well downstream from the confluence of the Jack's Fork and Current. Finally, some action must be taken to limit the "partying" of canoeists on the river. Again, most canoeists are respectful and responsible, but there is a growing segment that arrives just to party. This is a difficult problem, because I believe those "partiers" are drawn to several large campgrounds in the area, some of which sell liquor and fully encourage wild behavior. I understand that these people support these local businesses, in an area where economic opportunity is hard to come by. However, perhaps some type of restrictions on (a) liquor sales at campgrounds; (b) number of campers; (c) number of rental boats on the river, would assist in keeping the river clean, peaceful and safe for the majority of paddlers. Finally, I believe that, in contrast to the "sneak out of the woods and bust one group" model of law enforcement, the opposite would have a greater effect: have frequent, visible law enforcement on the river. Many people seem to believe that these rivers are so far "out in the boonies" that anything goes. Simply seeing that a ranger is present and patrolling the area will prevent many people from crossing the line of propriety. Further, once the word gets out that enforcement is up, perhaps the true troublemakers will stay home, or go somewhere else to cause problems. In any event, I believe that without additional funding for law enforcement, the large crowds will continue to get worse. I already avoid paddling during summer months, because I don't enjoy the crowds. If I knew the crowds would behave responsibly, I wouldn't be so hesitant. I urge the NPS not to take a pure numbers approach to these issues. Of the many groups competing for the use of this area, some are much more destructive than others, and should face greater limits. Motorized land vehicles cause the most damage, and should be severely limited. Horseback riding, due to the weight of the animals, also causes lasting damage, and should be regulated to minimize that damage. Motorized boats are less damaging on a permanent scale, but are supremely distracting to any of the other groups seeking the peace of Ozarks wilderness, and should be limited to certain areas of the river. Like the motorized boats, canoes cause little permanent damage, but the boaters behavior can ruin the wilderness experience for others if there are too many boaters or if their behavior is allowed to run amok. I believe that this area is a rare jewel, specifically because it is a remote, wild, scenic and peaceful natural area. Adding more motors, structures, roads and trails will only degrade the experience. As much as is possible, the focus of the Park Service's work in the Current-Jacks Fork area should be to protect and encourage the preservation of this scenic beauty, and to enable citizens to peacefully and responsibly enjoy the area while preserving that same opportunity for future generations.</p>	8/24/2009	No			MO	65617

904	4) It is most important to protect the natural features of the rivers and surrounding land. I had my first experience on the Current this past July and it was one of the most spectacular sites. Drastic temperate changes where the springs feed into the main stream and lead to a watercrest wonderland. It was as if entering a different river/ place entirely. This is just one example of the rare features of the Current and the reason why it is crucial to preserve such a treasure for future generations.	8/25/2009	No		Open Space Council for the St. Louis Region	MO	63118
905	1) No action. The current allowed motors on the river are not outrageous. If anything I would limit the number of canoes so everyone can enjoy an uncongested river. Canoers have issues because they do not understand that a boat has to go fast enough to get "planed" out to make it over the shallow shoals. They also do not understand that cannot gather in route that the boats need to travel. THERE NEEDS TO BE MANDITORY EDUCATION FOR PEOPLE WHO USE CANOES TO HELP THEM UNDERSTAND HOW A BOAT OPERATES. It is not as intuitive as one would think. 2) No Action - education to canoe users so everyone can enjoy the river. 3) I feel strongly that option A, B, & C should not be included and that no action is taken other than educating people who use canoes on what they can do to allow everyone to use the river together. 4) My exteded family uses the Logyard section of Current River all year long. Swimming, camping, fishing, and gigging (we use it even in the winter time when there are no canoes). 5) Educate people who use canoes so they understand why the boats are running a particular course in the river..... why we are running "faster" than the canoes think we ought to run (to keep the boat "planed out" so we can get over the shallow water)..... We canoe this river as well as run boats - and when WE do we do NOT have a problem with the boats because we understand where the boat is going to go.....understand that the boat has to be able to get a run at shoals..... understand if we need to pull our canoe out of the main channel for 10 seconds (not unreasonable)..... understand that the boats just want to be able to enjoy the river and boats use the river year round..... not just once or twice a season.	8/25/2009	No			MO	63637
906	1. As a native of the Shannon/Carter county area whose family roots go back generations, I have strong feelings about the rights of the original Ozarkians and would currently support the No-Action plan. Under the other three plans I feel that our rights (those of natives) are being strongly neglected in favor of people who do not make this their home twelve months of the year. Ozarkians have always been proud of their heritage and have always had pride and taken care of the land while still using the land. I feel that the plan which allows us to continue OUR use of the rivers while still protecting them is the plan currently in effect. 2. I believe that the current management of horsepower of outboard motors should be kept as it is currently 3. I do not believe that the area around Big Springs should be designated as a Wilderness area which would limit access and useage 4. ALL areas of the river are special and should be managed is such a way as to keep them as pristine as possible while still allowing public use and freedom for ALL. 5. No comment	8/25/2009	No			MO	63965
907	#5. We must address education and not just of children. Our educational system has been so inadequate for so long that adults are functionally ignorant about ecological systems, watersheds, natural history, native plants and animals. The knowledge deficit is astonishing. Desire to know is there, but the public does not even have much idea what they do not know since most of our current knowledge has come from television! This evidence has been gleaned from working as a park volunteer for several years, as well as observations of behavior and thinking in my work as a nurse. Many problems in our parks could start to be alleviated with public knowledge. Therefore, I would strongly advocate for educational programs for adults on ALL aspects of ecology, natural history, native plants and animals. We must work to change, i.e. enhance healthy perception. Changing perception changes thinking. Changing thinking is the only thing that changes behavior. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring. Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by reducing and enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have an opportunity to protect these, OUR rivers, from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! We can do it. Let's do it! Janet Fiore	8/26/2009	No			IL	60964
908	I prefer the No-action alternative. Thank you	8/26/2009	No			MO	63128
909	#1 TAKE NO ACTION #3 take no action. especially in regard to further limiting the use of outboard motors # 5 pls. provide more small takeouts and put-ins which would allow more variation in hours and miles on the rivers; this would allow more flexibility in order to avoid the large weekend numbers of paddlers. more enforcement, although limited by funding, is the key to a better experience for all river users. in particular more rangers and/or park volunteers in boats on the rivers showing the park 'presence' would go a long way to cleaning up the behavioral abuses on the rivers. # 5 TAKE NO ACTION. FURTHER RESTRICTIONS WILL LEAD TO PEOPLE AVOIDING OUR PARK AND HURT THE LOCAL ECONOMY THAT PROVIDES MUCH-NEEDED JOBS AND REVENUES FOR THE LOCAL TOURIST INDUSTRY.	8/26/2009	No			MO	65466
910	1. alternative A is my preference. Concentration of removal of non-native species and management of the land to be an example of pre-colonial times is a goal that I would welcom. 2. reversal of human activities, including repair, restrict, protect, preserve, and prevent are all great actions to manage humans. We have a tendency to destroy anything that we have access to. The only way I have seen to protect is to isolate. 5. see statement of #2 and #1. In addition, restriction of alcohol on the river, strict litter laws, and an adequate number of wardens to enforce the laws. Ozark National Scenic Riverways must be preserved with stricter policies and better enforcement: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Clean the once-clear waters by limiting the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Reverse riverbank erosion by eliminating some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the 3,400 acres of pristine wilderness at Big Spring Limit power boat damage to the rivers and wildlife by enforcing horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren We have a welcome opportunity to	8/26/2009	No			MO	65233

	protect these rivers from abuse and neglect and preserve thousands of acres of wilderness around our first National Scenic Rivers! Thanks for helping NPCA reverse the damage to this park and save one of our country's treasured landscapes!						
911	I stated this before, but alternative B keeps the river closer to the Wild & Scenic vision that it should be. I recently paddled the river near Van Buren and filmed this video http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cUZiTEy0yes&eurl=http%3A%2F%2Fsites.google.com%2Fsite%2Fowwckc%2FHome%2Ftrips-past-photographs&feature=player_embedded The power boat scene was from a bar below Big Spring and above Big Tree. If you don't think alternative B is the only scenic choice, just listen. Only 2 in 5 power boaters even slowed down for canoes. I also was dismayed that there was no "floater" parking at Big Spring, just power boat trailer parking. The comment will be, "folks don't canoe that part of the river anymore" and the reason is "It doesn't feel like a canoe stream anymore.. Wake up NPS and keep the Current & Jack's Fork Rivers Wild & Scenic. There are plenty of lakes for power boating.	8/26/2009	No		Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club	MO	64118
912	1 - No action 2 - Horseback riding should be closely monitored. Specific areas should be designated. Horses should be kept out of the Jacks Fork River. 3 - Outboard motor restrictions as written. They should be the same as present. 4 - Keep the same rules in place as present. Let everyone have an opportunity to enjoy the river. There will always be conflicts between boaters, canoeists, and tubers, regardless of the horsepower limits. The river should be available for everyone to enjoy. 5 - You should look at limiting the number of tubers. I understand that there is limits on the rental liveries, but apparently they have found a way to beat the system.	8/27/2009	No			MO	65775
913	My family (wife and 2 kids) and I are frequent users of the National Parks and have been to 71 National Parks and Historic Sites from Acadia to Olympia. We are heavy users of the Current River from Akers to Round Spring. We use our own equipment (canoe and two kayaks) and camp on the gravel bars. We float at least 4 times a year (all times of the year), often more. We like the solitude that camping on the gravel bars provides as we are either ahead of or behind the groups that put in with the commercial outfitters. It also gets us away from the "partying" crowd in the campgrounds. We really like the quiet solitude and connection with nature that this provides. I like the proposal A or B because this helps preserve the natural resources in it's more natural form. I agree most with proposal B. I would like to see a limitation on the horsepower of jonboats and limit what parts of the river they use. I also agree with closing off some of the illegal roads and limit ORV use too. I would like to see a greater education about the area and it's resources that are described in plan B. I do not equate small family groups camping on gravel bars with this kind of use though. I do not see this kind of camping having to fall in the mixed use zone. We have gone backpacking in numerous National Parks and do not equate backcountry camping in the same catagory as motor boating and ORV use. From what I understand, proposal B would not permit gravel bar camping, unless with a guide. I don't need a guide to do this. We consistently camp with the Leave No Trace principals. I would REALLY like to keep the option of camping on the gravel bars available. Not all that many people camp this way (they prefer the established campgrounds) and allowing this should not degrade the natural resources greatly. You could even have these gravel bars as backcountry campsites that you would reserve. This would help keep these sites in better condition.	8/27/2009	No			MO	65039
914	Recommend leaving the managment of Ozark National Scenic Riverways as is. No action required.	8/27/2009	No			MO	63638
915	1. Alternative A appears to be the option closest to what I would hope the future of these rivers to be for the next 20 years. Since first canoeing these rivers in the late 1950s, I recall when access was limited and touring the rivers meant getting away from civilization and the debris of mankind. Granted, there were disposal issues, when these spring-fed rivers were used as a dumping ground, but we once felt comfortable about using the springs as a source of drinking water. The use of motorized boats and ATVs in the park areas and rivers seem far from where we hoped these areas would ultimately end up, it is shocking we are having a discussion that would consider allowing these noisy and polluting activities to be allowed. Not only does this traumatize the habitat and environment, but motorized boating removes the opportunity for one and all to enjoy or respect the wildlife. In some respects, if motorized boats and equipment is allowed, it is a form of takings, robbing those of us the opportunity to enjoy this experience as God presented it. 2. The limited alternatives are clearly an approach to allow some development and growth to business and tourism to the area. However, it also appears to limit the imagination of so-called businesses in the region, thinking they can be support for motorized boats and vehicles, or other polluting activities like massive horse repositories to provide the horseback experience for everyone who visits, while also funneling fecal material into the drainage basins of these rivers. Can we not configure a support and jobs system for the area that does not thrive upon the degradation of a valuable and beautiful natural resource? 3. For the future, it occurs to me to place these resources in a "traffic diet" program, limiting noise, limiting hydrocarbons, limiting alcohol and loud music, and discouraging hostile behavior of those on the river. My neighbor recently went on the Elk River, where it was bumper to bumper canoes, and blockades of partier's interfering with everyone's experience. Like the takings noted above, this kind of "floating" can be done without boats. Those participating missed most of the experience, while being too focused on consuming drink and being rowdy. In some cities across America, the idea of "traffic dieting" is working to enhance the quality of life. It seems to me, access dieting would enhance the experience and meet the long-range plan for these rivers that was in the minds of those who first proposed river protection and conservation of the environment. 4. The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are special places, uniquely developed by the Karst geology of the region, specifically differentiated by high flowing underground streams and groundwater, manifesting in the springs all along these beautiful rivers. Efforts to protect this geology need to be of primary importance for the long term maintenance of these river ways. Anyone who has been on these rivers during a rainstorm can see the startling difference between spring sources and surface runoff. Silt and debris flowing discolours the clear water, while the springs remain nearly unaffected by surface flow of water.	8/27/2009	No			MO	64111

	<p>Therefore, though the rivers natural clean themselves of this temporary surface contamination, it also behooves us to protect the surface drainage basin to minimize the negative impact of surface drainage that might contain bacteria from horse barns and other human activities. 5. If you read my comment with a critical eye, it is a protective position I am taking. However, as we have a population that has grown more interested in using this environment for their enjoyment, it seems that public education must play a significant role in long-range planning. We have seen this effort pay off in our national parks, as we have also seen dieting of access to our national parks become a priority to enable them to protected from a diminishing return of too much popularity. Obviously, the program is attempting to address the "popularity," and there is some wisdom in attempting to please a majority of people who play and benefit from these unique areas. Therefore, part of this education must be focused on preservation and not so much on development. In this climate of wanting economic development, it seems at odds with our desire to create jobs and welfare for the local population. However, after traveling around this country and Canada, it occurs to me tourism has evolved into ice cream and tee-shirt shops, creating shopping destinations as part of the exposure to the environment. This is not entrepreneurial development, but just an extension of marketing using goods made in China to make claims somewhat untrue about experienceing the waterways in question. There must be a better way to create a sustainable economic climate in concert with maintaining a clean environment for these rivers. Clearly, we can be more innovative than selling wares that attempt to compete with Walmart! Such atmosphere is more suitable for a carnival than being part of experiencing a beautiful river and its drainage basin. And yet, this begs the question: Is it the responsibility of the National Parks Department to consider and assist in the development of a local economy around a national treasure? It is nice to be able not to injure the local economy if possible, but since the beginning, there have alway been those who see exploiting as part of the process, and we should not expect this desire to end any time soon.</p>					
916	<p>1. Alternative A appears to be the option closest to what I would hope the future of these rivers to be for the next 20 years. Since first canoeing these rivers in the late 1950s, I recall when access was limited and touring the rivers meant getting away from civilization and the debris of mankind. Granted, there were disposal issues, when these spring-fed rivers were used as a dumping ground, but we once felt comfortable about using the springs as a source of drinking water. The use of motorized boats and ATVs in the park areas and rivers seem far from where we hoped these areas would ultimately end up, it is shocking we are having a discussion that would consider allowing these noisy and polluting activities to be allowed. Not only does this traumatize the habitat and environment, but motorized boating removes the opportunity for one and all to enjoy or respect the wildlife. In some respects, if motorized boats and equipment is allowed, it is a form of takings, robbing those of us the opportunity to enjoy this experience as God presented it. 2. The limited alternatives are clearly an approach to allow some development and growth to business and tourism to the area. However, it also appears to limit the imagination of so-called businesses in the region, thinking they can be support for motorized boats and vehicles, or other polluting activities like massive horse repositories to provide the horseback experience for everyone who visits, while also funneling fecal material into the drainage basins of these rivers. Can we not configure a support and jobs system for the area that does not thrive upon the degradation of a valuable and beautiful natural resource? 3. For the future, it occurs to me to place these resources in a "traffic diet" program, limiting noise, limiting hydrocarbons, limiting alcohol and loud music, and discouraging hostile behavior of those on the river. My neighbor recently went on the Elk River, where it was bumper to bumper canoes, and blockades of partier's interfering with everyone's experience. Like the takings noted above, this kind of "floating" can be done without boats. Those participating missed most of the experience, while being too focused on consuming drink and being rowdy. In some cities across America, the idea of "traffic dieting" is working to enhance the quality of life. It seems to me, access dieting would enhance the experience and meet the long-range plan for these rivers that was in the minds of those who first proposed river protection and conservation of the environment. 4. The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are special places, uniquely developed by the Karst geology of the region, specifically differentiated by high flowing underground streams and groundwater, manifesting in the springs all along these beautiful rivers. Efforts to protect this geology need to be of primary importance for the long term maintenance of these river ways. Anyone who has been on these rivers during a rainstorm can see the startling difference between spring sources and surface runoff. Silt and debris flowing discolours the clear water, while the springs remain nearly unaffected by surface flow of water. Therefore, though the rivers natural clean themselves of this temporary surface contamination, it also behooves us to protect the surface drainage basin to minimize the negative impact of surface drainage that might contain bacteria from horse barns and other human activities. 5. If you read my comment with a critical eye, it is a protective position I am taking. However, as we have a population that has grown more interested in using this environment for their enjoyment, it seems that public education must play a significant role in long-range planning. We have seen this effort pay off in our national parks, as we have also seen dieting of access to our national parks become a priority to enable them to protected from a diminishing return of too much popularity. Obviously, the program is attempting to address the "popularity," and there is some wisdom in attempting to please a majority of people who play and benefit from these unique areas. Therefore, part of this education must be focused on preservation and not so much on development. In this climate of wanting economic development, it seems at odds with our desire to create jobs and welfare for the local population. However, after traveling around this country and Canada, it occurs to me tourism has evolved into ice cream and tee-shirt shops, creating shopping destinations as part of the exposure to the environment. This is not entrepreneurial development, but just an extension of marketing using goods made in China to make claims somewhat untrue about experienceing the waterways in question. There must be a better way to create a sustainable economic climate in concert with maintaining a clean environment for these rivers. Clearly, we can be more innovative than selling wares that attempt to compete with Walmart! Such atmosphere is more suitable for a carnival than being part of experiencing a beautiful river and its drainage basin. And yet, this begs the question: Is it the responsibility of the National Parks Department to consider and assist in the development of a local economy around a national treasure? It is nice to be able not to injure the local economy if possible, but since the beginning, there have alway been those who see exploiting as part of the process, and we should not expect this desire to end any time soon.</p>	8/27/2009	No		MO	64111

917	I would like to see the Riverways remain the same as it has in the past. Please do not change this wonderful resource that everyone should be able to continue to enjoy! Sincerely, Greg W Snider	8/28/2009	No			MS	38632
918	The Park Service must restore the degraded natural conditions on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I support Alternative A provided that the Park Service enforces the management policies as follows. 1. Operation of ATV's, dirt bikes and similar recreational vehicles are banned in the park except on legally designated state and county roads. 2. Excess river access points need to be closed and the banks restored to their native vegetative cover. Many of these access points are illegal. 3. Improperly planned horse trails in the park must be redesigned to be set back from the rivers and creeks a sufficient distance to prevent pollution problems, like e coli, that exist. Also, the number of horse river crossings must be reduced and limited to reduce damage to the aquatic habitats on river and creek bottoms. 4. Mobile campers must be restricted to official park campgrounds designated for these camping units. 5. I urge the National Park Service to control the number and frequency of floaters putting in at various Park Service access points. 6. I urge the National Park Service to prohibit the use of recreational power boats above Two Rivers and to enforce the speed limits of power boats on other areas of the rivers. As an avid canoeist I say The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is too beautiful and too important to Missouri and the National Park system to risk further degradation. It needs to be saved now, before saving it requires more drastic measures. Sincerely, Anne M Hussar Individual and Member of OWWC	8/28/2009	No		Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club (OWWC)	KS	66212
919	1) I support reversion to wilderness areas, including prohibiting boat motors, rv campgrounds,4-wheelers/atvs, etc. If the nps can actively manage the riverways's preservation as pristine and unspoilt by commercialism, we, as Missourians, will have bolstered its' inherent value for the next generation. That means returning the area to johnboats and no mechanized boats. It's ridiculously unrealistic to ban motors in one stretch of the river only. The Ozark profile's much more fragile; 300 horses crossing the river concentrated in one area, will leave lasting scars. Future management should include more funding for more rangers on the spot rather than lengthy "plans". Once commercialism arrives, it's like that relative who comes to visit and stays too long, except that it'll ruin Jacks Fork. Also, for some mysterious reason local gravel dregging's been banned, so the river's flowing deeper underground. What's the rationale for this? Locals do not want the riverways polluted, like the Lake of the Ozarks. Bottomline: by limiting ALL development, the river will have more value to future generations. 5) Don't alienate locals. Don't open up huge tracts to development or increase access. Topography limits road usage. Hwy 60's expansion will bring more people, more pollution to the area; all the more reason for the nps to preserve Jacks Fork.	8/28/2009	No			MO	65251
920	1) Preliminary alternative "A" is the only one I can begin to consider. 2) Designate the Big Spring tract as wilderness. (Heck, designate as much wilderness as possible. I say this because even a wilderness designation is no guarantee of a wilderness experience for the user... but it's a step in the right direction.) Begin limiting access to the river through unauthorized roadways and ATV trails. Put limits on the number of horses and horse trails. Perform studies to determine a max capacity for all river activities and begin limiting access to the river during periods of peak use! Limit boats. Too many boats and too many people are too many! Not only does it serve to degrade the quality of the time spent on the river (invariably subjected to the drunken reveries of the male subspecies known as "bubbas americanas,") but their passing also taints the experience of those that come behind when they are forced to deal with the mess of beer cans, human litter and toilet paper left in their wake. protect scenic easements! 3) I have problems with alternative B as it seems to put a lot of emphasis on education and visitor experience and improving their connections to the rivers. It all sounds very expensive to implement when the river is in such need of other assistance. Seriously, while I am not opposed to education, per se, it needs to be done in a way that SHOWS rather than TELLS. In other words, make the necessary changes to protect these rivers, and then educate the young'uns on how you did this by pointing to the success you are having in rehabilitating them once unauthorized access was restricted, usage quotas were put in place and enforced, and efforts were made to clean up the mess on a constant basis. And if you really want people to make a connection with something, start by making all that much easier to love. 4) None that I can think of. 5) I think you get the idea where I stand. There are too many boats, too many horses, too many trucks, too many motors, too many ATV's, and WAY too many people! There is a place for all these activities on the rivers but it has to be balanced against the needs of everyone. The negative impacts of so many are escalating to the point that if things aren't done to put checks on them soon it will just become harder and harder to do so in the future.	8/29/2009	No			AR	72116
921	I was on a float of the Current with friends, my daughter and her friend. I was shocked at the behavior allowed on the Current. I expected to see a beautiful river with birds singing. Instead I saw drunks acting the way drunks often do. I heard loud music and loud profanity virtually non-stop. I saw litter. I saw someone cutting down a live tree just for the fun of it. I would highly recommend entrance to the river be restricted to those who understand and are willing to live by the seven Leave Trace Principles. Visitors would have to carry with them a Leave No Trace card similar to a driver's, fishing or hunting license requiring a course of instuction and testing on Leave No Trace. This should be required for entry to any of the National Parks and Rivers. This would not only impact the parks and rivers for the good but the lessons learned would soon show up with less litter on the highways and a greater respect for other human beings and the natural world. Here are some other issues we are facing which would become less severe with the use of a LNT license system. 1. Horse back riding and ATV crossings degrading the area. 2. Illegal access roads allow motorized vehicle access to nearly every gravel bar on the river. 3. Scenic Easements not properly enforced. 4. Excessive outboard motor horsepower limits.	8/29/2009	No		Ozark Society	AR	72034-2945
922	Plan B is closest to my opinion. I am an avid outdoorsman, and I quit floating and hiking the Current and Jacks Fork area. I am against any motorized traffic on the river or in the forest- the noise ruins the outdoor experience for anyone within miles. The illegal roads (especially to the gravel bars need to be eliminated. The drunks need to be controlled better (in the campgrounds and on the river). Thanks you. I consider our Ozark rivers a precious resource and I see all of them dying. Mark	8/30/2009	No			MO	65810

923	<p>1. Alternative A is by far the best alternative for future management of the ONSR. That best reflects the reason for establishing the Park in the first place, and unfortunately poor management in the interum has allowed the experience to be degraded so that the original experience is almost lost. Big jetboat motors need to be eliminated, and uncontrolled horse usage needs to be cut back. The resource needs to be protected, which is not happening now. 2. Cutting back on jetboat motor horsepower, controlling atv usage, closing undesignated accesses, and cutting back on the volume of horse usage are things that need to be done to preserve the resource and the river experience. 3. There needs to be more control of those activities that create water and noise pollution, but there is no need to more money to be spent on interpretation and development of facilities. There are adequate facilities now, if they are just maintained properly. 4. I used to float the Current and Jack's Fork frequently, but the riverway has been allowed to deteriorate so much in recent years that I no longer go there. So I am not familiar with current conditions, except that it is well known that things need to improve in order to protect the resource. 5. As stated above: Limit accesses and atv usage, limit horse usage to protect water quality and erosion, and require human waste to be carried out. Also, the number of rental canoes perhaps should be phased back, as there are times that there are way too many boats on the river.</p>	8/30/2009	No			MO	65814
924	<p>This comment pertains to the disdainful attitude National Park Service employees display toward locals and tourists alike. After being harassed, berated, and publicly incited by one of the Rangers from Round Spring, it is apparent that the discrimination that occurs on behalf of your staff needs to be curtailed. Personal reports abound of rangers "picking on" locals. In this incident, however, the NPS employee came to Eminence in plain clothes. Not only did the employee harass and try to instigate trouble by belittling locals, his disdain for the local was explicated by his statement to all within ear-shot, "white power." His statement fully showed his lack of respect and concern for local views. He went on to indicate that the comment process is geared to gather information in support of closing off local access points and uses and will more prominently consider the views of urbanites who wish for people to not be able to enjoy nature, but view a picture of nature on their desk at work.</p>	8/30/2009	No			MO	65466
925	<p>When locals were informed of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways being founded, public meetings were held in the areas in and around the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. Locals were consulted, as this decision to create a scenic riverways would actually affect this group. Those who wished for this park who did not reside here did have an interest in protecting the resources here, but were not directly affected. In these meetings, both public and in private encounters, the people of South Central Missouri were told the Park Service would help perpetuate the culture; working farms would be here as evidence of what once occurred in these hills and hollows. Historical houses, traditional put-ins, cultural recreational uses would be protected via the enabling legislation. Jobs for locals residing near the riverways would provide for economic impact in place of the potential for this land to be privately owned. If privately owned, real estate taxes payments would be paid at a self-sustainable level, not starving the school districts in the region for money. Initially, jobs for locals were provided. Traditional crafts were practiced by locals at sorghum mills, blacksmithing demonstrations, and the like. Although old homeplaces were eliminated by the NPS, preventing people from seeing their ancestral homes and from this portion of the local culture to be passed on, working farms were still in existence. Fields were managed, some spots were left for planting crops, and the people's livelihoods were to be assisted from the tourist-based economy. It may be noted, NPS employees and rangers were seen in public, friendly, and the happenstance of seeing helpful rangers in uniform in boats and canoes picking up trash, providing information was not uncommon. Locals were given jobs to keep Alley and Round Spring and other areas clean, mowed, and well-kept. This not only kept the areas looking respectable, this provided for jobs. Moving through the next thirty or so years, people not directly affected by decisions made about the riverways were pursued by park administration were more readily counseled and consulted. Jet boats was a pet-project for some time. People who do not enjoy jet boats and believed the dogma and propaganda of preservationist organizations and schools of thinking worked to remove this from the rivers. Trappers had to get an injunction against the NPS just to be able to continue their traditional form of recreational activity. Legislation had to be passed just to prevent our beloved wild horses from being mass-slaughtered, because people from other parts of the nation carry out this practice. This is exactly the problem facing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. A nation-wide plan of management, garnered from park management plans in other areas of the nation have been promulgated as being beneficial for this uniquely created riverways. Because of the uniqueness of this Ozarks and of the natural wonders you find here, this should prompt a more catered approach to management. One that considers local experience, knowledge, and cultural information passed through generations. Park Service employees, doctrine, and administrative policy will change. Beliefs from various environmentally preservationist sub-groups about resource management and preservation will change. The founding documents, no matter how altered, however, state this is a group of resources which are set-aside for recreation. This is the idea that rather than having the "king's forests" of England years ago which peasants could not touch, nature in this belief is for touching, feeling, experiencing in a very personal way. This nature is not one that you merely view in a picture on one's desk at work. Ideas abound about how this scenic riverways should be managed, however, there is one that should be considered foremost: No Action. In fact, the no action alternative does not go far enough to address the concerns of locals and those who have taken care of this land and waterways for so many years, there are certain rights to access and to use this property that should be protected in management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. No more roads should be closed. Ancestral homeplaces, natural wonders, and the nature experience should not be limited by the desire to make resource management fancifully lazy. Increases in jet boat motor horsepower should be reviewed and catered to allow groups and families to travel in and along the rivers. Hunters and fishermen should be helped, not harassed and hindered. Gravel should be removed from the river corridor. Roots and trees should be removed from the river for safety. These enhancements and safety procedures do not hinder the natural experience. Tourists should be informed, not spied upon by agents in the bushes. Visible NPS employees who are friendly, not full of disdain and ready to harass locals and tourists alike, would have a much more positive affect on the experience of those using the riverways. Jobs should be provided for locals to better maintain the appearances of springs, resources, and roads. A musuem, one that does justice to the culture of this area, should be built, maintained, and staffed by locals. Cultural and craft demonstrations should happen throughout the year, providing steady and readily available employment. Jobs for seasonal staff should be more secure. The economic factor should be considered. Those</p>	8/30/2009	No		Voice of the Ozarks	MO	65466

	who are affected most by such decisions in management should be considered first and foremost--extra-local interpretations of ultra-urbane attitudes should be seen at face value. Education from a book and propaganda from the latest facade in resource management should be seen for what they are. The fundamental difference in management beliefs are this: Some people believe nature exists to experience in all her glory and splendor for not the few, but others believe that resources should be limited, preserved to prevent anyone from enjoying, in existence at such a distance they can drive through on a day trip, while ignoring the hipocrisy they pollute their own environment. They feed their ego by thinking other areas should be set-aside rather than taking care of their own. In lieu of tax payments should be fully realized, for this area is one of the poorest counties per capita in the nation, in part because of federal and state government land holdings. Local methods for making an income should be protected and promulgated. Although the park service does not generally log their lands, if they do, locals should receive first consideration in bids. Just like certain socio-economic groups receive protective status in government bidding, so should locals. Some of these ideas may sound biased, however, this bias has not been presented in years past, for whatever reason that may be, and should be brought to the attention of those in NPS management and to elected officials. These ideas deserve such passion and thoughtfulness which may sometimes be communicated in comments and should be understood in context and with the pretext that for years locals have not responded to the extra-local push to remove us from our native lands. Please consider this in your next general management plan alternative. Yours truly, John Mark Brewer						
926	The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for decades. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. To further strengthen the hand of the NPS against future development, Big Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Thanks,	8/30/2009	No		Northwest Fly Anglers	WA	98155
927	The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for decades. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. To further strengthen the hand of the NPS against future development, Big Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Thanks, Ryan McNair	8/30/2009	No			MO	64105
928	The first time I went to the Ozarks and enjoyed its scenic beauty was 49 years ago. The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for decades. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. To further strengthen the hand of the NPS against future development, Big	8/30/2009	No			CA	95128

	Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Regards, Patrick Hall						
929	1. The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for decades. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. To further strengthen the hand of the NPS against future development, Big Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Thanks,	8/31/2009	No			MO	64111
930	Proposal A in particular seems to favor a long term conservation path that I believe is critical to preserve. This includes not only the natural experience for the visitors, but most importantly the health of the indigenous plants, animals, and micro-organisms that live there permanently (and in some cases nowhere else). This is an opportunity to have a "light foot" approach to preserving something that is special, and can easily and quickly be destroyed - forever. Any increase or introduction of new motorized traffic of any kind will be a huge detriment to these areas and how people have learned to enjoy them. Any proposal should look at ways to reduce the existing and eliminate any future motorized activity (boat, ATV, vehicle access, PWC, etc.). These areas that have drawn folks for hundreds of years due to their beauty and pristine nature. Whether you believe this scenery was created by God, or millions of years of time, or a combination of both, these decisions on use represent a one time (or maybe last chance) opportunity to forever change, or continue to preserve this wonderful place. Please preserve and conserve these areas, so that people, animals, and all biology can enjoy them for decades and centuries to come. Specifically I believe that education is the key to helping folks understand the importance of how a tread lightly approach will promote the health and longevity of this area - and without it, a gradual erosion of what makes it special and unique. This could include more naturalists and park personnel to develop programs or even "walk around" activities designed to meet with folks as they use these areas. These should be done at those access points and along the corridor of use, not just at the current conservation HQ's. Getting young folks involved in that education - junior park rangers or the like to teach young and old the advantages and ways to conserve the resources.	8/31/2009	No		Ozark Mtn Paddlers	MO	65742
931	1. No-Action	8/31/2009	No			MO	63638
932	The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for decades. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. To further strengthen the hand of the NPS against future development, Big Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Thanks, C Eidson	8/31/2009	No			MO	64105
933	The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for	8/31/2009	No			MO	64105

	decades. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. To further strengthen the hand of the NPS against future development, Big Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Thanks, Kate					
934	1) The No-Action is my idea of the best way to manage the areas. They were supposedly taken for public use. Let the public use them. User capacity management? Legislators and voters knew this undoubtedly would happen. Now they want us to quit using it? Or use it only when told we can? 2) My answer to number one surely answers number 2 also. The No-Action Plan! 3) A,B, or C should not be included, period. The National Park Service took these areas for the public to be able to use, and we should be allowed to do that. I realize I was repetitive there, and that some visitors are destructive, but others should not be penalized because of them. Walk-in areas anywhere are discriminatory. What about anyone disabled? If I am someday in a wheelchair, shouldn't I still be able to visit any area of the river as any able bodied person? 4) The area of Current River, from Owls Bend to the Log Yard are of my concern. The Rocky Creek area was to be a part of my heritage. Enough of it has disappeared. Please leave things the way they are. 5) No visitor, local or otherwise, can profit from Wilderness Areas. One can only imagine the historic structures and buildings that went by the wayside when the National Park Service first took over. I know. One of those stood on my grandfather's place and was destroyed. Visitor experiences are already great, or they wouldn't keep coming back. I fully realize that this is a National Park. Let's not ruin the human experiences of it by limitations the way we have other parks.	8/31/2009	No		MO	65588
935	The Arkansas Canoe Club represents almost 600 families and more than 1200 people mostly from Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana who have a special connection with the rivers of our region, including the Current and Jack's Fork. We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and input on the River Management Plan. Q1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? R1) I believe that Alternative B best is the best overall plan for future management because it provides the most balanced approach. Specific suggestions for additional elements to be considered will be provided in response to question 5. Q2)Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? R2) I like the fact that Alternative B proposes to include a mix of traditional recreational activities, such as floating, boating, and horseback riding. The natural resource management is an important aspect of why this plan is preferred. Specifically I like the that the natural resources would be maintained or restored to more pristine conditions that lack signs of substantial development or use, and that there would be some increase in areas designated and managed as wilderness areas. Q3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? R3) I did not find any parts of the proposed plan to be so objectionable as to suggest their removal. Suggestions for modification are covered under question 5 below. Q4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? R4) While there is still much of this river I have not experienced first hand, being able to paddle into Cave Springs was a highlight for me. In the balance between preserving the resource, and providing visitors with unique opportunities to experience this river, I hope that this spring and most similar attractions can remain open for un-guided visitation. Q5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? R5)a) Consider placing additional restrictions on the total number of rental boats allowed on each section of the river to reduce crowding on peak usage days. R5)b) Do not impose restrictions on the number of privately owned boats that use the river each day. It is our belief that private boaters are a sufficiently small percentage of the total river usage as to not require restrictions. R5)c) Make no changes in current alcohol restrictions, but enforce public intoxication laws. The current level of alcohol abuse is creating a public safety issue and an environment that makes it an unsuitable place to bring young children on summer weekends. Additional enforcement of laws on public intoxication and anti-litter laws should be used to send the message that the public as a whole is no longer willing tolerate the Current River becoming an "adults only outdoor party" each weekend. R5)d) Take steps to minimize the impacts of horseback and ATV riding in the park. The management plan should include steps to prevent development of unauthorized access points or uses, such as unauthorized four-wheeler trails. R5)e) Better management of human wastes is needed. We believe that there is already an unacceptable impact from poor practices in human waste disposal in the river watershed, with every gravel bar and every trail leading away from the river showing "toilet paper blooms" during the summer camping season. For over two decades now, several key Western rivers which require overnight permits have also required overnight visitors to "carry out" all human waste. These rules were not popular when first implemented, but have been very effective in reducing human impacts on these protected areas. While the Eastern environment is more tolerant of this environmental challenge, we also have fewer restrictions on the number of users who might camp overnight on summer weekends. We recommend that a similar "carry it out" policy be "phased in", perhaps by starting with a requirement that overnight groups larger than 6 people be required to have a system for carrying out human wastes. We do not believe that a "phased in" rule would require significant Park resources to implement. "Wag bag" systems contain the waste in bags that can be legally disposed of in any landfill system, while "container" type systems come with attachments and fittings that allow them to be emptied at any existing RV disposal station. Even if a "carry out" policy initially achieved low compliance levels, it would serve two purposes; first, whatever	9/1/2009	No	Arkansas Canoe Club	AR	72032

	<p>level of compliance was achieved would be a desirable reduction in the amount of human waste currently found on gravel bars, and secondly, awareness of the rules would have an educational impact, making people more aware of the need to use proper "cat hole" techniques, if only to avoid detection and fines for failure to use a "carry out" system. As a minimum, the current educational materials should be revised to educate the public and encourage the use of "carry out" systems on a voluntary basis, with "cat holes" being presented as the "second choice" system. R5)f) Retain or strengthen current motor horsepower restrictions, and phase in a requirement for four-stroke motors. High horsepower motors create significant safety issues due to operation of the craft in a relatively confined river channel which is shared with numerous slower craft, tubers, and swimmers. Older, "two-stroke" engines leave visible residue on the water and a notable smell in the air considerably after their passing. Additionally, most currently produced four-stroke motors are quieter than their two-stroke counterparts. For these reasons, we recommend requiring that after some future date only cleaner-burning "four stroke" motors should be allowed. Since current federal environment regulations are already restricting the sale of new small outboards to four-stroke motors, if such a rule change is announced well in advance and well publicized, it would likely impact only a minimal number of motorboat owners. R5)g) Implement science-based best management practices. The riparian environment will continue to evolve as a result of both man-made impacts and acts of nature. Management of some issues is often controversial and can elicit strong emotional responses and even political activism in those who hold strong opinions about causes and possible solutions for each problem presented. The strong public reactions to certain wildlife reintroduction problems, and strong opinions about controlled burns, are two examples that come to mind. The Management plan should be crafted to provide needed flexibility for dealing with these and other unforeseen issues in the future, and to the extent practical should point to the use of science-based methods for guiding those future decision-making processes. Again, we thank you for the opportunity to provide our input and thoughts at this planning stage, and stand ready to work with you in any capacity possible as the plan is further developed. In particular, we would be willing to meet with your staff at any time for focused discussions on any of the management issues mentioned above, or other issues of potential mutual interest. Sincerely, Debbie Doss Arkansas Canoe Club Conservation Chairperson</p>						
936	<p>1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? I believe that Alternative B best is the best overall plan for future management because it provides the most balanced approach. As to modifications, see response to question 5. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Alternative B proposes to include a mix of traditional recreational activities, such as floating, boating, and horseback riding. I feel strongly these should continue to be a major focus of the park experience. The natural resource management is also an important aspect of why this plan is preferred. I like that the natural resources would be maintained or restored to more pristine conditions, and that there would be some increase in wilderness areas. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? I did not find any parts of the proposed plan to be unacceptable. Suggestions for modification are covered under question 5 below. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? While there is still much of this river I have not experienced first hand, being able to paddle into Cave Springs was a highlight for me and my wife. I hope that this spring and most similar attractions can remain open for un-guided visitation. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Yes, I have several suggestions, as follows: Consider placing additional restrictions on the total number of rental boats allowed on each section of the river to reduce crowding on peak usage days. Do not impose restrictions on the number of privately owned boats that use the river each day. It is our belief that private boaters are a sufficiently small percentage of the total river usage as to not require restrictions. Make no changes in current alcohol restrictions, but enforce public intoxication laws. The current level of alcohol abuse is creating a public safety issue and an environment that makes it an unsuitable place to bring young children on summer weekends. Additional enforcement of laws on public intoxication and anti-litter laws should be used to send the message that the public as a whole is no longer willing tolerate the Current River becoming an "adults only outdoor party" each weekend. Take steps to minimize the impacts of horseback and ATV riding in the park. The management plan should include steps to prevent development of unauthorized access points or uses, such as unauthorized four-wheeler trails. Better management of human wastes is badly needed. Within 15 minutes of first arriving at the Current River, I stepped in a pile of human waste that had been buried under less than 1" of sand. I believe there is already an unacceptable impact from poor practices in human waste disposal in the river watershed, with every gravel bar and every trail leading away from the river showing "toilet paper blooms" during the summer camping season. For over two decades now, several key Western rivers which require overnight permits have also required overnight visitors to "carry out" all human waste. These rules were not popular when first implemented, but have been very effective in reducing human impacts on these protected areas. While the Eastern environment is more tolerant of this environmental challenge, we also have fewer restrictions on the number of users who might camp overnight on summer weekends. I recommend that a similar "carry it out" policy be "phased in", perhaps by starting with a requirement that overnight groups larger than 6 people be required to have a system for carrying out human wastes. I do not believe that a "phased in" rule would require significant Park resources to implement. "Wag bag" systems contain the waste in bags that can be legally disposed of in any landfill system, while "container" type systems come with attachments and fittings that allow them to be emptied at any existing RV disposal station. Even if a "carry out" policy initially achieved low compliance levels, it would serve two purposes; first, whatever level of compliance was achieved would be a desirable reduction in the amount of human waste currently found on gravel bars, and secondly, awareness of the rules would have an educational impact, making people more aware of the need to use proper "cat hole" techniques, if only to avoid detection and fines for failure to use a "carry out" system. As a minimum, the current educational materials should be revised to educate the public and encourage the use of "carry out" systems on a voluntary basis, with "cat holes" being presented as the "second choice"</p>	9/1/2009	No		Arkansas Canoe Club	AR	72032

	system. Retain or strengthen current motor horsepower restrictions, and phase in a requirement for four-stroke motors. High horsepower motors create significant safety issues due to operation of the craft in a relatively confined river channel which is shared with numerous slower craft, tubers, and swimmers. Older, "two-stroke" engines leave visible residue on the water and a notable smell in the air considerably after their passing. Additionally, most currently produced four-stroke motors are quieter than their two-stroke counterparts. For these reasons, we recommend requiring that after some future date only cleaner-burning "four stroke" motors should be allowed. Since current federal environment regulations are already restricting the sale of new small outboards to four-stroke motors, if such a rule change is announced well in advance and well publicized, it would likely impact only a minimal number of motorboat owners. Sincerely, H. C. Chadbourn						
937	A group of us went floating on the Current River at Van Buren over the July 4th weekend. Someone is going to get killed on that river by one of the motorized boats! We were in canoes and at times four or five motorzied boat would "zoom" by us and produced wakes that would have "flipped" us over if we had not turned our canoes so the wakes would not hit us broadside. This happened all day long. On many occasions a motorized boat would zig zag between people in inner tubes just missing some of them. Our group also noticed that the wakes produced by these boats were "washing out" the banks of the river. A "no wake" zone needs to be established on these small rivers. If these people want to joy ride at high speeds, let them go to a lake or much larger river, thus elminating erosion and possibly running over someone at high speeds. Many people were complaining about this siuation all along the river that day. I am sure many of us will find a safer place to go floating.	9/1/2009	No			MO	63701
938	Topic Question #1 - I choose the "No Action" Plan. These rivers have been here for hundreds of years and several generations have been raised on these streams. The people have used them as a source for food when raising their families. They also have been used as a water source for the same. They have provided, and still do, a great place for recreation. Not to mention how beautiful they are just to sit on the bank and watch the water. I also enjoy going to old home places, some of them even in my family. Lots of people have family graveyards to visit in the areas of the rivers. I feel that the people should have access to any area of the water-ways that they choose. Thank you.	9/1/2009	No			MO	65466
939	1.)-no-action with the modification that limits the number of tubers the concession owners can let on the river on weekends during the summer months. The number of tubers is extremely dangerous, and most certainly eliminates any chance of having a family experience because of the drinking activities that are rampant on the summer weekends. 2.) no-action 3.) any additional restrictions on boats,meaning we have enough already. 4.)Van Buren north. Not exactly. As stated above, a restrction on the amount of tubers must be considered on the summer weekends.5.) I keep mentioning the restriction on tuber amounts because it is a SERIOUS problem ! The only reason you dont't have more incident reports is because of the lack of on-site park personnel available to report them to. People simply " let it go " because of the hassle involved with trying to locate the limited amount of park service INFORCEMENT personnel available during the busiest part of the season (summer weekends). Other than this one serious issue, I believe the NPS has done a tremendous job, with it's limited resources in this area. I personally have enjoyed all areas of the Current and Jacks Fork for over 35 years. There's not a place in the world I would rather be, except on summer weekends...please, please, please take our considerations to heart. These rivers are our refuge and often times the only one we have.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63901
940	1) No-action should be taken. 5) Reduce the number of tubers on weekends during the summer months. Congestion is a major issue.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63945
941	Action A to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative A fits closest to my ideal for the ONSR General Management Plan, but along with that horsepower limits should be lowered to what a traditional johnboat needs, which is around 10 hp. Stop shrugging and ignoring infractions of existing regulations. The National Park Service at Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to first and foremost remember for whom they work: the nation. The park has slowly been degraded over the past 45 years by allowing the expansion of illegal roads, trails and access points to the rivers. Unlawful gravel mining in nearby tributaries, off-road ATV use and overuse of horseback trails near and in river crossings (which elevate fecal coliform counts beyond limits for human contact) should be fixed immediately. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations should be a top priority. The recent two million dollars in federal stimulus money should have gone to fix this problem. This has been sending the wrong message to those violators for decades. Pollution from commercial horse operations, mining, and agricultural runoff must be stopped. The Ozark Hellbender, a unique Ozark salamander which acts as "the canary in the coal mine," is on the endangered species list from water quality degradation. This is due to overuse and abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers by too many special interest groups that did not exist when the park was established in 1964. The encroachment from larger power and jet boats buzzing up and down the river, numerous man-made cut bank erosion areas and illegal off-road use of ATVs are causing stream bottom disturbance and siltation. Horseback trails close to and in the rivers as well as the associated horse barns next to the river that have expanded to hold upwards of 3,000 horses are creating non-point and point source pollution during heavy rain. Closing and removing illicit roads, trails, campgrounds and access points would lower the number of hours needed for park cleaning, maintenance and patrols. This, in turn, becomes cost effective for the NPS and us taxpayers. I was disappointed to see the residential development in the Big Spring area, spoiling the wilderness experience and affecting aquatic life and plants. Strengthen NPS against future development, e.g. Big Spring Area needs to be designated a Wilderness Area.	9/2/2009	No			MO	64064
942	1. No Action Plan/// The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs 5. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - Stop seeing park works driving around in four door vehicles (truck and SUV), when there is only one person in them. Which is all the time.. It might save on gas and money for the NPS. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas. - My great grand father was ran off of this land. Know I feel that I am.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63638

943	1. No-Action	9/2/2009	No			MO	63965
944	1. No Action Plan/// The park is a recreation area for people to use... Better Road. Also this is an area that people can do something that they can afford. Limiting the area to use is going to hurt the area economy. I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. All of the area 5. - Help people to use the area, not stop people from using the area. - Better roads. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - Keep 40 - 60 hp motors on the upper part of the river.. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - Stop seeing park works driving around in four door vehicles, when there is only one person in them. Which is all the time.. It might save on gas and money for the NPS. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63638
945	1. No Action Plan/// Help people to use the area. The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs 5. - Open up more fishing spots. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63638
946	i have been going to Current River since I was a child. The Logyard has been a part of all of Reynolds County residents lives forever. We take pride in our river and hold it dear to our hearts. We request that The Park Service leave our river ALONE! TAKE NO ACTION!	9/2/2009	No			MO	63638
947	Topic Question 1. I would prefer no action. Topic Question 2. In alternative B I would like to see more trails and more interpretive ranger programs. And I think that at the big springs the lodge should be developed as a nature center. Most of the commercial things that have been in there have been disasters. And I doubt that the people who get the contracts have taken care of the buildings. Topic Question 3. Forget the roads. There are historical accounts of roads all over the Ozarks. I think that you all spend to much time grousing over the roads with the locals. NO NEW ROADS should be allowed, unless absolutely necessary. However I think the road business is just a way to not bother with what you need to do. I also question that the big spring area needs actual wilderness designation. It is already managed well in that respect. Topic Question 4. Alley Mill, Has the most visitors and still has not got an actual visitors center. Also if there is a really bad flood the cutoff at alley will wash the one room school away. Question 5. I really think that you all can do something more about the lewd behavior of the visitors. ONE THING THAT WOULD HELP WOULD BE GET OUT OF THE BUSHES AND GIVE SOME TIME ON THE RIVER. I have canoed on the Jacks Fork river for 30 years. I have seen one ranger one time and that was last summer with the checking for glass in the boats and canoes at the put in. And I don't think that was a law enforcement. I guarantee you that visibility on the river will run lots of those folks off. I go the the buffalo and I see guided river tours I see rangers everywhere. I understand that since most of the land was taken by imminent domain that the Park can actually make most of its own rules. Just tell people they can't drink It would solve the problem.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63901
948	1. No-Action. Please know that our rivers do not now nor have they ever needed to be saved. We live here and we work hard at keeping our rivers beautiful and trash free. Feel free to come and visit but if you don't live here, then don't presume to tell us how to live here.	9/2/2009	No			MO	63638
949	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs 5. - Keep people on the river, not run them off... - I feel that city people cant take care of their land so they want to tell us how to take care of ours. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - Stop seeing park works driving around in four door vehicles (trucks and SUZ's), when there is only one person in them. Which is all the time.. It might save on gas and money for the NPS. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas. - My great grand father was ran off of this land. Know I feel that I am. -	9/3/2009	No			MO	63638
950	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. Can't see how jet boats can cause a problem with erosion. When the river gets up causes more erosion than any thing. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs. Yes they keep me from being able to use the river. 5. - This is going to hurt the economy in the local towns in the surrounding areas. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - Stop seeing park works driving around in four door vehicles, when there is only one person in them. Which is all the time.. It might save on gas and money for the NPS. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas. - My great grand father was ran off of this land. Know I feel that I am.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63638
951	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs 5. - I live 5 miles from the river, and it is part of my culture and home I would hate to lose it. - This is a recreation area, why are we losing our rights of using the area. Once again the government is bullying their way around, like they did in the 60's. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas. - My great grand father was ran off of this land. Know I feel that I am.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63638

952	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use... I hate to lose my wright to use the land. I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40 - 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs 5. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - Stop seeing park works driving around in four door vehicles, when there is only one person in them. Which is all the time.. It might save on gas and money for the NPS. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63638
953	1. No Action Plan ... Help people use the river. The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40 - 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative a b c 4. All of it.. 5. - Take care of the roads better.. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63624
954	Along with a number of friends, I frequently ride the horse trails in this area. We ride in Eminence and near Jadwin, MO. I would hate to see changes in the current trail system that would inhibit our riding. This is a wonderful family activity and we are responsible when riding. What we bring in, we take out, but I know this does not always occur. Limiting the use of 4-wheelers would help preserve the trails. We also encourage water crossings to be at designated areas, without lingering in the water or running up and down the banks. The current management system could use mroe enforcement but overall I believe the system is good.	9/3/2009	No			MO	65789
955	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40 - 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely... 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. All Area 5. - The park brings in a lot of money for surrounds town. With some of these alternatives, this will hurt the towns. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - Open the park areas up more - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas. - More camping sights.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63624
956	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. Log yard to Round springs 5. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63624
957	1. No Action Plan The park is a recreation area for people to use. I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. All areas 5. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation ares. - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63624
958	1. No Action Plan The park should be a open park, which is what it was set up for. I understand that you need to have rules but, the way it sounds the NPS is trying to shut the park down from some many recreation. The park is a recreation area for people to use... I also feel that the horse power should stay the same at 40- 60 horse power so I can get my family up and down the river safely.. 2. No action 3. Alternative A B C 4. All areas 5. - Open up more roads so I can get to my favor recreation area and fishing spots. - Better boat ramps. - No charge to go camping in areas. That is what taxes is for. - The NPS stop trying to run people off the river... - More trash cans in camp areas.	9/3/2009	No			MT	59107
959	1. No Action 2. No Action 3. 4. 5. Less tubers on weekends	9/3/2009	No			MO	63901
960	I am highly concerned as to the overuse of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in certain areas, including Jack Forks and Current Rivers. Garbage and loss of habitat is occuring at alarming rates. Please include a plan for assistance to preserve these vital natural spaces.	9/3/2009	No		audubon	MO	65807
961	1. My favorite alternative is A, but I realize that there will likely be a compromise with other interests, especially those tied to economic and business issues. The no-action plan is very insufficient to deal with some of the serious issues of environmental degradation. I can't quite connect with alternative C - it is hard to tell what some of it actually would mean. I like the idea of establishing a wilderness/roadless area. 2. I strongly support limitations on motorized vessels and the amount of equestrian use of National Riverways land. Both of these add to the pollution of the NR environment as well as subtract from the "natural" experience. To the extent possible, limits also need to be promoted on the "total human load" placed upon the environment. 3. I do not support expanding access to motorized vessels or any increase in horsepower. 4. Upper reaches of the rivers are especially vulnerable and deserve special protection. 5. Hellbenders are especially at-risk and deserve special consideration and protection in policy setting. Encroachment on the boundaries of the National Scenic Riverways by development needs to be opposed.	9/3/2009	No		Southwest Missouri Fly Fishers	MO	65807-0988
962	To Superintendent Reed Detring: The opportunity to share my opinions with this national institution is one I greatly appreciate. I deeply respect the work, history and continuing role of conservation that the National Parks Service offers. Though I'm sure many associate the NPS with wonders like the Grand Canyon, Yosemite and Yellowstone and other majestic places, I take pride in knowing that the NPS provides preservation to public lands here in my own backyard, like Wilson's Creek National Battlefield, the Eleven Point Wild and Scenic River, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Unfortunately, this latter site, ONSR, faces a problem similar to the grand giants of the parks system – being loved to death. I will be honest – the ONSR is still a mystery to me. I have only recently begun to venture into the cool waters of the Current, and it has been years since I have floated the Jack's Fork. But it is this mystery of the wild, the wonder of nature, that calls me back for further investigation, and I hope that as I further explore the length of the rivers and their surroundings, their natural beauty will be not just sustained but improved. That is why I believe Alternative A is the best course of action of the NPS to take with the future management of ONSR. My home water, the Niangua River, flows	9/4/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65804

	through several counties not more than an hour or so from the ONSR. In many ways, it is a very different place than ONSR, albeit just a few counties over; however, it also suffers from similar problems. In my short time, I have seen the continued deterioration of its qualities through the disrespects of overuse. On a recent float with my father, we pulled out with a canoe full of trash in our own effort to help beautify what could be so much more. I want everyone to be able to enjoy this river and the other rivers of our state, including the ONSR, but that is hard to guarantee with overcrowding and overuse. With unbridled access via illegal roads and an excess of commercial horse trail-riding, this problem could also further degrade the ONSR. Restoring illegally developed roads and accesses would reduce these effects. Nature will respond to these protections, and what was once overrun by those with little respect will heal with new growth. In addition to the Sierra Club, I am also a member of Trout Unlimited. In addition to the beautiful scenery, ONSR is also a terrific fishery. As an angler, I am aware that the overuse and misuse of the rivers has a negative impact on trout, smallmouth and other aquatic inhabitants. Reducing illegal accesses and limiting commercial trail rides will also benefit the fishery and the waters that provide it life by preventing soil runoff and E. coli contamination. Furthermore, the peace and solitude of these rivers must be protected by reducing the disruption caused by motorized boats by limiting their use and power. For those who use them, I know it is a matter of convenience. But when it encroaches on the enjoyment of others who pursue the virtues of nature, something must be done. I also strongly believe that the backcountry area at Big Spring should be declared a Wilderness Area. It is ripe for designation, and an area as pristine as this needs the sort of protection that the designation provides. I myself have not visited it yet, but when I do, I hope to find it in such an unspoiled state. With a general management plan for the next generation of the ONSR as outlined in Alternative A, we can leave the ONSR better than we found it. It is that same ethic I live by when I visit any natural setting, and I hope the NPS will do continue to do the same. Thank you. Aaron Scott Springfield, Mo.						
963	Dear Superintendent Detring, Thank you for taking the time to gather comments and carefully consider how the National Park Service's General Management Plan can best balance access and protection. The Jack's Fork and Current River, as well as the surrounding hills, springs and caves, are truly special places worthy of our protection. Our connection to these great places starts with the opportunity to experience them, and a variety of recreational opportunities invites broader use and a deeper connection on the part of the general public. However, at some point the type or quantity of use degrades the experience to the point where it is lost. I am a motorboat enthusiast, and have spent many wonderful hours fishing the Gasconade River from a motorized boat, but I feel strongly that the limitations in Option A are most appropriate for the Jack's Fork and Current. 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Yes. A. I would like to see better hiking trails with more informational signage. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Option A's horsepower restrictions and the closure of illegally constructed roads. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Motorized activity on the Jack's Fork as proposed in Option C. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? I would like to maintain public access to the spring water's for swimming as often as is practical given safety concerns. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Provide clearly marked, but very limited access for motorized vehicles. Not everyone can hike or canoe. I would fully support upgrades in the developed zones, and improved/expanded hiking, biking and horseback trails. I would support limited strategic clearings to create views of the rivers from high points along the trails, and additional trail signs with natural and historical information – but most importantly, information regarding location and distance to other interesting points along the trail. I would highly recommend the same kind of signage along the rivers as well, with obvious information stations that give location on the river and estimated times to points down river. Impact on water quality needs to be weighed heavily as new trails are developed and old rails improved. Not all trails may be open to horseback or bike use for instance, and the clearings that create views may not necessarily be designed to give big panoramas, but rather a glimpse of the river and surrounding hills. And last, but not least, please continue your efforts to control rowdy behavior on the rivers! My thanks to the National Park Service for their dedication to this unique and beautiful piece of Missouri. My family and I had a wonderful float on a Thursday in early August. It was not too crowded and there was no offensive behavior. All 3 of my kids agreed that we "have to come back next year." Matt Gaunt Columbia, MO	9/4/2009	No		Conservation Federation of Missouri	MO	65203
964	1) I am not intimately familiar with each of the sections of the riverway. I lived in Van Buren for 3 years and used the lower Current regularly. It seemed to me that individual users could find what they were looking for (developed vs. primitive) on their own, based upon available access, without regulatory restrictions creating it for them. Recreational use should only be restricted as much as necessary to protect the integrity of the riverway system. I do not know enough about the details to know how current and future projected use may negatively impact the system. Alternative B seems to be the most reasonable of the alternatives offered, providing both protection of this valuable state and national resource while still providing reasonable access to the people that enjoy it for recreating and depend upon it for their livelihoods, with one exception. I do not think it is necessary to seek wilderness desginations. Wilderness designation is too restrictive with regards to potential future management options that may be required/desired. Other forms of use restriction to duplicate the intent of a wilderness area could be created and enforced without this needlessly restrictive congressional designation.	9/4/2009	No		NWTF	MO	65077
965	We support Alternative A	9/4/2009	No		Stream Team 2991	MO	63015

966	1. No-Action I wish I was brilliant enough to comment in the form you want me to. I am a retired person who has been coming to the river for 35 years. We purchased a home here five years ago, on the river in Van Buren. I love to tube with my family when they visit, and I love to take our boat 60/40 up river and down to explore. I used to love to canoe the upper Current but no longer enjoy that. The trail riders brought horse flies that will eat you alive, so I stay away from there. But they deserve to enjoy their hobby also. The main thing I have noticed in these 35 years is the change in the behavior of the people! We used to enjoy the drinking and floating but it was done in moderation and we had civility about us. We were considered the fun people but knew how to conduct ourselves around children and other people enjoying the river. Today the floaters just seem to be "out of control". They don't have any idea how to conduct themselves in a civilized manner. And they don't care one bit if they disturb others. I spend many hours sitting beside the river and the things I hear are disgusting and sad. And I AM NOT A PRUDE! I even hear people using REALLY filthy language on their own children, screaming at them. If you say ANYTHING about maybe holding it down a little around the poor kids, you get attacked! I don't know what the park system can do about this. It's certainly a cultural thing, and a sign of the times. There are TOO MANY TUBERS. We use our boat to get above or below the tubers. Unfortunately you have to go through them to get away from them. Limit amount of tubers, not change limits on motors on boats. The boats save the tubers and are polite. Thank you for listening and I'm sorry I didn't follow the form. Good Luck I know it's hard. If you eliminate our boat we waited all our live to afford, we will have to move on to somewhere else because the river will just be left to the obnoxious young people, not smart enough to realize the boat has to plane to be able to get by them. And they cuss us and flip the bird. Not a very sociable expression of their opininions.	9/4/2009	No			MO	63965
967	Dear Superintendant, I am writing to advocate for maximum protection of natural resources from human disturbances under the management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I am also in favor of restoring the river area where damage that has occurred in recent years due to overuse by people, horses and ATVs. My family and I are big fans of the outdoors and have enjoyed many trips to the Ozarks. What makes them special to me is the pristine condition of the rivers here. As a kid growing up in Maryland, I never knew a stream could run crystal clear. So moving to Missouri and seeing the Ozark streams has been a revelation to me. There are several important points that the plan should address: -elimination of illegal roads -elimination of illegal wildcat access to rivers -controlling number of commercial trail rides -eliminate motorized boats! -add pocket of wilderness by Big Spring to management area Please turn back the tide of destruction for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. People can enjoy these rivers without destroying them and it is your responsibility to ensure that can happen. Sincerely, Nicole Blumner St. Louis	9/4/2009	No			MO	63112
968	1. Alt A is close to my idea of how the Ozark Rlver system should be managed. 2. All motorized vehicles limited to official roads only. No ATV's should be allowed. No motorized boats in the rivers. 3. No additional development of recreational buildings and facilities. (ALT C). The area needs to be retained in its somewhat pristine state for future generations and to protect the water resources. 4. The Current River is noted for its caves. These need to be protected from public access. I feel that we need to respect the privacy and rights of private property owners along the rivers who should not be disturbed by NOISE from motors and people. 5. We need to be sure that there are enough enforcement officers to patrol the riverways. At this point, I do not feel safe visiting the Current River. I spent time as a child on the river, and I have very happy memories of its serenity and beauty. We need to take care of the rivers and its visitors. PLease note, the banning of ATVs should extend to all of the National Forests, not just Park areas.	9/5/2009	No			MO	63011
969	I would like the Park Service at Pzaarl Matopma; Scemoc Riverways to remember for whom they work, and protect the Current River as originally prescribed.	9/5/2009	No		OWWC	KS	66604
970	1) My wife and I STRONGLY support alternative A, the option that would protect 51% of this national park from speed boats, ATV's, horse trails (and horse manure, etc. 2) Keeping speed boats, ATV's, and horses OFF the areas and trails used by people for hiking and boating! 3) ALL the alternatives in A SHOULD BE INCLUDED! 4) We have no special areas, the whole 134 miles are special! 5) Large rowdy, drinking, groups should not be allowed to canoe or camp on the beaches of the river. Thank you for allowing us to comment!	9/6/2009	No			MO	65203
971	1. Alternate A is close to how we should manage the Ozark River System. 2. Keep all motorized vehicles on official roads only. Off-road vehicles of any kind should not be allowed in streams, woods, or any trails. 3. Do not build more recreational buildings or facilities. This is from Alt C. The purpose of the areas are to visit wild areas that are as pristine as possible. This will protect them for people now and all future generations. 4. The caves on the Current River are well known. They need to be protected from public access. Protect the rights/privacy of private property owner who live or have land along the rivers. Motor noise and loud people are rude and unwelcome. 5. a) Ensure that we hire enough law enforcement officers to patrol the riverways. I have floated the Current river in the past, but am now concerned for my and my family's safety when visiting the area. b) Ban all ATVs from All national parks. c) What is taken in, must be taken out rule should apply. d) Police and remove drug offenders in the River System and national forests. d) Bottom line: protect the wild and pristine nature of the rivers, while protecting the people who do visit. Thanks for listening.	9/6/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	63011
972	1) Alternative A and parts of B are close to what I would like to see. Missouri has many miles of floatable rivers and only one National Park. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways are a place of pride for all of us in Missouri. We all know examples of National Parks that have become so overused for recreation they no longer are the special wild places they once were. Yosemite NP is an example. Those who are interested mostly in recreation and not in preserving our national heritage should find other stretches of the many rivers outside the park for their activities. 2) Restrictions on motorized water craft, other than low-use season johnboats should be a first priority. Other uses that harm wildlife habitat or vegetation in the riparian corridor should be restricted. The ranger led programs in option A and parts of B would be welcome. I agree with repairing signs of overuse and closing illegal roads. 3) No part of Alternative C seems necessary to me. Missourians who want hunter education or other activities mentioned have many choices among Missouri State Parks and Conservation Areas for these activities. Parts of Alternative B that	9/6/2009	No		Meramec Hills Master Naturalist & Stream Team	MO	65401

	include motorized water craft, especially wave runners, should not be included. I am not sure about horseback riding, but I am part of a stream team on the Big Piney River and have seen the damage to stream banks done by horses and cattle. Again, there are many other public parks for these activities. 4) All of the 134 miles are important to me. I believe both the No-Action Alternative and Alternative C change the character of the park in a way that is damaging to the natural and cultural heritage. 5) The framers of these plans have done an excellent job suggesting management practices and visitor experiences that will keep the park special for all Americans as a National Park. I might add that the Stream Team program should be enlisted to help with restoration efforts.					
973	1. No-Action. Leave as is. 2. No-Action. 3. A, B, and C 4. Mostly Jacks Fork river. Yes. 5. I think there should be no further restrictions. We already are limited to our use of the rivers we grew up on or around and alternatives A, B, and C will limit the use even more. Preserving and protecting keeps us from enjoying what was already ours to enjoy. I totally support the No-Action alternative. Also, I am joining the Voice of the Ozarks tomorrow, my check and membership form will be in the mail. Thank you.	9/6/2009	No		MO	65466
974	I would lean more toward "no action" but the 3400 acres might be considered as wilderness as part of the "no action" plan. Better roads to some of the access points would be good too. Another thing to consider would be more river patrol especially on weekends. It becomes very crowded with lewd, obnoxious, foul-mouth drunks. You can't take a family on the river most summer weekends.	9/7/2009	No		MO	65791
975	Although not currently residing there, my family owns approximately 360 acres along the Current River in Ripley County. During the 1970's, we enjoyed a number of years living, learning and working the land along the river. Clean and quiet, only local john boats and floater canoes were seen on the river. We felt privileged to enjoy, and committed to protect, this natural wonderland. We can honestly say that the time spent on the river greatly influenced the persons we are today. We can only hope that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will have the same opportunities. It is imperative that we act quickly and effectively to protect and restore healthy conditions along the ONSR. After reviewing the preliminary alternatives, we are responding to the questions in the following ways: 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? ANSWER: Alternative A. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? ANSWER: Regardless of management decisions, more staff is needed. We believe that park rangers are in a difficult position to both protect the environment and enforce violators. Increasing their numbers would empower them. As tax payers, we gladly vote to increase funding. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? ANSWER: Mechanized activities (high power motorboats, ATV's) and large horseback riding parties should not be permitted on the rivers. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? ANSWER: Illegal roadways, building, etc. Wilderness designation. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? ANSWER: Until conditions are restored, the following should be considered: On the upper portion of the Current River, only canoeing should be allowed and possibly limited in number by permit only. On the lower portion of the Current River, motorboats should be limited to twenty horsepower or less. Permits might also be required. Revenue from permits can be used to support efforts. For all areas of the riverways, guidelines should be established regarding acceptable behaviors and forbidding those which are lewd. Noise restrictions should be put into place. Violators should be subject to fines. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Stephen and Diana Estep St. Louis, Missouri	9/7/2009	No		MO	63132
976	1 No-Action There is no reason to change the way the National Scenic Riverways in the Ozarks are used today. Nothing in this area has changed that much over the decades to require the proposed changes. The NPS needs to respect the rights of the local people to use this recreational land as they have been using it for many generations. If population pressures from those coming from large cities on the weekends to float these rivers and ride these trails become a problem the locals themselves can best suggest how the government can manage it. The Ozark NSR area needs to be protected by the Federal government from large scale commercial development but the Federal Government profile here should be minimal. People live here and come here to enjoy these beautiful recreational lands and we simply do not need government pushed by environmentalists that have never lived here and have no intention of living here trying to limit, compartmentalize, and restrict the traditional recreational use of these river lands. We also do not need to make the rivers an unusual target of police enforcement actions. When those that are pushing all this police action on the rivers learn how to clean up major crime in their own cities the rural people of the Ozarks might be more inclined to accept more aggressive enforcement of minor infractions on the rivers.	9/7/2009	No		MO	65479
977	1. Give the land back to the people. If you won't do that at least give it back to the state...If not the NO ACTION!! 2. There should be NO ACTION taken...Leave it as is!! 3. Leave as is....NO ACTION!! 4. Leave as is..NO ACTION!!	9/7/2009	No		MO	65588
978	1. Give the land back to the people. If you won't do that at least give it back to the state...If not the NO ACTION!! 2. There should be NO ACTION taken...Leave it as is!! 3. Leave as is....NO ACTION!! 4. Leave as is..NO ACTION!! IF THE PEOPLE FROM ST LOUIS, COLUMBIA, ETC. FEEL THE NEED TO KEEP A RIVER CLEAR AND NEED TO BE INVOLVED IN SOMETHING, LET THEM CLEAN THEIR OWN RIVERS!! OUR FAMILIES AND GRANDPARENTS, AND GREAT GRANDPARENTS HAVE TAKEN CARE OF OUR FOR YEARS... ALL THE PEOPLE THAT COME INTO OUR AREA ARE MOST OF THE PROBLEM...THEY FLOAT AND DRINK AND THEN GET OUT AND PEE AND OTHER THINGS IN THE WATER AND THINK IT IS FUNNY. I HAD TO GET MY GRANDCHILDREN OUT OF THE WATER THIS SUMMER WHEN A LARGE GROUP CAME THRU AND THOUGHT IT WAS REALLY FUNNY TO ALL GET OUT AND AS THEY CALLED IT "A PISS BREAK!!!(STAY AT YOUR OWN RIVERS AND POLLUTE IT!! OR BETTER YET, START YOUR OWN RIVER MANAGEMENT IN YOUR OWN LOCATION AND	9/7/2009	No		MO	65588

	LEAVE US AND OUR BEAUTIFUL RIVERS ALONE!! THEY BELONG TO US AND TO OUR CHILDREN. YOU HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THEM!! JUST BECAUSE WE HAVE TAKEN CARE OF THEM FOR GENERATIONS AND THEY ARE STILL CLEAN AND BEAUTIFUL, YOU THINK YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO TAKE THEM!!!!!!!!!! STOP IT AND STOP IT NOW. WE ARE SICK OF YOU!! STAY HOME IF YOU DON'T LIKE THE BOATS AND OUR WAY OF LIFE. THERE ARE PLENTY OF OTHER PLACES FOR YOU TO GO. GAIL BLAND						
979	1. Give the land back to the people. If you won't do that at least give it back to the state...If not the NO ACTION!! 2. There should be NO ACTION taken...Leave it as is!! 3. Leave as is....NO ACTION!! 4. Leave as is..NO ACTION!! IF THE PEOPLE FROM ST LOUIS, COLUMBIA, ETC. FEEL THE NEED TO KEEP A RIVER CLEAR AND NEED TO BE INVOLVED IN SOMETHING, LET THEM CLEAN THEIR OWN RIVERS!! OUR FAMILIES AND GRANDPARENTS, AND GREAT GRANDPARENTS HAVE TAKEN CARE OF OUR FOR YEARS... ALL THE PEOPLE THAT COME INTO OUR AREA ARE MOST OF THE PROBLEM...THEY FLOAT AND DRINK AND THEN GET OUT AND PEE AND OTHER THINGS IN THE WATER AND THINK IT IS FUNNY. I HAD TO GET MY GRANDCHILDREN OUT OF THE WATER THIS SUMMER WHEN A LARGE GROUP CAME THRU AND THOUGHT IT WAS REALLY FUNNY TO ALL GET OUT AND AS THEY CALLED IT "A PISS BREAK!!!(STAY AT YOUR OWN RIVERS AND POLLUTE IT!! OR BETTER YET, START YOUR OWN RIVER MANAGEMENT IN YOUR OWN LOCATION AND LEAVE US AND OUR BEAUTIFUL RIVERS ALONE!! THEY BELONG TO US AND TO OUR CHILDREN. YOU HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THEM!! JUST BECAUSE WE HAVE TAKEN CARE OF THEM FOR GENERATIONS AND THEY ARE STILL CLEAN AND BEAUTIFUL, YOU THINK YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO TAKE THEM!!!!!!!!!! STOP IT AND STOP IT NOW. WE ARE SICK OF YOU!! STAY HOME IF YOU DON'T LIKE THE BOATS AND OUR WAY OF LIFE. THERE ARE PLENTY OF OTHER PLACES FOR YOU TO GO. GAIL BLAND	9/7/2009	No			MO	65588
980	1. More of the upper Current (north segment) should be designated as primitive along the river, but Alternative A is closest to what I envision. I would like to see river use highly restricted from Montauk to Cedar Grove - fewer canoes and no alcohol permitted. Even up to about 5 years ago, I could put in at Baptist during the week and canoe for two hours at a time in solitude and see birds, mammals, fish, turtles... It pains me to see the area degraded. 2. I endorse management zones because they accommodate different users' interests. 3. I dislike any motorize boats on a scenic or protected river but recognize it is part of the heritage/culture on the lower river. 4. I no longer go to Alley Spring or Emminence to avoid drunks yelling, urinating, blasting music and beating oars on the sides of the canoes. I am not a prude, I just feel sorry for families with young children. Now the problem has spilled further upstream. Pulltite is a mess and that was my favorite, more rustic place to camp. I left this year in tears to find a private campground that does not tolerate the noise and drunkenness. While on the river this year, college kids were falling down drunk, yelling and peeing in the middle of the river by the time I got to Cedar Grove around noon, on a Thursday. 5. - I am willing to pay a user fee (for example \$20) to have the right to canoe through a more quiet, pristine area from Montauk/Baptist to Cedar Grove. - From Cedar Grove to Akers (or Pulltite), create a no alcohol and family friendly zone. Only a few miles of river. For families. - NPS visibility would help. - Perhaps volunteer hosts could monitor/patrol and radio for help in extreme cases. No one is around to pull drunks off the river. Safety is a huge problem for the drunks as well as the rest of us. - Reduce the number of canoes on the river before it's too late to reclaim the natural state. I first came down to the Current River from central Illinois 30 years ago. This year my experience was so horrible, I am not sure that I will ever return. I am most hopeful that new leadership and a management plan will help. Robin Walker	9/7/2009	No			MO	65203
981	1)- I would like to see the NPS adopt the "No Action" alternative. I feel the Big Springs area should be included for "Wilderness Designation." 2)- Alternative plans should include the idea of presenting information concerning special areas,sites,and local history and culture available to individuals to learn and experience on their own. Don't feel the presence of more commercial operators or NPS personell are needed for this type of proposed activity.Srongly feel that new or proposed trails and roads are not needed within the park. There seems to be enough roads now, but I feel current roads,trails and access points should be left open and not closed. 3)-Do not care for Alternative A and its proposals. Recall of earlier days and events would mean more commercial operators and NPS personell on the river.In fact seems ironic to suggest and earlier time and historical remembrance of the river and its culture.That experience only occured be fore the parks creation and the layers of bueracracy that came along.It would be hard to imagine a simulated/re-created log drive! Agreeably control and restriciton needed to take place to protect the area and its unique experience from commercial explotation,but I feel living history re-enactments and displays,exhibits along the river would take away from the wilderness experience. 4)-I have personally floated sections of the Current from Cedar Grove to Powder Mill and the Jacks Fork from Hwy 17 to Two Rivers many times throughout the last 25 years.All of the river is special and brings memories of the past to mind.I have seen the increased public use of the river occur mostly in the last 8-10 years.I usually float the middle of the week with plans of being off the river by Saturday. Horse usaage has seemed to increase as of lately and my personal experience with jetboats has never been a problem either while floating. Rowdy behavior has been seen more on the Upper Current above Akers and below Alley Spring on the Jacks Fork but that occured mainly when I had a Saturday float planned. Most of my jetboat experience has mostly been below the Two Rivers area. 5)-Strategies and approaches to management should be the continuation of already implemented rules such as no loud/lewd behavior, restriction of glass, jello shots,beads,bongs,boom boxes,and nudity.Feel that NPS personell and MWP should have more of a visible presence at put-in,take-outs,and access points instead of being secluded or hidden along the river.Believe that the number of horses have increased so the effect of "Horse" polution, especially run-off at camps and corrals/arenas should be monitored.I feel that no new roads or trails should be developed within the parks. The present roads and access points should not be blocked,restricted,or eliminated as they allow the local area citizens to enjoy the river long after the summer crowds have left. I also feel that further restrictions on motorboat horsepower limits are already adequate and no change of horsepower limitaions or area of use is needed as of now above Two Rivers on the Current and below Alley Spring on the Jacks Fork.I t appears to me that the majority of motorboats are used mainly by local citizens and not to visitors that come to the Riverways and further restricting horsepower would not eliminate useage. Perhaps a means of limiting numbers of boats allowed to put in at designated access only would be an answer to controlling boats numbers if their presence presents a valid problem.Futher access for the public shouldn't be considered due to an increase of traffic. The area doesn't need to be more easily	9/7/2009	No			IL	62040

	<p>accessibly to allow for more saturation of visitors. Instead of improving public access by creating more area, exisiting area should be improved such as campsites,showerhouses,and toilets.Group camps could be improved buy providing electricity and a small percentage of indiviual campsites could have electric availalble.There seems to be plenty of NPS and private campgrounds available, but NPS needs to improve their exisiting facilities,not create futher camps,trail,boat ramps, and public access areas. In closing there seems to be no easy answer or fix to balancing the wilderness experience, more access, boating , horseback,managing wildlife,and protecting the environment. I can forsee a restiction of numbers, whether it is people,boats, horses or canoes, especially on weekends if public use continues to increase.The NPS has done a good job of protecting the Riverways since its inception so that it has become more popular through the NPS control, but more restricitons and limitations is not neccessary, especially on a full-time, year around basis.Private landowners, local citizens, and surrounding communities are also important assets to the Riverways and its experience to those who visit the area and impact that visitor as to whether they return to the Riverways area or not.Please consider all the surrounding area business and communtiys to be included in the decision making process which affect the Riverways long after the visitors leave.</p>						
982	1. No-Action	9/7/2009	No			MO	63638
983	I feel things are just fine the way they are. It is a beautiful and peaceful area and should be left along for this generation and future generations to enjoy.	9/8/2009	No			TX	77465
984	I think that the no change option is the best for now. The changes that have been implemented over the years to improve access to the river, has been necessary to allow more people to enjoy the beauty and other resources of the Current-Jacks Fork, but as a lifetime resident of Carter County, I have seen both the way it was and the way it is. Everyone who goes to the river enjoys it is their own way. I don't want to be kept from enjoying my river the way I do now. The river seems to be surviving very well the way things are right now.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63937
985	1) No Action. I have visited the Current River many times and have always found it to be beautiful and pristine. The local people take very good care of the river and it's surrounding areas. 2) No Action. All citizens should be able to use the riverways, one group wants to limit the use of other groups.....that's just not FAIR! 3) Alternative A, B or C should not even be considered. It restricts the use of the riverways to the citizens. 4) The areas I have concerns about are the areas within the city limits of Eminence and Van Buren. Partying within those areas is out of control, tubes are bank to bank in some areas. Tubes & rafts should be limited. 5) Keep the rivers and the banks along it clean but allow all citizens use the river. No limit any particular group.	9/8/2009	No			AZ	85204
986	Dear Superintendent: I'm writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated through Audubon Missouri and partners to identify, monitor and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate recreation. Please support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternatives B and C are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this area. It is imperative the National Park Service carefully manage access, enforce easements and regulations, prevent unauthorized building construction and forest clearing, and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area through annual budgeted funding. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that by existing National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes are to be preserved in an unimpaired condition; unimpaired. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close illegal and unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers and close unauthorized boat access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. We request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. We recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. Designating a Big Spring Wilderness area is an important opportunity to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. We urge you to support wilderness protection for the Big Springs tract. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude—integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Mike Stoakes	9/8/2009	No			MO	64063
987	1) No Action. The local people along with the ONSR take very good care of the river and it's surrounding areas. Our river is beautiful! We keep it that way! 2) No Action. All citizens should be able to use the riverways, one group wants to limit the use of other groups, that should not be allowed to happen 3) Alternative A, B or C should not even be considered. It restricts the use of the riverways to the citizens. 4) None. 5) Keep the rivers and the banks along it clean but allow all citizens use the river. The river is beautiful and pristine. That's because it's been well taken care of, so what's wrong with the way things are? Nothing!	9/8/2009	No			MO	63638
988	1) I believe that no action should be taken with the management of the ONSR. 4) I am very concerned with more restrictions being applied when the current ones are not fully enforced. There are a few people from every user group that will abuse where ever they are, including the ONSR. Catch those abusers and fine them.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63116

989	Question 1 - No Action. Modify No Action by increasing environmental awareness of the users of the ONSR, providing more trash receptacles, and increase the visibility of NPS officers in areas of high floater/boater traffic. Question 3 - Any further horsepower restrictions and the closing of roads and access points. Question 4 - Almost all of it at some time.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63638
990	1. No action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
991	1)I am the concessioner for five of the six Lower Current River concessions. They are: River Run Canoe Rentals dba Current River Outfitters (OZAR010), Landing Canoe Rental dba Hawthorne Canoe Rental (OZAR023), The Landing Canoe Rental (OZAR024), Big Spring Canoe Rental (OZAR025) and River Run Canoe & Tube Rental dba Current River Outfitters (OZAR049). Our businesses employ approximately 100 people during our float season that deal first hand with the many visitors to the Lower Current River. We get much feedback from the floater and local resident as to congestion, rowdy behavior and "boater/floater conflicts" during the heavy periods of floating (from June 15 through August 15). Almost 99% of the comments stem from Saturday use of the Waymeyer to the Van Buren Bridge stretch of river during this heavy floating period amounting to six or eight crowded Saturdays. Concession put in points for Canoes, Rafts, Kayaks and Tubes are restricted to the Waymeyer and Raft Yard access points upriver from the Van Buren bridge, therefore crowding occurs from the 10AM to 4PM times on these six or eight Saturdays in this area. We have found that responsible boaters, which make up the vast majority of the local boating public, elect to avoid this crowded area of the river on Saturdays and will launch their boats at Waymeyer and proceed upriver, or will launch their boats at Big Spring Landing and proceed downriver. Consequently the boaters that elect to run their boats in the Waymeyer to the Bridge area are involved in most of the conflicts that arise. Our feedback from visitors and observations on our own indicate that these boaters represent a very small percentage of total boats and are involved in almost 100% of the conflicts. This coupled with unnecessary rowdy behavior from floaters results in the majority of the conflicts. I personally grew up on this river with parents, uncles and other kin folks who were always responsible boaters, and I believe that boating on Current River is one of the enduring legacies of the river. Therefore, I totally support the NO ACTION alternative of the GMP. If I were to modify it in any way, I would suggest that more stringent law enforcement be implemented on both the same boaters that are causing all of the problems and on rowdy behavior by floaters and boaters alike. Continuing rowdy behavior by both boaters and floaters on the crowded stretch of the Lower Current should result in greater financial punishment, ie, ticketing resulting in larger fines, and also in very harsh punishment to the point of removing them from the river and restricting future river use by these people. I am aware this would require more man power by both the state and local governments, but I believe it would result in a dramatic reduction of problem conflicts. Further, I believe that expediting the construction of the proposed boat ramp and parking area upriver from Waymeyer should be a major thrust of the NPS. Local boaters would make great use of this area and would further reduce traffic on these busy Saturdays in the crowded floater stretch of the river. 2) None 3) Horsepower limitations from Big Spring to Gooseneck should not be included. As a concessioner, we have not had one floater or vessel float below Big Spring this year. The only take out point for floaters below Big Spring in Cataract Landing and is virtually never used by our concessions. Therefore, there can be no boater/floater conflict in this area of the river. This area of the river should be maintained to allow the owners of the somewhat larger horsepower motors to use and enjoy without worry of any floating congestion. I strongly support no horsepower limitation from Big Spring to Gooseneck. 4) The entire river is special to me, and that is why I support the NO ACTION alternative. 5) I believe that the greatest impact on providing the local boater and the park visitor with a quality experience on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers would be for much more stringent law enforcement as stated above. Future budgets of the ONSR should include significantly larger amounts of tax payer dollars for the purpose of law enforcement through more year round Park Rangers as well as seasonal personnel. Enforcement of the rules and regulations that already exist should be the number one priority of the NPS. Any natural resource that is extensively used by the public is subject to rowdy behavior and conflicts. It is my belief that human behavior will always result in some form of poor behavior in crowded situations. Stricter enforcement, heavier fines and restricting repeat offenders from using and enjoying the resource would go a long way to alleviating many of the problems that might exist.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
992	I believe that no action should be taken. The actions that have already been taken regarding the rivers here in the Ozarks (Shannon County) were intrusive and wrong. People living in this area need not be treated as as children awaiting the "smart" people from Missouri's cities to come tell them what to do with their own property that (in some cases) had been in their families for generations. As for the idea that people from Missouri's cities who like to vacation on the river feel that they have the right to dictate what goes on here at our home is ludacris! Obviously we have been doing something right because they are still "slumming it" down here with us.	9/8/2009	No			MO	65793
993	I have been enjoying the Current river and the Jacks Fork for my entire life. What used to be the ideal family vacation destination is turning to another commercial party zone. After a recent trip west, I realized just how bad it has gotten here at home. California, with their swollen population, manages to control the rivers and maintain a natural setting. This is what state and national parks are designed to accomplish. They are public places to be enjoyed by everyone, with the least environmental impact as possible. This means no horses, no atvs and no large motors. Land owners on other scenic rivers in the nation have come to accept these restrictions and see the long term benefits for themselves. It is shocking that as our planet faces multiple environmental crisis', we would consider neglecting one of our own greatest resources. Please do not let the rivers go the way of the Lake of the Ozarks. It is time missourians learn from their mistakes and exercise some effective conservation. Thank You, Concerned River Rat	9/8/2009	No			MO	63118

994	I am most in favor of alternative A. My wife and I have found the Current River as being too crowded during the summer months. The multitude of various activities although meeting a diverse population who has many interests in using the area is not at all conducive to what I would consider a "scenic" protected area. I have been to many wilderness and other protected areas around the country that provides the solitude and unique naturalness of the area being preserved and protected. I do not find that on the Current with horses damaging the waterways, jet boats that make dangerous waves with noise that one can hear a mile or more away, and "barges" of floaters who are dangerous to themselves and almost equally noisy. If there must be any motorized boats at all on ANY National Scenic Waterways I would like them to be limited to just enough horsepower to go up stream such as 10hp or less. I don't understand at all how jet boats or those with large engines are compatible with floaters or preserving the waterways as a natural resource. It seems from time to time there is some concern that wants to explore for minerals or the like in the area of waterways. There should be an ironclad policy that prohibits any mining or exploration for minerals in the watershed area of scenic waterways. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns. Brent Lowenberg	9/8/2009	No			MO	65203
995	I am writing to express my general comments on the current and future management of the ONSR. Last year I moved away from Missouri for the first time in my life, and now reside in Kentucky, at the edge of the Cumberland Plateau and Outer Bluegrass regions. I have spent time in the Red River Wild and Scenic River, the Big South Fork of the Cumberland (managed by the NPS), live near the Kentucky River, and have seen many other creeks, big and small, throughout this region. None of these compares to the beauty of the waters of the ONSR. This fact is something I believe unrealized by many Missourians, as it was to me - that the clarity and beauty of those Ozark waters is a unique gem, and a gift that we have received and have a duty to pass on to future generations. In the region of my new home, the waterways run silty from poor land management practices or Off Highway Vehicles, or run orange with mine waste. And this is all people know. It makes me think of how my daughter, who now loves to visit Johnson's Shut-Ins, has no basis for understanding how clear the water was, and what she will never know. The laws creating the ONSR are very clear in their intent. The ONSR is not supposed to be managed as a play-park. To be honest, if you all can't do any better then you need to get the hell out and let someone else in who's willing to work to protect the unique values of the resource, rather than create a false dichotomy, and then "compromise," between those who would "use" and those who would "protect." There is a difference between "use" and "abuse," and what is frequently allowed on the ONSR is simply abuse. Too many roads, too many horses, too much access, too many drunk morons floating their coolers of beer down the river pissing and shitting wherever and leaving their lighters, beer cans, and whatever in the river. There's no room for this. Living just a few hours from the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, I have seen a National Park with a huge population of visitors, and major challenges in management, yet it is so much better taken care of than the ONSR. For the most part - despite the ignorance of most visitors of the importance of the resource - the National Park is treated with reverence and respect. Rules are clearly posted and often respected. This is completely different from the ONSR. A couple of years ago I brought my new family to the Ozarks to float on the Current for the first time. I had told them of the beautiful, clear blue waters, and how they'd never seen anything like it. When we got there, the river was brown and turbid, and I was saddened and angry that things have been allowed to get that way. The Park Service needs to get some backbone and protect the ONSR. This is not about balancing "access" with "preservation." This is about keeping the OHVs out and way, closing unnecessary accesses (and not letting the backward county governments push you around and bulldoze them open again), keeping horses and horse-shit away from the rivers (or at least minimizing their contact), and placing restrictions on recreational outfitters that over-use and tax the ecosystem to the breaking point. You, the National Park Service, are charged with taking care of this special ecosystem for future generations, and for the resource itself. Please do your job. If you're not up to it, there are numerous water- and theme-parks around the country that may need your help.	9/9/2009	No			KY	40403
996	(5) The General Management Plan should provide for the implementation and enforcement of new ways to address new challenges including legal and illegal river access points, and increasing park congestion. The National Park Service should develop Management Plan that includes better solutions to inadequate enforcement and insufficient regulations. Thank you Ed Brocksmith Save the Illinois River, Inc. Tahlequah, Oklahoma	9/9/2009	No		Save the Illinois River, Inc.	OK	74464
997	1. No-Action. Until the NPS comes up with alternatives that are less radical I choose no action at this time. Please don't forget your mission that you are here not only to preserve and protect the environment but also a way of life. The people of this area involved the Federal Government seeking its protection. Don't make them regret their decision.	9/9/2009	No			MO	65466
998	1. I prefer alternative "A" but in deference to the local economies that now exist to service those of us who enjoy the park, I would support something between "A" & "B". 2. Protecting water quality and stream banks in as natural a way as possible. I appreciate the Park Service's efforts to contain the rowdy behavior though I understand the urge to be wild when one is in the wild (having been young once myself). 3. Any further accommodation of motorized vehicles. I believe they are in the minority of users of the park, yet their activities easily overshadow that of the majority. Also there's already substantial pollution from the vehicle traffic just accessing the park. 4. I believe the upper stretches of both rivers have incredible beauty and every effort should be made to preserve that. I suspect Park Service personnel have similar objectives. They are also (fortunately) less trafficked. One thought I have had was that a scenic overlook of these areas would give some opportunity to appreciate without further intrusion. 5. I see no discussion of "Peak Oil" in these alternatives. I believe that will soon provide natural limits to any growth of motorized activities. So that is in and of itself a major reason for not bowing to pressures for more access for those types of activities.	9/9/2009	No		MoCoalition4Environment	MO	63385-3395
999	1) I favor A or B; the major issue is dealing with the current illegal ATV and other, nonconforming, polluting uses. 2) Keep the experience as nonmotorized as possible. 3) Business as usual will ruin the ecosystem forever.	9/9/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65203

1000	1. Alternative A is closest to my ideal for management of the Ozark National Scenic Reiverways ("OSNR"). I like the idea of minimal development within the park and fixing some of the encroachments, including ending illegal roadways and illegal uses of the park. 2. I feel very strongly about not allowing motorized boats on the upper stretches of the Current and along the Jacks Fork. These boats are intrusive and disturb both quiet use and the natural habitat. 4. As noted above, I feel very strongly about the area of the Current from just below Montauk down to Pulltite. I also feel strongly about protecting the Jacks Fork. These are areas that should be protected from development and from motorized traffic.	9/9/2009	No			MO	63005
1001	1) Yes, No-Action. I believe it should be kept as is for future generations to enjoy.	9/9/2009	No			MO	65588
1002	I have reviewed the alternatives for the General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and I find none of the plans acceptable. These plans do not go far enough to correct the problems that exist on the river. The following statements address topic question #1. - Get all motorized vehicles out of this river. Only authorized park officials should be allowed to operate emergency motorized vehicles on the river. If you can't enforce it, then grant the MO Stream Team members authorization to confront and ticket offenders. - Get the horses out of the streams. Establish rules that horses around the land areas of the park must wear bags equipped to capture feces exiting the animals. Establish strict rules for disposal of the feces. If you can't enforce it, then grant the MO Stream Team members authorization to confront and ticket offenders. I am battling E Coli and the effects of bacteria present in feces in my own back yard at Castlewood Park dealing with health issues suffered by my dog. This is nasty stuff. Keep it away from the streams. - Restrict the number of commercial canoes available in the park and rentable on any given day. Establish a reservation system that spread park usage over the 7 day week. Enforce that when renting canoes from commercial establishments, as part of their license to rent canoes, they must also provide renters with a list of rules for the river. - Reduce the river access points and camp grounds along the river. - Ban all electronic audio devices unless used with headphones. If you can't enforce it, then grant the MO Stream Team members authorization to confront and ticket offenders. I support the General Management Plan proposed by the MO Coalition for the Environment. I have used this river since I was a kid. I treasure this national resource and wish to see it preserved in its natural state. Please get tough on those who want to violate the natural serenity and beauty of this park. Steve Seyer	9/9/2009	No		MO Coalition for the Environment	MO	63021
1003	1. No action	9/9/2009	No			MO	65588
1004	1. Alternative A is best. 2. My main concern is to keep the area clean and peaceful - it needs to be managed for that to happen, and some limits are needed on the number of people who can be on it at one time, particularly in certain ares. It is so overcrowded on some weekends - I'm afraid it will only get worse. 3. NO ATVs and limit power boats. Keep horse crossings to a minimum to avoid pollution. 4. The Big Springs tract is a sacred place. Keep it pristine. See Alternattive A. 5. Ban ATVs. They entertain only a few people and spoil the atmosphere for so many others.	9/9/2009	No			MO	63122
1005	I am not a member nor am I associated with any environmental group or recreational usage organization. I do, however, feel very strongly about this issue. I favor restriction of the use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area beyond the current status. I would suggest the following: A usage permit requirement for all types of usage in the area, with a damage and clean up deposit required. Fees and additional fines in keeping with the type of usage or abuse, ie how potentially damaging the activity is and how expensive it is to maintain facilities for the activity. A limit on motored water craft to a very low horsepower rating is, say outboards of less than 9 horsepower and a speed limit of 5mph with a fine and enforcement mechanism. This would lower the noise and damage to the environment without excluding those unable to paddle the river and outfitters who sometimes need to retrieve equipment on the river. A ban on all motorized vehicles except at prescribed crossings and on designated roads. A permit fee and fines to mitigate any damage done. An increase in enforcement and arrests for boating or floating on the river with a blood alcohol level above .08, refusal to take a breath test resulting in a fine and ban from future usage. If found on in the area without permit a manditory jail time and fine. Test the water for the source and type of pollution. Is it human or horse. My guess it is man. Limit horse crossings and require a deposit to be lost if you are caught crossing elsewhere. This area is a national treasure. Please defend it for future generations.	9/9/2009	No			MO	63105
1006	I have read the alterntives and also the information on the pre-determined management zones and I am gravely conerned about the inability to comment on the managment zones. As the management zones read, horseback riding has already been closed out of primitive areas. The equestrian values the primitive experience just as much as the hiker. Horses are included in primitive areas throughout the country and I am very concerned that equestrians are not given the opportunity to comment on this predecided closure. Horseback riding can be managed in a primitive area and equestrians should not be penalized. The primitive experience should be available to not only the hiking community but to the equestrains as well.It is of grave concern that the alternatives do not address the pre-loading of management zone restrictions. I am respectfully requesting that you revisit the primitive zone restrictions to include the equestrian community. Thank you, M. Copeland	9/9/2009	No			MO	65590
1007	5. I am most concerned about the use of ATV's as they pollute the air, cause sound pollution, and ruin the landscape. Please restrict them to legal county roads. This may also help to maintain the ecology of the river banks. Please make the Big Springs natural area a designated wilderness, to preserve some of the best wild beauty that our state has remaining. Sincerely, Janet and Geoff Hamill	9/9/2009	No			MO	63119
1008	Keep ATV's and motorized vehicles only on legal county roads and enforce laws that achieve that. Create a detailed plan to eliminate unauthorized roads and trails that reach the water's edge because they introduce additional vehicles, excessive runoff and pollution, weaken riverbanks, destroy wildlife habitat, and degrade scenic vistas. Pursue a wilderness designation for the Natural Area at Big Springs so that future	9/9/2009	No			IL	62930

	Americans can enjoy native Ozark wilderness. Explore solutions to reduce congestion on the Riverways to maximize enjoyment of the natural features and native wildlife of the rivers. Locate horse trails on higher ground so their use does not destabilize banks, increase erosion, and damage riparian habitat. Minimize horse trail river crossings to reduce damage caused at these locations. Establish a system for limiting the size and frequency of horse trail parties to reasonable numbers at one time that do not strain capacity of the natural systems and cause excessive damage to banks, soils, vegetation, habitat, and water quality. Monitor and minimize human waste pollution by improving signage, educating users about toilet use in the Riverways, and insuring adequate, safe, and clean facilities designed to have minimal impact on the scenery and ecology in the Riverways. Expand and improve partnerships with residents and organizations to promote the natural, scientific, and cultural heritage of the Riverways.					
1009	At the age of 83, I have lived either on or near the Ozark streams since I was 8 years old. The largest outboard motor we had on our long john boats was less than 5 horsepower, and usually we propelled our boats by paddle and not motors. Today we have a family tract of about 300 acres on the ozark stream and we've worked hard to keep the area as natural as possible without anything more than minimal impact on the environment. Our children and grand children get around on the river primarily with play kayaks, canoes and "tubes." The area is posted against hunting and the silence of the environment is delight. We are in favor from all points of view in limiting all sorts of motors on our Ozark streams. Jordan Heiman and the Heiman/Young families.	9/9/2009	No		Sierra Club	Missouri 63132-4124
1010	1) A is the best plan. Keep it quiet, non-mechanized, and in close to its natural state. Please adopt plan A. 2) Preserve the beauty and serenity for future generations. Thank you for extending the comment period.	9/9/2009	No			MO 63119
1011	1) I support the "No Action" option. I would consider raising the horsepower limit to 80 h.p. to be measured at the jet pump outlet, not at power head. 40 h.p. is a minimal amount of power for a family of 4, 2 being children. 80 h.p. is much less than some of the boats before the current h.p. limit. My dad had a boat with I believe 115 h.p. There were some boats that had much larger engines. 2) No comment 3) No comment 4) I love to float (canoe, tube, kayak, raft) from a far up river as possible (Current or Jacks Fork) to Round Springs. Some of the most beautiful scenery I've ever seen is from the upper ends of both rivers to their convergence. I want to be able to run a jet boat from the mouth of Sinking Creek downriver with no lower limit. 5) I would like to see more resources provided for people to enjoy the rivers. I strongly urge no "hiding in the bushes" operations to manage the riverways. Park Service staff should be in uniform, visible to everyone and in locations where they can provide assistance to whoever might need it. I do not want any roadways to be restrcted to any vehicles or horses.	9/9/2009	No		Voice of the Ozarks	MO 36368
1012	1) Alternative A is closest to what I would like to see. I don't want access cut off completely, but the past has shown us that with public use comes abuse. If enforcement of illegal use is increased, then B might be acceptable. Big Spring must be protected. The river banks and land adjoining the rivers must be protected. ATV use should be discontinued and other use leading to erosion should be monitored. While I hate to ban all motorized boats, that is tempting. On the more developed stretches, I am in favor of 10 hp limits. The goal of the plan, I believe, should be to preserve the natural beauty of the area. Public use should be limited and monitored. Canoeists and hikers and campers should be able to enjoy the Ozark NSR without seeing and hearing damage from motorized and illegal uses.	9/10/2009	No			MO 64152
1013	No-Action	9/10/2009	No			MO 65466
1014	I have been visiting this area of the country for the past 57 years. There is no more beautiful area in this the greatest country on God's green earth. It has remained beautiful for years without government interference and allowed the communities around it to benefit from tourism dollars. No Action is required to continue this tradition of combining God's beauty with American capitalism for the benefit of all. Let the Missouri communities benefit from this resource and let the rest of us enjoy it.	9/10/2009	No			IA 50676
1015	NO ACTION!!!	9/10/2009	No			SC 29645
1016	NO ACTION!!! The trails and the rivers are pleasant and nature has always had it own way of cleaning. the rivers flood and the trails are kept clean by normal riders, they stick to the rule " Pack it it, Pack it out." NO ACTION....	9/10/2009	No			SC 29645
1017	1. No-Action should be taken on this. 2. I believe the action already taken are working. 3. Nothing...No- Action taken 4. I love all of the riverways. 5. I think you are all doing fine with what you are doing.	9/10/2009	No			KS 66701
1018	#1 NO ACTION	9/10/2009	No			FL 33844
1019	1) We choose no-action. As twice a year visitors to the NSR, we contribute approximately \$4000.00 to the economy in the area each year. If you close or modify the trails or river crossings, we will find somewhere else to spend that money. 2) No action is the best alternative. The only addition should be more patrol personnel to manage the "yahoos" who run boats where they should not. 3) Any alternative which disallows equine	9/10/2009	No			IL 61265

	activity will cost the entire area tourist dollars. Sometimes you need to figure out where your bread is buttered. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We are conservationists and truly enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.						
1020	I am strongly in favor of the NO-ACTION option. We travel to the Eminence MO area a couple of times each year for a perfect vacation with our horses and we don't want to lose the access to wonderful trails along the river or in the surrounding area. We also spend our afternoons floating on the river and it's the combination of vacation activities that I can imagine. Please don't change a thing!	9/10/2009	No			MO	64133
1021	To Reed E. Detring, Superintendent, My name is Jon McRoberts and I am a Missouri native. Like so many other native Missourian, I hold our state wildlands in high esteem. Furthermore, I feel a responsibility to past, present, and future Missourians to promote quality management and preservation of the ecosystems and natural areas that have shaped our heritage and identity for decades. With this goal, I feel it is appropriate to briefly comment on the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. To be direct, I think we, as stakeholders, need to take all necessary actions to preserve and restore the natural integrity of the river system. This would be accomplished by limiting motorized access from boats and other vehicles, limiting the myriad of equestrian pressures, promoting quality stream-bank management, and providing the necessary enforcement to successfully maintain this state treasure. These changes will undoubtedly be met with resistance from some people, but the responsibility is ours and we must not miss this chance. People deserve the opportunity to experience the cool water, sights, and sounds of the Ozark National Science Riverways in its natural state. Please contact me with any questions or if I may elaborate on my statements. Respectfully, Jon McRoberts	9/10/2009	No			MO	65201
1022	No Action! It seems to me that every few years the government seems to try to remove our rights so we can't enjoy this great land. I enjoy my yearly trip to jacks fork, currant river area. The people pounding the drums to change our use of this would much better spend their efforts trying to clean up cities, crime and drugs than a group of people riding their horses in the country. We all don't agree on how to live our lives but that is why we can pursue life, liberty and the pursuit of trail riding. If anything put some trash cans out where people can put trash. Then empty them! Regards, MSG Karen Downer	9/10/2009	No			MO	64439
1023	1) No action please. I have ridden the trails along both the Current and Jack's Fork rivers and have not noticed anything except the beauty and awe of the gorgeous scenery that unfolds before me at every turn. It would be a shame to limit the number of people that would be able to view the splendor of nature if some of the trails were to be closed. Please please please, no action!!	9/10/2009	No			KS	67156
1024	I am in favor of the "No-Action" alternative concerning specifically the Jack's Fork and Current River portions of the Park. I think that things are just fine the way they are and I have been traveling to MO from North Carolina for five years to participate in camping, canoeing, and kayaking, events held on and near the rivers. I think MO is a great place to vacation and I would really hate for those prolonged yearly plans to be deterred by a change in the use of them. Thank you for your time.	9/10/2009	No			NC	27053
1025	I am in favor of the "No-Action" alternative concerning specifically the Jack's Fork and Current River portions of the Park. I think that things are just fine the way they are and I have been traveling to MO from North Carolina for five years to participate in camping, canoeing, and kayaking, events held on and near the rivers. I think MO is a great place to vacation and I would really hate for those prolonged yearly plans to be deterred by a change in the use of them. Thank you for your time.	9/10/2009	No			VA	24076
1026	1) The No-Action Alternative is the best one. 2) Taking no action. 3) All of the A, B, and C alternatives should NOT be included. 4) All 134 miles. 5) No, just leave it like it is.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65466
1027	In response to Topic Question 5: I believe the National Park Service should manage the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers to achieve the mission spelled out by Congress when it designated the Ozark National Scenic Riverways: 1) to preserve and protect this unique resource, and 2) to provide for uses and enjoyment of the rivers that are consistent with preservation and protection. My priorities for management would be: * Keeping ATVs and motorized vehicles on legal county roads and out of the rivers. Their use in and around these rivers is degrading the banks and riverbeds, not to mention the experience of anyone trying to enjoy the beauty of the area. (During a recent trip, we were enjoying lunch on a gravel bar when 12 ATVers passed through on their "day trip." Not pleasant.) * Locating horse trails and camps on higher ground to protect banks and keep the gravel bars clean. Limiting the size of horse-riding parties would also be a good idea. (On my most recent trip to the Current River, the excessive amount of horse poop made it difficult to find a spot to pitch a tent on one usually desirable gravel bar. I've taken a number of wilderness horse trips and realize how enjoyable they can be; I also realize that, unless the groups are limited and carefully managed, they can be very hard on the environment.) * Finding ways to minimize human waste pollution by educating users about toilet use along the Riverways and by creating at least primitive toilet facilities in some popular gravel bar camping areas. The number of users demands that this problem be addressed. I've been to quite a few national parks in recent years; none had a human waste pollution like this. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is Missouri's "national park"--a natural treasure that should be enjoyed by all Americans and our guests. At present, I'm embarrassed to take anyone there. It's time for a true reclamation and management plan.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65203
1028	Alternative A, with its reasonable horsepower restrictions, is in my opinion the best alternative offered to preserve the values envisioned when the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established. There are many other places in Missouri where motors of all sorts and sizes are allowed for those that prefer that type of recreation. There are very few places that offer the type of recreational experience that will be available to anyone that likes quiet, human powered boating if Alternative A is chosen.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65202

1029	No-Action	9/10/2009	No			MO	64870
1030	I would like to see the land use continue as it currently is. That would be "No Action". Too many times "management" means closing the land except to those employed by the Government. It is deemed a terrible thing for a civilian to go there, but somehow a Forest Ranger or other Government employee is ok. Please remember that this land is owned by the The Citizens of the United States of America. As a horseback trail rider, I cherish the natural beauty we have in the Ozarks. We try to leave no trace left behind. This land was settled by people on horseback. Riding through our forests on horseback is a much more real and true connection to our past than a walk on a graded self interperative walking trail. One thing you might consider is accepting more assistance from the public. When storms cause damage to trails, there are groups of hikers, bikers, and equestrians who would be very willing to jump in and help fix the damage. Instead we usualy just get a "trail closed" sign until a year or two later somebody working for the government trims up a few fallen trees to re-open it. Yours Paul N. Sidio Spokane MO	9/10/2009	No		OCER	MO	65754
1031	I am in favor of No Action.	9/10/2009	No			IN	46321
1032	Question #1: I would like to strongly support Preliminary Alternative Plan "A", which calls for a restriction on motors on the Upper Current and the Jack's Fork Rivers. I have canoed the Upper Current many times, in more recent times with my wife and daughter. It is beautiful, with clear waters and, at times, abundant wildlife. I would like to see it remain in this condition for my daughter's children to enjoy. The National Park Service (NPS) is particularly superb at maintaining such areas. I would also like to see the NPS build and maintain interpretive activities along the river (at such places as Round Springs, Welch Springs, Akers Ferry, etc.) again this is something at which the NPS has a rich history for providing an excellent service. Question #2: I would like to see the following parts from Preliminary Alternative Plan "A" be included in the future management of the park: (a) restriction on motor activity on the Upper Current and Jack's Fork rivers, (b) closing of all non-NPS roads that give access to the rivers, (c) enforcement of the code of conduct respecting the boaters and fishers on the river, and (d) more interpretive activities along the river. Question #3: I would not wish to see motorized boat access to the Upper Current or the Jack's Fork rivers, nor would I wish to see the current policy of low powered motors on these continued. Question #4: I am particularly drawn to the Upper Current. I have been on that the most and as such it is most dear to me. Question #5: I would reiterate the four points made in answering question #2. I would like to see all those points implemented.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65401
1033	1. I would like to see things stay as they are. Thousands of people travel hundreds of miles to enjoy the beauty of this area on horseback and to start restricting access to this area for horse riders is just another way of cutting us out. It seems that the minority rules the majority when it comes to state, national and county lands. While it's under the disguise of it's for the benefit of the land, it also cuts alot of human use out. It limits access for the many that are not able to walk by foot into these areas. We are as a group a very large and money spending bunch. We pay taxes as everyone else and are willing to spend millions of dollars a year on horses and activities that include horses. Roxie Bank	9/10/2009	No			IN	46410
1034	1) Alternative A 2) Strong protection and restoration of the natural resources, terrestrial and aquatic. Protection of high water quality. Elimination of illegal access and activities.	9/10/2009	No			MO	63379
1035	To Reed E. Detring, Superintendent As stakeholders in the ONSR, I feel we should take all necessary steps to preserve and restore the natural integrity of the river system. I was one of Dr. Oscar Hawksley's students and actually helped map those rivers back in the late 1950's. Please keep them as close as you can to the natural state. Thanks Glenn D. Chambers	9/10/2009	No			MO	65203-1828
1036	1)The no-Action alternative is the one I believe should be selected. This alternative would have the least negative impact on local users and local residents. Local uses have been restricted since the park was formed in the 1960's while the NPS had favored tourists who come once or twice a year. If you have attracted too many tourists then raise the campground fees and put tighter limits on canoe numbers. NPS should work with the counties on road issues instead of looking for roads to close. NPS should stop harassing hunters on the county roads south of Big Spring and elsewhere in the park. The superintendents job should no longer be a nice spot to spend the last 2 or 3 years before retirement. We deserve someone who in willing to stay 20 years and not be afraid to go out and meet the locals.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65588
1037	1) Alternative A is closest to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This should include limits to horse, motorized boats, and vehicles (ATVs)use; and even visitor use, if warranted. 2) I feel management of the parks should emphasize preserving/protecting and promoting the natural resources of the riverways, including especially the water quality and quantity, native flora, fauna, as well as scenic views, etc. 3)Parts that should not be included: More development, as in trails, accomodations for motorized uses. 4) The Upper Jack's Fork is a very special place for me. I am especially concerned about keeping the water clean and clear. Whichever alternative is chosen, should have active enforcement (above and beyond, if necessary) of the most stringent water quality standards throughout the watershed. 5) The most important strategy is to focus on the goal of preserving the park in its most natural state for future generations. Perhaps volunteers could help! Additional thoughts: I would like to present my viewpoint, and at the same time, speak for many other voices who share my views and wishes. Please preserve the jewels that are the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. They are a national treasure, entrusted to the National Park Service to preserve in perpetuity, and are even designated as "Outstanding National Resource Waters" by the U.S. Congress. They do not belong to just one faction, or generation, or even one species, for example, humans. But they are to be preserved to be a living, enduring example of what they represent – clear, cool, clean waters supporting a diverse, unique, native habitat, all in its most virgin state. To be sure, human development has had an	9/10/2009	No			MO	65201

	<p>impact on these ecological wonders, but we should all strive to impose as minimal effects as possible. I realize that I, through my use of the river over the last 50 years. have also had an impact. But any of us who choose to experience this environment in ways that impose negative effects on others to a great degree, do not deserve to do so. That takes away the right of the greater common good, of man and all living beings in the environment, to exist, flourish, and endure. This includes firstly, damage to the environment by excessive uses of, for example, motorized vehicles (including ATVs), horses, or gravel mining, and includes peripheral damages such as soil erosion, noise, and, especially, water pollution. The myriad effects of too many human visitors swimming, picnicking and camping along the streams has of course, its own impact. I, as well as everyone that values these rivers, of course, want to be able to enjoy them, but I am willing to also do so responsibly, with as minimal effects as possible on the environment, and believe it is the responsibility of the National Park Service to make sure everyone is obligated to do.</p>						
1038	<p>1. No-Action as I feel this would keep the area the way it currently is. It is already well preserved and used to enjoy what God created here. I do think that more of the area could be opened up to public use. 2. Canoeing, Hiking, Swimming, Fishing, Camping, any that gives us more public access, I feel the area should be used and enjoyed. 3. No park rangers hiding in the bushes, no cutoffs to roads, the stopping of public access to the public. I do feel that if Park personnel is in the areas, in uniform out in the open without threats of tickets that this would deter any problems. 4. There are so many that we enjoy, mostly through floating, but some such as Bay Creek, and B bluff we like to go to even in the winter just to walk out and fish or look at the snow on the bluffs. We love to float Buck Hollow when water permits, there are so many lovely places to look at and stop and rest or fish. Alley Spring, Two Rivers, Round Spring, these are also places we enjoy spending time in, and they are so well taken care of by everyone. 5. Yes, let people enjoy nature as it stands, don't deny us access, or make it where you have to drive by a road and say, oh look its pretty. God intended for it to be used, and the local folks here take care of it and have for a long time, their living depends on it!!</p>	9/10/2009	No			MO	65571
1039	<p>My name is Carl Younger, I live in Shannon County, Missouri and I want to say thank you for the opportunity to voice my thoughts in regards to the GMP Preliminary Alternatives. By statement will cover all five (5) questions as I express my thoughts. As a citizen/tax payer of Shannon County, I have read the information the ONSR's has published concerning the GMP Preliminary Alternatives and it really concerns me that there has been open meetings concerning the proposed changes for Howell, Dent, Shannon, Texas, and Carter Counties in Missouri along the Current and Jacks Fork River and because of the NONE support for what is being proposed we offer meetings in Kansas City, St. Louis and Cape Guardia Missouri to obtain peoples opinion whose lives will not be changed or effected on a daily bases like it will affect the local citizens of the counties the Current and Jocks Fork Rivers run through. As I reviewed the changes that are purposed for the future of the counties I listed above by the ONSR's and as I reviewed the history of the making of the OSNR's for the counties I mentioned above I found a great correlation of what took place on December 29, 1890 at a place called Wounded Knee Creek, in South Dakota where local citizens basically were forced off their land and a grave injustice was pronounced upon them in the way of reservation or death. NO ACTION would have been the best course to have taken at that time and I believe that NO ACTION would be the best action for the present. As you compare the events of today and the events that happened on December 29, 1890, you will find a many innocent people were displaced and a great injustice was done by the Federal Government wanting the land that many people had used and lived on for years only taking what they needed when they needed it and that is what you would call conservation, however I know that there are smarter people than the dumb Indians that can run the land better, preserve it better and make better use of the land so no one can use the land that sustained people for hundred's of years. NO ACTION was desired back in 1890 nor in 1964, but what happened? The people were lead to believe that all parties involved in these events came to an agreement and all were happy with the end result and the Federal Government came in and took the land from the Lakota people which was also do to the local people of the five (5) counties mention above. If you the ONSR's who represent the Federal Government believe every one was happy with the end result lets go and talk to Mr. Alton Keton's widow who had to give up her home and farm to accommodate the wishes of the ONSR's so you could better manage their land that now looks like it had never been farmed. Let's go see her just to see how happy she was/is. While we are in that area, lets go visit my Aunt who's family home and farm was basically taken from them so that the Federal Government could manage it better as the Keton's farm now looks like it had never been farmed or taken care of. If you the Federal Government think every one was so happy, go to the reservation you place the Lakota people on that would not grow anything and they were literally starved to death to see how they feel, Oh and while you are there you might want to ask them just how happy they are about you the Government killing 300 plus men, women and children because they did not want to give up their land that they had lived on, hunted and fished on showing conservation skill to preserve the area that sustained them on a daily bases, but you wanted them off and you got them off. That seems to be what is happening in the area I live today. Wouldn't NO ACTION seem to be the best action or is it more fun and powerful to use your man authority to make people not be or go where you don't want them. Ask yourselves this question as you move forward with your agenda. Who will these changes affect? As I see it from my perspective there is no concern of affect. Let me share that there will be an affect. The local citizen will be pushed off of land that they have known, used, taken care of and used to sustain them just as the Lakota people did. When the dust settles and the local people who live in the counties mentioned above loose a few more rights to the usage of the land their fathers and grandfathers have used because the Federal Government/ONSR's continues to place more and more restrictions on people owned land, will the ONSR's be able to say what was said about the Wounded Knee Creek massacre in South Dakota? This battle is noteworthy, as it is the battle in which the most Medals of Honor have ever been awarded in the history of all wars in the United States. Will you the ONSR's be able to pat yourselves on the back, pump up your chest, throw a party and make that kind of statement when the dust settles? I feel like Black Coyote who was deaf not able to hear the orders given. I personally seem to be struggling with the orders that will be given no matter what we the local people say or think. The people who live in the areas that will be affected are not dumb hillbillies like some people have made us out to be. We do wear shoes and cloths and live in modern homes. It is my belief that the ONSR's already has a plan of action in progress that will be carried out and for those who oppose the action my question is this; "will we the local people be done like the 300 plus men, women and children who were hunted down, gathered up like animals in the dead of winter and moved to a place where four (4) Hotchkiss guns had been prepared in advance to</p>	9/10/2009	No			MO	65438

	rid those who were not happy about what was taking place to their land that they know and loved for years. We may not be killed, but in one since you could call it being killed. We the local people will be harassed and ticketed by the Government troops in the form of Park Rangers until we can not afford to get close to the Current or Jacks Fork Rivers and this is what ONSR's is looking for. Keeping the local people away. I personal experience, so I can make this claim. I just copied you last clarification about the "No Acton" Alternative. I love how you clarified the "No Action" Alternative: Quote "There are Alternatives A,B,C and one called a "No Action" alternative. This alternative does not mean that nothing would would happen". I like that. Sure leaves the door open to whatever the Government/ONSR's desires to do. Thank you again for this opportunity. I ask that you consider taking a step back re-look at what you are about to do to a area that needs the economy you are going to take away with the swipe of one pin. Carl Younger					
1040	To Whom It May Cocern, I am very concerned about the state of the environment in general but wish at this time to preserve the Ozark National Scenic Riverways/Big Spring area in particular. I often visit local rivers on the weekends and take my teenage son and his friends and I observe the activities that many locals are engaged in. Each visit to one river in particular I watch (and hear) the vehicles enter and cross the river, squashing whatever exists beneath the heavy steel and I see gouged out pathways in the sandbars. ATV's, trucks, cars, and motorboats all drown out the tranquility and beauty of the areas. It is getting harder and harder to experience true nature and what we destroy and allow to change is so hard to recapture! 1. I vote for A 2. Preserve the natural beauty. We don't need to add a bunch of ammenities - natural trails, a few ramps so that individuals can easily enter the water with kayaks, canoes or to swim is plenty. 3. Do not allow motorized boats in the river or vehicles in the river or on the sandbars! We don't need the noise or destruction (nor the trash & pollution of all kinds, etc. that goes along with it all). We are negatively impacting our environment. I feel that in time our destruction will be irrevocable. My hope is that we at least to the best that we can to delay the negative changes to the greatest extent possible and allow our children and grandchildren to experience the natural beauty before it is gone. I am 52 and I have seen natural beauty and creatures that my teen sons will not experience in their lifetime. Once gone, it's gone. Please do your best to "protect" as it is more than just the waterway that you are ultimately protecting! I thank you in advance for your concern and accordant behavior. Corinne Coco Bopp	9/10/2009	No		MO	63122
1041	Hello and thank you for the comment opportunity. To me, the number one objective is to preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins. With this as the prime guideline, let us then add our recreational opportunites. I think it wise and prudent for the biologists and other such experts who work in the area to have major input and decision-making power regarding what use is in harmony with this objective. My first choice in the plans would be: Please keep this area from becoming another Lake of the Ozarks. I strongly feel that area, which was so beautiful and peaceful 25 years ago, has been completely destroyed, and it is a shame. I am really drawn to Alt. B, as I think helping people to connect with the natural world will then lead them to want to preserve it. However, I also love many things about Alt.A, such as the quieter, slower atmosphere and being able to experience parts of the river with no motorized vehicles or boats. Would it be possible to combine Alternative's A & B? Yes, please: • designating an area of about 3,400 acres in the Big Spring area as wilderness. • quieter, less crowded, and slower paced. • Visitors would have opportunities to float secluded stretches of the river where they would not experience the sights and sounds of motorized boats or vehicles • Management would emphasize the protection and preservation of archeological resources, historic structures, and cultural landscapes, including the restoration of select open fields to preserve pastoral scenes. • Self-guided interpretive opportunities would provide visitors with a sense of being the first to discover remote, hard-to-find places, such as an old cabin or a secluded spring. Guided opportunities would include ranger-led tours of special features, such as old settlements, caves and springs, and river environments. This would help reach visitors who are looking for different or additional activities to the traditional float trip. • Resource management staff would develop opportunities for visitors and volunteers to engage in hands- on resource management projects. Learning center programs could provide more structured environmental education opportunities, especially for school groups. • Also, a variety of both guided and self-guided activities would be offered to help visitors discover the array of both natural and cultural resource-based opportunities available and increase visitor awareness of the many special resources and values • A focused program of resource monitoring, research, and preservation projects would actively support and strengthen management capabilities and ensure accurate visitor information • Management would strive to enhance visitor awareness of the continuum of people's cultural connections to the area that spans thousands of years. Living history programs would be emphasized to provide visitors with a better understanding of traditional, subsistence ways of life in the Ozarks. For example, an interpretive "float camp" would be developed to let visitors experience what river recreation was like in the past. I also agree with these points I received in an email. * Keep ATV's and motorized vehicles only on legal county roads and enforce laws that achieve that. * Create a detailed plan to eliminate unauthorized roads and trails that reach the water's edge because they introduce additional vehicles, excessive runoff and pollution, weaken riverbanks, destroy wildlife habitat, and degrade scenic vistas. * Pursue a wilderness designation for the Natural Area at Big Springs so that future Americans can enjoy native Ozark wilderness. * Explore solutions to reduce congestion on the Riverways to maximize enjoyment of the natural features and native wildlife of the rivers. * Locate horse trails on higher ground so their use does not destabilize banks, increase erosion, and damage riparian habitat. Minimize horse trail river crossings to reduce damage caused at these locations. * Establish a system for limiting the size and frequency of horse trail parties to reasonable numbers at one time that do not strain capacity of the natural systems and cause excessive damage to banks, soils, vegetation, habitat, and water quality. * Monitor and minimize human waste pollution by improving signage, educating users about toilet use in the Riverways, and insuring adequate, safe, and clean facilities designed to have minimal impact on the scenery and ecology in the Riverways. * Expand and improve partnerships with residents and organizations to promote the natural, scientific, and cultural heritage of the Riverways. Thank you for all the work you do. Regards, Nancy Eve Wolf	9/11/2009	No		MO	64034-9662

1043	My first attempt at sending a comment failed on clicking "Submit". In short, I favor PLAN A. Return the river to a pristine state Prohibit alcohol to eliminate the "party floaters" who are not there for the "river experience" rather just a means of a no effort "float and party". Control the size of motors on boats. There are other places for high powered boats.	9/11/2009	No			IL	62301
1044	Being a life long resident of Missouri, I have had the opportunity to enjoy the Ozark Scenic Waterways over 30 times. The reason for having protected parks is to preserve the area and allow people to enjoy it. There are ways to do both. I feel that in order to allow families to enjoy this treasure we have in Missouri, the No Action - C would be the best alternative. To raise the funds for more supervision, Missouri could charge a small use charge to each floater, boater, horesman, hiker, etc. Several counties require permits for use of their parks. It is a yearly permit and would cover the cost of the additional personnel. Why not do like the highways and have groups adopt areas along the river to keep clean? I believe there should be zones for non motorized boating only. There will always be people that abuse nature, but the majority enjoy it and respect it. People travel from around the world to canoe, ride horses, and hike in this area. Too much regulation will discontinue that right. I am a horse rider and have traveled to multiple states and Missouri is the best to ride in. Do not take the Ozarks away from people that enjoy the outdoors. Give people rules and have people to enforce them and the Ozark Waterways will continue to be a beautiful thriving wildlife area.	9/11/2009	No			MO	64079
1045	1) I prefer Alternative A. The Ozark National Scenic Riverway is a fabulous resource and should be protected in its original form as much as possible. 2) I like the declaration of wilderness areas, restoration of overuse areas, etc. Nonmechanized useage regulations are the best way to preserve the area for future generations. 3) It would be a mistake to overdevelop the area and in my opinion would negate the purpose of preserving this important national scenery. Mechanized useage should not be allowed! 4) No specific areas. 5) Concepts of sustainability include environmental protection but should also work on consumer education and awareness activities. People need to know more about this lovely riverway and understand how/why this is a safe, beautiful environment for family recreation for current and future generations.	9/11/2009	No			MO	65401
1046	No-Action This is public land and currently everyone can use this national riverway. No one special interest group should have priority over the other. The Riverway is still a great place to visit, the current management is working.	9/11/2009	No			MO	65066
1047	September 11, 2009 Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 Dear Superintendent of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways: As users of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, we wish to comment on the general management plan for these riverways. Our comments address primarily questions (2) and (3). Congress has mandated that the mission of the National Park Service at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways be: (to) preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins; (and) (to) provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the natural riverways resources. In keeping with this mission: (1) All ATVs and motorized vehicles should be limited only to legal county roads. (2) Unauthorized roads and trails must be eliminated. (3) Horse traffic must be managed and kept to higher ground so horse traffic will not degrade the quality of streams and rivers. (4) Laws, rules and regulations to accomplish the above must be strictly enforced. Thank you for your kind consideration of our input to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. Yours sincerely, Dr. and Mrs. Thomas J. and Helen Messerly Sager 8 Laird Ave. Rolla, MO 65401	9/11/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65401
1048	1) I would recommend "no action". I have been trailriding this area for the last 15 years and it is my favorite way to appreciate nature and its beauty. The availability to travel into the wilderness has enabled me to share this love with my granddaughter over the last 13 years--she is now a high school senior. If trails are closed or highly restricted, the parks which our forefathers gave us will become unknown to our future generations.	9/11/2009	No		Missouri FoxTrotter Horse Breed Assc; Walkers and Talkers Saddle Club	MO	64080
1049	1. A 2. A 3. C	9/11/2009	No			AR	72712
1050	1)No Action - The "balance" between local access and preservation is working and shouldn't be tampered with. 4)The areas not within the current boundaries (primarily around Eminence)should somehow be monitered closely to see that the natural beauty of the Jacks Fork is preserved and not polluted to the extent that it affects the Riverways area downstream. 5) Realize that locals' have ancestors going back generations who used this area to hunt, fish, gig and use for recreation. Realize that the whole culture of this area is related directly to the rivers, creeks and hollows contained in the park. Allow them to continue to carry on thise traditions - after all, preserving the Ozark culture in the Riverways area was one of the primary goals of the Park Service when the the Park was orginally established. Local people provided the National Park Service this land - let them continue their access and use they have enjoyed for generations - trust them to use it wisely. I'm not recommending a "double standart" here but it's imperative that local traditions are allowed to be preserved, respected and valued.	9/11/2009	No			CO	80526
1051	no action leave as is	9/11/2009	No			MO	63638

1052	no action leave as is	9/11/2009	No			MO	63638
1053	No-Action, if need be enforce rules about littering and misuse, because the people who are negligent in these areas are in the minority. As a trail rider I have been riding there since 1970 and I truley don't see many changes in the area since that time (meaning erosion, or badly kept areas, or littering) it is still a beautiful pristine location that I enjoy year after year. Thank you for listening to my coments. Kim Gamble	9/11/2009	No			IA	50237
1054	1) No-Action. My experience as a non-resident user of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is that it is currently well managed, and a good balance is now occurring between preserving this valuable resource for future generations and making enjoyable recreation opportunities available for citizens.	9/11/2009	No			MN	55433
1055	#1. We would vote for the no action alternative.	9/11/2009	No			IN	46391
1056	1. Please keep the "No Action" alternative for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The other alternatives would limit use for too many people and thus cut them off from enjoying this beautiful area.	9/11/2009	No			KS	66013
1057	Superintendent, I am writing to you regarding the General Management Plan Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. The National Park Service's mission regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, as laid out by the US Congress, are: (to) preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins; (and) (to) provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the natural riverways resources. Thus the NPS mission is twofold: to both protect the unique natural beauty of the river environment and to provide for recreation consistent with that environmental protection. There are a number of strategies which the NPS can include in its General Management Plan which will allow for continued access to and enjoyment of the riverways without sacrificing the health of the natural environment. These include: • Keep ATV's and motorized vehicles only on legal county roads and enforce laws that achieve that. • Create a detailed plan to eliminate unauthorized roads and trails that reach the water's edge because they introduce additional vehicles, excessive runoff and pollution, weaken riverbanks, destroy wildlife habitat, and degrade scenic vistas. • Pursue a wilderness designation for the Natural Area at Big Springs so that future Americans can enjoy native Ozark wilderness. • Explore solutions to reduce congestion on the Riverways to maximize enjoyment of the natural features and native wildlife of the rivers. • Locate horse trails on higher ground so their use does not destabilize banks, increase erosion, and damage riparian habitat. Minimize horse trail river crossings to reduce damage caused at these locations. • Establish a system for limiting the size and frequency of horse trail parties to reasonable numbers at one time that do not strain capacity of the natural systems and cause excessive damage to banks, soils, vegetation, habitat, and water quality. • Monitor and minimize human waste pollution by improving signage, educating users about toilet use in the Riverways, and insuring adequate, safe, and clean facilities designed to have minimal impact on the scenery and ecology in the Riverways. • Expand and improve partnerships with residents and organizations to promote the natural, scientific, and cultural heritage of the Riverways. By focusing on reducing unnecessary congestion and stress on the riverways, while still allowing for and fostering the public's access to the river, the NPS can carry out its twofold mission of environmental protection and public recreation. It is imperative that the new General Management plan provides for the enforcement of existing regulations, as well as addressing problems not provided for in the existing plan. These problems include ever increasing park congestion and excessive river access points, leading to environmental degradation. It is possible for the National Park Service to succeed in its dual mission of protecting natural resources and providing for their enjoyment within the Ozark Riverways. To accomplish this, however, the new General Management Plan must be carefully planned to strike a balance between the two. By reducing congestion and pollution without completely eliminating access to the rivers, the General Plan can provide for continued sustainable usage of the riverways, allowing the public to access and enjoy the rivers without sacrificing the rivers' future. Thank you for considering these comments while developing the General Management Plan. Sincerely, Theresa Karasek	9/11/2009	No		Missouri Sierra Club	MO	63126
1058	1. While I like to think that the Current River at Van Buren has some nice get away spots, after living in Carter County for over 30 years I admit that there are definite signs of over-use and abuse by rowdy "river rats." If the NPS will supervise more carefully I am in favor of alternative C, otherwise, A would be my first choice. We hardly go to the River any more because it is being identified more and more by local people as "dangerous", due to drunken visitors drifting down the River. I've heard that folks that live on the River feel like they are held hostage to these "floaters." I also heard on the radio how some campers up near Ellington got attacked by folks who came in on canoes and that the brawl ended up effecting 30 people. This is not a "safe environment." Over the past three decades there has been safe things for families, now I'm not sure this is still truly there. Neither am I in favor of increasing the speed of the motorboats.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63937
1059	Steven Krichbaum 412 Carter St. Staunton, VA 24401 540-886-1584 Loki4@rica.net September 10, 2009 Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, Missouri 63965 http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar www.nps.gov/ozar http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parkmgmt/general-management-plan-information.htm To: Superintendent Reed E. Detring and all whom this concerns Re: new general management plan (GMP) for Ozark National Scenic Riverways I have visited (for hiking, canoeing, camping) the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, including the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers, as well as Big Spring. These places have outstanding natural values and beauty. They are among the finest free-flowing	9/11/2009	No			VA	24401

<p>waters in the USA. The Big Spring tract has "wilderness qualities." (4) These lands and waters belong to, and are the responsibility of, all Americans, not just those living locally. The contrast value offered by these places is immense and significant. These public places grow increasingly important as they provide conditions that are different from the rest of the developed landscape. Tragically, these conditions and their contrast value have been and are being diminished, degraded, and destroyed. (5) The vast majority of the landscape in Missouri and elsewhere in the East is developed in varying intensities and does not exist in a "primitive" or "natural" state. In contrast, such conditions can be found almost exclusively on public lands such as the ONSR. And the ONSR represents only a tiny fraction of the overall land; in some senses as an island in a sea of development. The National Park Service needs to protect and restore pristine conditions and natural communities as much as possible, while providing for nonmechanized forms of recreation and activities that are quieter, less crowded, and slower-paced. (5) It is the duty of the NPS to preserve and protect the natural values of lands in its charge unimpaired for future generations. Alternatives B and C suggested for the GMP do not and cannot accomplish this fundamental mission. (3) In fact, implementation of these alternatives would exacerbate problems and diminish and degrade ecological integrity (such as through water quality degradation from recreation, habitat fragmentation and harmful edge effects, trail proliferation from illegal off-road vehicles, the spread of nonnative invasive plant and animal species, visitor-related disturbances to wildlife, and land uses and activities that occur outside the boundary that impact National Riverways resources, including water quality). An issue/concern I want to raise is effects of management and recreational use on and interference with turtle behavior, reproduction, and population viability. (5) See Bodie (2001) for a good overview of some of the ecological and management issues involved. Turtles are significant and valuable components of riverine and terrestrial ecosystems (Moll and Moll 2000; Lovich 1995). Human use of aquatic and riparian habitats has potentially devastating effects to chelonian populations. Riverine, freshwater, and terrestrial turtles use a variety of terrestrial and aquatic habitats throughout their long lives (Bodie and Semlitsch 2000; Bodie et al. 2000; Klemens 2000; Moll and Moll 2004). Therefore, access to habitats with different and annually variable attributes may be especially important for long-term population persistence (Burke and Gibbons 1995; Lovich and Gibbons 1997; Burke et al. 2000). Thermoregulation through basking is a crucial component of turtle behavior, health, and survival (Boyer 1965; Lindeman 1999). Turtles use woody debris and terrestrial sites (e.g., banks and sandbars) for this (Moll and Moll 2004). The various turtle species use (e.g., for foraging) a multiplicity of aquatic and terrestrial settings throughout their life cycle (Bodie 2001; Moll and Moll 2004; Klemens 2000). Terrestrial sites such as banks, sandbars, beaches, and forest canopy gaps are used for nesting, oftentimes at considerable distance from water (Bodie 2001; Klemens 2000; Moll and Moll 2004; Ernst and Lovich 2009). Are turtles being forced to use sub-optimal nesting sites? What affect may this have on species with temperature dependant sex determination (Moll and Moll 2004; Lovich 1996)? Human activities can disrupt behaviors such as basking, foraging, and nesting. Human activities can damage or destroy nests (e.g., through trampling, digging, or vehicle use). Human presence and/or activities can facilitate depredation of eggs, young, and adult turtles by meso-predators such as the Raccoon (Mitchell and Klemens 2000). Boat motor propellers can injure or kill turtles (Bennett et al. 2009), as can wheeled motor vehicles (Gibbs, J.P. and W.G. Shriver 2002, Steen, D.A. et al. 2006). Collection by recreationists can lead to turtle population decline (Garber and Burger 1995). The effects of human disturbance/disruption on turtle basking, foraging, nesting, and other behaviors and habitat use, and subsequent/concomitant impacts to turtle fitness, survival, reproduction, recruitment, and population viability, all must be fully considered and addressed in the revised GMP. These issues and concerns have implications not just for protective management/actions, but also for restorative. Turtles in general share life history characteristics that make them especially vulnerable and sensitive to increased human-caused loss and mortality: slow growth, late maturity, high natural mortality of eggs and juveniles (such as from predators), long lives, and low reproductive potential (Heppell, S. 1998). Unlike many other animal species, turtles appear to lack a density-dependent response - meaning increased reproductive output in response to a decreased population density (Brooks et al. 1991, and Galbraith, D.A. et al. 1997). Field studies and statistical analyses clearly show that even extremely modest rates of take (intentional or incidental) of adult and/or juvenile turtles can lead to strong declines in populations (Enneson, J.J. and J.D. Litzgus 2008, Seigel, R.A. 2005, Gerber and Heppell 2004, Gibbs, J.P. and G.D. Amato 2000, Heppell et al. 2000, Heppell, S.S. 1998, Congdon, J.D. et al. 1994, Congdon, J.D. et al. 1993, and Doroff, A.M. and L.B. Keith 1990). Traditionally, the application of riparian "buffers" has been done in order to protect water quality and aquatic habitat and populations. However, it is crucial to recognize and address the fact that "riparian" or stream-associated zones are not just buffers for aquatic habitat, but are themselves part of the "core habitat" for various taxa, including sundry turtle species. So the "riparian" areas/core habitat themselves not only need to be fully protected, but also buffered as well. See Crawford, J.A. and R.D. Semlitsch 2007, Semlitsch, R. D. and J. R. Bodie 2003, Semlitsch, R.D. and J.B. Jensen 2001, Wenger, S. 1999, and Burke, V.J. and J.W. Gibbons 1995. Site-specific surveys and monitoring need to be undertaken so as to obtain site-specific boundary justification information for designating special protected areas and/or protected habitat buffers, and/or implementing spatial/temporal alterations/restrictions on human use. Many of the concerns/issues related to impacts to turtles and the need for strictly protected zones also pertain to other taxa of flora and fauna, such as salamanders (Crawford, J.A. and R.D. Semlitsch 2007). The new General Management Plan can and must do better than its predecessor. It must include measures to more strictly enforce existing park policies and regulations. Additionally, the General Management Plan must include the implementation and enforcement of new measures to address new challenges including excess legal and illegal river access points, and increasing park congestion. In order to accomplish its goals, the National Park Serurtle and Tortoise Society, New York. Mitchell, J. C. and M. W. Klemens. 2000. "Primary and Secondary Effects of Habitat Alteration," pp. 5-32 in M.W. Klemens (ed.), Turtle Conservation. Smithsonian Institution Press: Washington D.C. Moll, D. and E.O. Moll. 2004. The Ecology, Exploitation, and Conservation of River Turtles. Oxford University Press, New York. 393 pp. Moll, E.O. and D. Moll. 1997. "Conservation of River Turtles", pp. 126-155 in M.W. Klemens (ed.), Turtle Conservation. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C. Seigel, R.A. 2005. "The importance of population demography in the conservation of Box Turtles: What do we know and what do we need to learn?", pp. 6-7 in C. Swarth and S. Hagood (eds.), Summary of the Eastern Box Turtle Regional Conservation Workshop. Humane Society of the United States, Washington,</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	D.C. Semlitsch, R.D. and J.B. Jensen. 2001. Core habitat, not buffer zone. National Wetlands Newsletter 23: 5-11. Semlitsch, R.D. and J.R. Bodie. 2003. Biological criteria for buffer zones around wetlands and riparian habitats for amphibians and reptiles. Conservation Biology 17: 1219–1228. Steen, D.A. et al. 2006. Relative vulnerability of female turtles to road mortality. Animal Conservation 9: 269-273. Wenger, S. 1999. "A Review of the Scientific Literature on Riparian Buffer Width, Extent and Vegetation". Report dated March 5, 1999 for the Office of Public Service and Outreach, Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia. 59 pp.						
1060	2) Eliminate illegal motorized accesses. Vehicle use off of legal roads must be eliminated. Control the locations and numbers of commercial trail horse rides. Strictly control motorized boats (my preference is to eliminate the noise and water pollution they create). Propose that the Big Spring tract be designated as a wilderness area.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63026
1061	1. Alternative A. is the closest, though I worry about any motorized use of the river, due to the hazards we've seen occur, plus the pollution from the engines. I would prefer that only law enforcement and rescue teams have motorized equipment on our rivers/streams. 2. I would like to see four-wheelers restricted from crossing our streams or riding within a certain distance of the banks. They create erosion, as well as pollute the water. Their noise can also be quite disruptive to wildlife and annoying to humans. 3. These streams are part of our heritage and part of an ecosystem. We need to take every measure to protect their integrity. Lessening erosion and pollution, employing measures such as I've identified above, would help. 4. I love the idea of wilderness area designation. Doing so would help protect a fragile system, better preserving it for future generations, plus raise awareness and appreciation for what we have. Thanks for listening! --Lauren Glen Williams	9/11/2009	No			MO	63701
1062	Dear Park Service, I have spent the last 40 years floating the Current River from Tan Vat Hole to Van Buren on the Current and from the Prongs to Alley on the Jacks. These trips have been by canoe anywhere from 1 to 7 days. I have also backpacked the Blair Creek and the Between the Rivers section of the Ozark Trail. Additionally, I have floated hundreds of miles of the many streams scattered throughout the state and have hiked or backpacked most of the national forests, wilderness areas and state parks in MO. The vast majority of these trips have been from September to May in an effort to avoid the crowds and large groups. However, even in the "off season" it is no longer uncommon in the Park to be sharing the wilderness with what seems an ever increasing number of jet boats, horse trail riders and shore car campers. I urge the park service to establish wilderness areas with only primitive camping and to begin limiting the number of visitors in the back country as well as the number of day visitors using the services of commercial outfitters for floating and horseback riding. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and please protect the Park and return it to the wilderness that it once was. David Freeburg	9/11/2009	No			MO	63122
1063	Response to Question #1: First, I want to say that I found the written descriptions of the four preliminary alternatives to be rather general in nature, making it difficult to form a firm opinion as to which alternative might be best. The accompanying charts and maps helped provide some additional information; however, it remained difficult to try to determine the specific effects of the different alternatives on any given access point, campground, or stretch of river. Having said that, I believe the No-Action Alternative seems to come the closest to my idea of the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverway (ONSR). I base my belief on my 30-plus years of regularly (i.e. several times a year) visiting the ONSR, during which time I have been quite satisfied, overall, with the oversight and management of the ONSR provided by the national Park Service (NPS). I believe the NPS has been an excellent steward of these exceptional waterways and their surrounding lands, and encourage the NPS to continue their stewardship as they have in the past. In other words, the old adage of, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it", pretty much sums up my reason for choosing the No-Action Alternative. Unfortunately, though, there has been one fairly recent management decision by the NPS with which I do not agree, and believe needs to be modified in some form or fashion. That management decision involves the recent restrictions placed upon the primitive camping areas within the ONSR, i.e., limiting such primitive sites to a maximum of six occupants and two tents. This decision has caused me, my family, and the families of several of my close friends considerable difficulty and consternation over the past several years. There are several reasons why we collectively disagree with this decision, including the following: (a) A couple of families have now grown beyond six members, so those families are effectively precluded from camping as a family unit at a primitive campsite; (b) For many, many years, we have held an annual multi-family (20-25 adults and children) primitive camping trip, to enjoy a shared wilderness-type experience and the associated benefits of such an experience, which is now prohibited; (c) Given the remote and isolated nature of the campsites we intentionally choose to visit, we are no longer allowed the comfort of "safety in numbers", which has been a very real advantage on a number of occasions in the past; and (d) The two or three primitive campsites we historically have used for our multi-family trips are very large (e.g. approximately 6000 square feet), can easily accommodate a group our size without environmental damage, and it makes no sense to limit such sites to only six occupants. In summary, we believe that the decision to limit all primitive campsites to a maximum of six occupants and two tents is overly restrictive and unnecessary, and should be modified. Potential alternative strategies to consider include: (i) adjusting the number of campers / tents based on the size of the site as discussed above; (ii) basing the fee for each site on the number of people or tents that are present, e.g. the fee today is only \$5 per day per site - increasing the fee or basing it on the number of tents / people per site, may achieve the intended effect of reducing over-crowding within a given site without effectively discriminating against large families or groups; and/or (iii) allowing reservations for specific groups in specific camping areas with deposits required to cover any damage or costs for litter clean up, etc.. This should discourage improper use or abuse of the site. The ONSR is a precious resource that needs protection and we are certainly willing to pay to ensure that the resource remains protected. Response to Question #2: I recommend that the following management strategies from the different Alternatives be included in the future management of the ONSR: (a) Maintain the current level (percentage) of Land-Use designated as Primitive and Natural; (b) Maintain, or expand, the current availability of primitive campsites; (c) Continue the focus on natural resource management, with particular attention to water quality degradation from recreational use (and monitoring of potential sources of contamination within the watershed areas); (d) Maintain the current level (percentage) of Waterway-Use designated as nonmotorized; (e) De-emphasize motorized forms of recreation, particularly on the upper stretches of both rivers; (f)	9/11/2009	No			IL	60938

	Restrict horseback riding, in the form of large trail rides, from areas near the rivers, particularly on their upper stretches; (g) Increase self-guided interpretative opportunities to provide visitors with a sense of being the first to discover remote, hard-to-find places, such as an old cabin or a secluded spring; (h) Continue the contracts of the 23 commercial operators that provide services to visitors, and maintain the daily quotas on boat rentals to prevent crowding; and (i) Propose the Big Spring tract for wilderness protection. Additionally, I believe that the user capacity analysis to be performed by the NPS should be explained in detail and should allow for comments and suggestions by interested parties prior to any implementation. Response to Question #3: Generally speaking, Alternative B and Alternative C propose more development within the ONSR than I would like to see. I recommend that the current rugged and remote character of the ONSR be maintained, including the current levels (percentages) of Land-Use and Waterway-Use, as noted above in my response to #2. We need to preserve and protect our current wilderness, or near-wilderness areas, from further development and commercialization. There are plenty of other areas that offer people higher levels of development and commercialization, such as Lake of the Ozarks. Additionally, I am concerned that Alternative A may overly restrict previously permissible activities in ways that are not fully described. Response to Question #4: The upper Jack's Fork River, from Alley Spring to The Prongs, and the upper Current River, from Akers Ferry to Tan Vat Access, are most special to me. As indicated previously, I am concerned that the Alternatives do not adequately address the current restrictions on primitive camping, which I believe need to be modified in some form or fashion to allow larger families and family groups access to those areas. Response to Question #5: Please see the three alternatives for primitive camping proposed at the end of my response to Question #1, as well as my responses to Questions #2 and #3. Thank you.						
1064	What the current and jacks fork need most, are more park people being seen in the eyes of the people on the river..There should also be portable restrooms on flat bed trailers were people can step out of the river an use them..PLEASE not a 1/4 mile from the river..this will help river sewage cleanup..If MODOT highway department has weekend workers.. WHY CANT NPS? Than we have MO. Water Patrol giving kids in Freshman year training, on boats,an motors, why can't NPS train canoes,tubes, kayaks,, with a little window on the park servive screen to click on an have 2 canoers floating down the river an hear a motor boat comming up stream... All they would have to say was, why don't we paddle over towards the gravel bar a little bit,,to give the moter boat some time to clear us too... REMEMBER PLEASE THIS IS A TWO WAY RIVER..NOT JUST FLOATERS. THIS IS A SCINIC RIVER WAYS RIVER,, FOR ALL of us to enjoy.. Now lets talk road closings, in case of an emergency,how will the first responders get there????will they walk? Will they boat? EMERGENCY VEHICALS NEED ROADS,, THIS COULD BE POSSIBLE LAW SUIT CITY,, THINK ABOUT THAT.... Now about taking 40 hp of the river 18ft boat weight cap.750lbs..40/60 moter,now you have [2] 16 foot boats..with25 hp moter weight cap 450 [2] people in 2 boats,,twice the congestion.more wakes,,,NOW TAKE ALL THE BOATS,AN WHO WILL SAVE THE FLOATERS OUT OF THE BAD SPOTS IN THE RIVER THAT TURN OVER IT WONT BE THE PARK SERVICE WORKERS. I've never seen them in the water..EVER..IF YOU WANT MORE INFO HERE IS MY CELL NUMBER5733518805 MARK SLATON WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PARK SERVICE CLEANING OUT THE RIVERS ALSO,,, WE CLEAN THEM UP ALL THE TIME,,	9/11/2009	No		voice of the ozarks	MO	65466
1065	The No-Action Alternative is the only plan that I will support. Many of our community families use the river in different ways and no plan should exclude family recreation. I believe any plan other than No-Action will do just that.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63638
1066	1.no action should be taken. 2. More parks, and camp grounds. 3. Nothing more should be done. There has been enough freedoms taken away from the local park users. 4. Like I have stated, we have enough problems in the world with out the goverment taking away more freedoms we as local people have. 5. Yes I can!! You can stop trying to takeing away the rights of the local people. We have enough issues with economy in such a slump.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63638
1067	1). No-Action Alternative I have visted and camped at the Current and Jacks rivers,and enjoyed myself as did my family and friends, just as it is now, I wouldn't change a thing. We have had family reunions,canoeing,fishing walks,bike riding, out door theaters,explore caves(Rockbridge Sate Park). I'm also a horseback rider and trail rider at Eminence Mo.(Cross Country Trail Ride),my son enjoys riding dirt bikes at special events(Finger Lakes),so our parks are providing enjoyment,and the land ,rivers, trees, animals, all the natural beauty is in the way I see it now. No-Action Alternative	9/11/2009	No			MO	65201
1068	1). No-Action Alternative I have visted and camped at the Current and Jacks rivers,and enjoyed myself as did my family and friends, just as it is now, I wouldn't change a thing. We have had family reunions,canoeing,fishing walks,bike riding, out door theaters,explore caves(Rockbridge Sate Park). I'm also a horseback rider and trail rider at Eminence Mo.(Cross Country Trail Ride),my son enjoys riding dirt bikes at special events(Finger Lakes),so our parks are providing enjoyment,and the land ,rivers, trees, animals, all the natural beauty is in the way I see it now. No-Action Alternative	9/11/2009	No			MO	65201
1069	The No-Action alternative is the one that most closely matches my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. ONSR was created for recreation. It should be available for all types of recreation and all types of people who have all types of interests. Current use areas should remain open to the public. I strongly object to any plan that bans a particular activity. ONSR has been maintained and managed in a very satisfactory manner and no changes should be made.	9/11/2009	No			MO	65588
1070	1. (A) 2. (A) 3. No Action 4. I am concerned about all of the areas, particularly their over-development. 5. Please treat our National Park with the same respect that other parks are afforded. Preserving the resource should be first & foremost, not catering to commercial interest. The sense of solitude that one can find on these rivers is what is really special to human beings, even though many may not realize it.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63965

1071	I am concerned about the outcome of the proposed plans. I have owned a cabin on the Current River at Van Buren for 60 year. I have enjoyed the natural beauty of the river. I want to preserve the river and it's habitat during this time, as have my children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. In recent years, the increase in use by the public has decreased the quality of the area, both ecogically and for families. Loud boisterous visitors who litter excessively, use obscenities, and deface the river are on the increase. Huge jet motors are dangerous to humans and wildlife. I support alternative plan A because of these reasons, and support a return to a more protected habitat and cleaner river. This would also lead to a more quality experience for visitors who appreciate the natural beauty of the river and surrounding area. Thank You, Charlotte Schumacher	9/11/2009	No			MO	63701
1072	1) Alternative A is the closest to my preference of how the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be managed. 2) The aspects that I think are most important are those that promote a healthy hydrology and aquatic ecosystem. I think limitations on the use of motorboats in the rivers is very important. I also think that the use of ATVs and other motorized vehicles on trails should be prohibited (with the exception of authorized staff vehicles) and that the numbers of trails and roads that reach the rivers should be limited. Horse trails should be monitored to ensure that they are not contributing to bank erosion. If they are, they should be eliminated. These uses of the land contribute to the degradation of our precious resources. The preservation of this area as a true wilderness is vital to the ecological preservation of this amazing resource for future generations. Our natural and cultural resources must be preserved. Thank you for the opportunity to comment!	9/11/2009	No			MO	63119
1073	My how the years fly by --- another GMP. First and foremost the management of OZAR should always be dictated by the Rivers and it's surroundings environments. "They" are the common dominator to which all management plans must to be directed. The Bill that Congress passed creating the Riverways was primarily directed toward the preservation of the Rivers. It's intent was certainly not to create a boating "highway" or revenue creating opportunities!! To provide "management" so that an area may be enjoyed by present and future generations demands a stewardship and is a huge responsibility that very few people understand or comprehend. If someone is ill because they have a poor diet you change what they are eating with the hope that they will get better. If the Riverways has changed so that it no longer reflects the "presence, view, aesthetics and experience that it did in the 60's and it is within the ability of NPS to implement a "better diet" than the present one - it would be foolish not to do so. It takes a lot of courage and guts to take a stand and do what is right for the resource and forego the gold stars around the local coffee table!! Sometimes we have to look and act for the common good and swallow a little pride, and ego. We have been entrusted with a huge mandate to preserve, protect and manage this most precious resource – so we must act responsibly, intelligently, and decisively. Like it or not present decisions impact future generations!!!! The Riverways is not about individual needs – again it is about the needs of the River. If we take care of it - it will take care of us "collectively". The no action alternative would be basically "business" as usual – I really can't think where this would work "long term" for anyone or anything. Sounds nice - but life is about causes, conditions, actions and consequences. The resource can't afford for us to manage it by default. If this were the selected alternative in '64 where would the Riverways be now? Thank goodness some individuals had a little insight to think otherwise!!!! The best Alternative for the Riverways and for us long term is A. It is the only one that truly emphasizes the RESOURCE. It manages for the needs of the resource first and the needs of "all the people" not just the wants of a few. If we could turn back the clock and float the river along side Leonard Hall, George Hartzog and Stewart Udall this would probably be the Alternative that could result in the view and vision that they saw. If the resource is taken care of it will be enjoyed not only by this generation but also for many to come. This Alternative understands that there is more (a lot MORE) to the Riverways than a boat ride and mechanized forms of recreation. The other Alternatives are nice but experiences are by products of the resource. Manage the resource first and opportunities for experiences will be generated. It might not be the ones that "all" of us want but that requirement was not part of the enabling legislation. Alternative A forces us to accept the Riverways on its terms, and work with it – and not try as was sometimes done in the past and make it everything for everybody. We have to understand natural and logical limits and develop the insight to manage within these. Just as our body has limits to what it can stand and be exposed to – so do cultural, natural and recreational "assets". Any management plan implemented has to be based on RESECT. This respect involves NPS with the resource, and with user groups, and user groups respecting other user groups. Disrespect begets disrespect. Education, modeling, expectation and consequences all play an integral part on solving user complaints and dilemmas. In manageing a Riverways for "all" to use, it isn't about the "I want" with no regard for others.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63941
1074	* we need to substantially decrease number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails * need to limit motorized vehicles to official roads and ban ATVs * need to reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats * need to enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations * need to limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to E. Coli contamination * need to designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * need to monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat * need to reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63026
1075	The rivers have suffered many changes since the white man has come here and most have not been good for the wild nature of this place. The ONSR was created to help preserve these rivers in their most natural state that would still allow some use and visitation. In general I believe that the NPS has failed to completely provide that protection even though it has been possible. In the long run less will be more. The more the rivers can allow only limited access the more valuable the experience of being there will be. 1. Plan A is good but should be more restrictive perhaps. Motors of any kind above Alley and Round just seem out of place at most river level conditions. 2. Access to the river should be limited and some access points should be closed. 4. All of the park is valuable. Some local people seem to think that it is our river and our heritage, but we are all just visitors here. The idea that we have some right to run the river at high speed is a recent development historically. It hardly makes any more sense than having a place for recreational bulldozing or free mowing zone. Some things just shouldn't be allowed... ever. 5. It seems to me that this area of the Ozarks have an untapped potential to attract a great deal of Eco-Tourism. If there were to be a way for park staff to work with local	9/11/2009	No			MO	63941

	business and guide service to promote this it would be valuable to all. Natural features would be more relevant if visitors had local to help them understand the importance of this area. I appreciate the time you have taken to consider these comments. Perhaps an ongoing forum could be established to facilitate continuing dialog. Respectfully, Dave Turley						
1076	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1077	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1078	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1079	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63822
1080	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63875
1081	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1082	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63961
1083	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1084	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1085	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			IL	62208
1086	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63961
1087	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63841
1088	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1089	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63822
1090	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830

1091	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1092	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1093	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1094	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63877
1095	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63876
1096	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1097	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63857
1098	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1099	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63801
1100	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			TN	38024
1101	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1102	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1103	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1104	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1105	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63822
1106	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755

1107	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			AR	72401
1108	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1109	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1110	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1111	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1112	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1113	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1114	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1115	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1116	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1117	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1118	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63877
1119	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1120	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1121	Response to Question 1: No Action needed	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1122	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755

1123	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1124	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1125	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1126	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1127	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1128	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1129	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1130	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1131	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1132	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1133	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63851
1134	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63960
1135	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63857
1136	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63857
1137	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63841
1138	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63961

1139	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1140	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	65560
1141	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63857
1142	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1143	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1144	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1145	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1146	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1147	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63876
1148	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1149	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63879
1150	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1151	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1152	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1153	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63801
1154	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755

1155	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1156	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1157	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63801
1158	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1159	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1160	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1161	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			IL	62236
1162	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/26/2009	No			MO	63957
1163	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/26/2009	No			MO	63957
1164	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/26/2009	No			MO	63957
1165	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/26/2009	No			MO	63129
1166	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1167	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65588
1168	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	63801
1169	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	63901
1170	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65588

1171	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/11/2009	No			MO	63935
1172	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1173	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1174	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1175	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1176	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1177	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1178	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1179	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1180	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1181	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1182	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	63766
1183	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63935
1184	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1185	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1186	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937

1187	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1188	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63932
1189	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1190	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1191	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1192	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1193	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1194	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1195	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1196	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63546
1197	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63640
1198	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63640
1199	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1200	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	65548
1201	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			AR	72461
1202	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	64850

1203	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	65456
1204	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63620
1205	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1206	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63823
1207	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1208	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63130
1209	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63801
1210	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1211	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63801
1212	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63701
1213	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63841
1214	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63841
1215	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1216	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1217	Response to Question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1218	Response to Question 1: No Action Needed	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937

1219	Response to Question 1: No Action Needed.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1220	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1221	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65439
1222	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63638
1223	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63629
1224	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65565
1225	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65565
1226	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65440
1227	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63629
1228	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63645
1229	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63633
1230	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63638
1231	Response to Question 1: NA	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1232	Response to Question 1: NA	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1233	Response to Question 1: No Change No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72401
1234	Response to Question 1: No Change No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72521

1235	Response to Question 1: No Change No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72364
1236	Response to Question 1: No Change No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63877
1237	Response to Question 1: No Change No Action	9/16/2009	No			AR	72521
1238	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: No Change Response to Question 4: No Change Response to Question 5: No Change	9/2/2009	No			MO	65588
1239	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: No Change Response to Question 4: No Change Response to Question 5: No Change	9/2/2009	No			MO	65466
1240	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			MO	63855
1241	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1242	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1243	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1244	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1245	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1246	Response to Question 1: No Changes	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1247	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72442
1248	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72404
1249	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			CA	72404
1250	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315

1251	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1252	Response to Question 1: No Change	9/16/2009	No			AR	72315
1253	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63638
1254	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63638
1255	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1256	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1257	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	63060
1258	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	63060
1259	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63638
1260	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None	6/22/2009	No			MO	63935
1261	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None	6/22/2009	No			MO	63935
1262	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None	6/22/2009	No			MO	63935
1263	Responses to all questions were left blank.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1264	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1265	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No Action	9/14/2009	No			MO	63561
1266	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No Action	9/14/2009	No			MO	63530

1267	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Restriction on access or recreational usage Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Actions	9/16/2009	No			MO	63730
1268	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No restriction on access or recreational usage. Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63780
1269	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No restriction on access or recreational usage. Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63755
1270	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 5: Don't harass the law abiding local people.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1271	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I think the riverways should be used for fun and personal enjoyment. They shouldn't be covered in restrictions that prevent that. Response to Question 3: They shouldn't tell be what they can or cannot do on rivers to have a good time. You should be able to go to the rivers and be able to have fun and not be covered in rules. Response to Question 4: By allowing spots for more recreational use there are plans that adequately address what we would use the area for.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65438
1272	Response to Question 4: I'd love to see more places open to canoe haulers: for example "kintons" on the jack fork & I'd love to see more permints made available to get more canoes on the water.	9/16/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1273	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No futher restrictions or access & restrictions on use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any futher restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 5: Keep thing simple. Keep Gov. Bureocry to a minumum	9/16/2009	No			MO	63028
1274	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Why change something that works well Response to Question 3: Any chang Response to Question 4: I like the Eminence Area. You Nazis can't hid in the bushes there. Response to Question 5: let local ppl have more of a say in whats going on	8/28/2009	No			MO	65807
1275	Response to Question 1: Please leave this beautiful river alone. No-Action Response to Question 2: This river should be accessible for everyone & all activities Response to Question 3: Opposed to any more restrictions Response to Question 4: No alternatives Please! Response to Question 5: Rangers need to stop harrassing locals & Tourists.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63117
1276	Response to Question 1: Absolutely No Action/No Modification! Response to Question 2: No More Restrictions on access & using it. Response to Question 3: No more restrictions! Response to Question 4: I use it all--leave it alone Response to Question 5: Keep it open so all can use it for lots of different activities.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63043
1277	Response to Quesiton 1: No action Response to Question 2: None, take away needless current restrictions (horsepower limits) Response to Question 3: Any horsepower limits Response to Question 4: Round spring Response to Question 5: Quit hiding in the bushes, that makes you all look like dipshits.	8/28/2009	No			MO	63660
1278	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Don't implement further restrictions on access and recreation Response to Question 3: --No further complicated restrictions --No wilders area Response to Question 4: Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: Keep things simple, don't have law enforcement hiding in the bushes	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955
1279	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: Leave as it is Response to Question 3: Don't Restrict Any Users Response to Question 4: No Action so we can All use the Resorce Response to Question 5: Stop the people who Abuse our Resorce	9/2/2009	No			MO	63629
1280	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: no change Response to Quesiton 3: any changes Response to Question 5: Turn Bears loose, so the can eat ranger who hide in the bushes.	8/28/2009	No			MO	65807
1281	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Nothing no change Response to Question 3: Anything that has to do w/change Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: Hire local ppl to work there not ppl from god knows where	8/28/2009	No			MO	64429
1282	Response to Question 1: No change Response to Question 2: Leave it Alone Response to Question 3: We swim fish and have fun don't bother it. Response to Question 4: Stop botering people on the River. Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965

1283	Response to Question 1: No-Action, there needs to be erosion control. Response to Question 5: There needs to be more trash cans and bathrooms.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1284	Response to Question 1: No-Action will be the best Response to Question 2: There should be no changes. Response to Question 3: I don't think alternatives A, B, or C should be included ever. Response to Question 4: No changes should happen. Response to Question 5: Leave everything the way it is.	9/16/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1285	Response to Question 1: Alternative B Response to Question 2: Alternative B Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Two rivers, local people areas Response to Question 5: I think, sence glass contaners are legal on rivers, bussnesses should not be allowed to sell glass contaners near the rivers. Should alow local area.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1286	Response to Question 2: No action and Alternative C. Response to Question 3: Alternative A and B. Response to Question 4: The current river, and Jacks fork.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1287	Response to Question 2: Allow more freedom on waterways. Allow more access to rivers and streams. Thanks for the good roads into the area, just keep them open for all of us. Response to Question 3: Less control over the lands surrounding Parks & waterways. Less control of private lands. Response to Question 4: All areas around Shannon Co, Texas Co and surrounding counties. This area needs to be left as it is and kept available to all people. We don't need Lakes but pure streams. Response to Question 5: Rangers should not be allowed to have so much control such as--searching canoers property without good reason--not allowing horses or vehicles in the water. We love our streams as they are and don't need more govt. control on us.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1288	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and reactional use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit various parts of ONSR every year. Response to Question 5: NPS personnel should be visible and deal with situations in a positive non-confrontational manner.	9/16/2009	No			TX	77532
1289	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. Response to Question 5: Implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional and courteous at all times.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1290	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Quesiton 4: Lower Current Response to Question 5: NPS should support rather than compete with private enterprise. These sections of Missouri don't have much private enterprise--it's important that NPS take steps not to harm the local economy --NPS personnel should be friendly and interact amicably with visitors rather than "undercover cops" in the inner city.	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955
1291	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the lower current annually.	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955
1292	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the upper current annually.	9/16/2009	No			IL	62819
1293	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. Response to Question 5: Keep government bureaucracy to a minimum. NPS should not compete with private enterprise to provide goods & services.	9/16/2009	No			TX	76109
1294	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the upper current of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: NPS personnel should be visible & deal with situations in a positive non-confrontational manner. NPS should not compete with private enterprise to provide goods and services.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1295	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. Response to Question 5: *Keep things simple *Keep government bureaucracy to a minimum	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1296	Response to Question 1: No action! Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. Response to Question 5: -implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional & courteous at all times. --Keep things simple.	9/16/2009	No			TX	77331

1297	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned w/all parts of ONSR. I visit various parts of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: --NPS personnel should be visible & deal w/situations in a positive non-confrontational manner. --NPS should not compete w/private enterprise to provide goods & services.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63135
1298	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further Restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further Restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the upper current of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: --Keep government bureaucracy to a minimum. --NPS personnel should be visible & deal with situations in a positive non-confrontational manner.	9/16/2009	No			TX	75204
1299	Response to Question 1: No Action we need to do away with some of the restrictions we now have. Response to Question 2: Take no action and add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restictions of any kind Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the current and Jacks fort Rivers. no because any other alternatives add more restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes. better trash control, more boat ramps, more patrolling on the rivers and better handicapped accesses.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1300	Response to Question 1: No-Action we need to do away with some of the restrictions that are on us now. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the current River and Jacks fork River. No, because every alternative adds restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes. more trash control and better patrolling of riverways.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1301	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No futher Restrictions Response to Question 3: underage drinking Response to Question 4: all areas Response to Question 5: Boat Safety	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
1302	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the lower current of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: --NPS personnel should be visible and deal with situations in a positive non-confrontational manner. --Keep government bureaucracy to a minimum.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63043
1303	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I visit various parts of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: 1) Keep things simple. 2) Implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional and courteous at all times.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1304	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Don't make regulations more complex Response to Question 3: No Further Limits on recreation or access NPS shouldn't compete with private Co's Response to Question 4: Lower Current Response to Question 5: NPS should provide better details as to proposed actions, reasons, costs, and specific results	9/16/2009	No			MO	63021
1305	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No more restrictions on access and recreation Response to Question 3: No more restrictions and NPS regulations Response to Question 4: All Response to Question 5: --NPS needs to better define actions, reasons for actions, beginning and ongoing costs and results to be achieved --Coordinate with rather than compete with small business	9/16/2009	No			OH	44646
1306	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: Just leave things yow they are forever. Response to Question 4: Big Creek, Circle B, martin hole	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1307	Response to Question 1: No-Action, Because it is not hurting a thing. On both rivers. Response to Question 2: No-Action or C on both rivers. Response to Question 3: A, b, sould not be used in the future. Response to Question 4: I like all of the 134 miles of current and Jack fork rivers. So leave it alone. no Action or C. Response to Question 5: no, just leave it alone. no Action or C.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65560
1308	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. Response to Question 5: --Implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional and courteous at all times. --Keep things simple.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1309	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 5: Keep things simple	9/16/2009	No			MO	63645
1310	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Do not add more restrictions Response to Question 3: Leave management policies as they are. Response to Question 4: I like it all but I don't think more restrictions is the correct way to solve the problems. Response to Question 5: Improve the enforcement of management where the problems are without putting more restrictions on the ones that don't create problems.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63848
1311	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: no further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 5: Keep things simple	9/16/2009	No			MO	63357

1312	Response to Question 1: (No Action!!!) Response to Question 2: No Further Actions Response to Question 3: Keep it the way it is now. Response to Question 4: They're some places on current River that are considered (Party Spots) and they do get out of hand sometimes. Enforce the Law on those and Let others enjoy the beautiful outdoors. Campers, visitors, tourists, floaters, canoes, bring in great Revenues for these areas. Response to Question 5: Let people know what you're Planning to do & Explain your reasoning. Put Articles in Newspapers & on News segments.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63848
1313	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 5 Keep things simple	9/16/2009	No			MO	63357
1314	Response to Question 1: All these plans are too confusing. I like it the way its always been so I vote-No Action. Response to Question 2: No more rules Response to Question 3: No more rules Response to Question 4: Our family has floated the Current river for years. We like it the way it is Response to Question 5: Please keep management at a minimum.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1315	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use! Response to Question 3: No further actions! Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of Ozark Nat'l Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 5: Leave it the way it is! NPS should explain, in detail, the proposed plan to be achieved. I feel that things have been fine in the past & no change is necessary!	9/16/2009	No			MO	63848
1316	Response to Question 1: No action Please Response to Question 2: No restrictons please Response to Question 3: Restricton on access and usage Response to Question 4: I use it all--no more restrictons Response to Question 5: Please keep it simple!	9/16/2009	No			MO	63141
1317	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action of Any Sort Response to Question 3: This is my River Leave it Alone Response to Question 4: My Famiy Always using it For boating & Fishing Leave it Alone Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1318	Response to Question 1: No Actions Response to Question 2: Please don't change our river its beautiful park service should be out so people can see them instead of hiding in the woods. Response to Question 3: No Change in using Response to Question 4: I use it all leave it alone Response to Question 5: Keep it open for all to use and enjoy	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1319	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action or C Response to Question 3: A and B Response to Question 4: From Akers Ferry to two rivers and from Alley to two rivers. Response to Question 5: Clean the cans out of the river	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1320	Response to Question 1: No-Action. We need to lift some of the current restrictions. Response to Question 2: To take no-action and add more accesess to undeveloped primative areas. Response to Question 3: Any new restrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: Upper reaches of Current and Jacks Fork. No, because every alternative adds restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes. There needs to be more accesess to the river, more park rangers actually on the water patrolling properly, and less restrictions.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1321	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the upper current once a year. Response to Question 5: 1) NPS should not compete with private enterprise to provide goods and services. 2) Implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional & courteous at all times.	9/16/2009	No			CA	93309
1322	Response to Question 1: No Action. Better focus of NPS on problems Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on recreation and access Response to Question 3: --wilderness designation--further regulations, complicated rules, admistered by arrogant NPS personel Response to Question 4: All areas--No Action with with improvemets Response to Question 5: NPS should be courteous, helpful, and professional rather than "undercover cops"	9/16/2009	No			TX	77508
1323	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: Don't make more zones & restrictons Keep things simple Response to Question 3: --Don't make more restrictions --Keep government bureaucratic stuff to a minimum Response to Question 4: Jacks Fork Lower Current Response to Question 5: Provide a less complicated descripton of plans with reasons as to why you want to do something.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63021
1324	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: --No further development Response to Question 3: We don't need any additional restrictions on access or recreation Response to Question 4: All areas of ONSR. I visit various parts annually Response to Question 5: Focus on the 5% who make trouble rather than everyone--Be visible	9/16/2009	No			MO	63021
1325	Response to Question 1: No-Action. It doesn't need changed because there is no reason to take anything awy when we go to the river every week and these other areas around hear. Response to Question 2: The No-Action and Alternative C. Response to Question 4: Big creek.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1326	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. Response to Question 5: --Implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional & courteous at all times. --Keep things simple	9/16/2009	No			CO	80502

1327	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit the lower current multiple times a year. Response to Question 5: --Keep government bureaucracy to a minimum. --NPS should not compete with private enterprise to provide goods and services.	9/16/2009	No			IL	62028
1328	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restriction on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am very concerned with all parts of ONSR.	9/16/2009	No			OK	74169
1329	Response to Question 1: Leave it alone. No Action Response to Question 2: The future is No Action Response to Question 3: No government control Leave it Alone Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Stop hiding in bushes!	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1330	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Furture Restrictions on access ^ Receation use Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63841
1331	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No restriction on Acess or Recreational Usage Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63960
1332	Response to Question 1: No Action To Be Taken on This. Response to Question 2: No Further Changes Should Be Made. Cut the Bureaucracy Cost From the Park Service. Response to Question 3: The Park Service Should Do No More Restrictions To The People Using The River. Response to Question 4: I Live At Deer Run And The Whole River is important To me To Use For Boating, Floating, and Fishing. Response to Question 5: I Think The Government And Bureaucracyes Should Not Restrict My Freedom And Taker Care of Their Own Business Not Mine.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1333	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: We use the river all the time Make no changes Response to Question 3: No more restrictions don't limit us Response to Question 4: I fish, I boat, I swim. No changes	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1334	Response to Question 1: (No Action) Less Restrictions For Example open up Roads That Have Been Closed Down. To Allow More Access To The Beautiful River. That People May Enjoy Especially People that are Disable or the Elderly That Are Not Able to Walk Long Distance Response to Question 2: (No Action) Response to Question 3: A.B.C Should Not Be Included Response to Question 4: I Enjoy Camping Fishing Giggig Swiming Boating & Driving Along Access Roads To The Beautiful Current River. From Below Doniphan To Two Rivers. I Feel Like That Alternatives A, B, C, Would Not Help. But Limit People From Doing things That They Love To Do on the River And Along the River. Response to Question 5: There Needs Be Strong Restrictions on the Use of Alcohol On The River. Also I Have Observed That The Tube Floaters Are The Main Reason For Pollution In The River and Along the River.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63937
1335	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Future Restirction on Access Recation Use Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63801
1336	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Additional Restrictions Response to Question 5: Conform to existing plan	9/14/2009	No			MO	63965
1337	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: People should have total unrestriced acess. Response to Question 3: Should be no primitive areas.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1338	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 3: I don't feel like we need any help perserving our area.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1339	Response to Question 1: No action No action No action No action Response to Question 2: No action No action No action Response to Question 3: ABC and any other restictions! Response to Question 4: Love every inch of the river, Don't change a thing.	9/14/2009	No			MO	63541
1340	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A & B & C Response to Question 4: Everywhere I Love/No Action	9/14/2009	No			MO	63561
1341	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A,B,C Response to Question 4: Current River, No-Action Response to Question 5: leave everything alone/stay the same	9/14/2009	No			MO	63501

1342	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: all of them except No-Action Response to Question 4: all of the river, No-Action address those beloved places adequately Response to Question 5: No Action is the best Action	9/14/2009	No			MO	65546
1343	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: B C A Response to Question 4: No Action	9/14/2009	No			MO	63561
1344	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: local ideas 10 to 1 over out of town ppls ideas Response to Question 3: any changes Response to Question 5: ask the local people more what they think, it is their park.	8/28/2009	No			MO	63122
1345	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Nothing the are all stupid Response to Question 3: anything the tree huggers would like Response to Question 4: I really like the Eminence Area Response to Question 5: Hire local rangers, the actually would know something	8/28/2009	No			MO	65233
1346	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Add gators Response to Question 3: any changes Response to Question 4: I like the Back Hollow area best, add a better bathroom there Response to Question 5: Turn gators loose who dont like people, who want to change peoples way of life	8/28/2009	No			MO	63144
1347	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Local enjoyment, the people down there dont try to come here and run our lives Response to Question 3: Any ristrictions Response to Question 4: I like the Alley Springs Area Response to Question 5: Open up more roads to the river. Locals police the area better then you people	8/28/2009	No			MO	63382
1348	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Not to limit Rec. use Response to Question 3: limited rec. use Response to Question 5: enforce current laws on waterways.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1349	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: Not to limit recreational use Response to Question 3: limited recreational use. Response to Question 4: all of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway areas allows a trip that includes boating, floating, camping, hiking, fishing, swimming family & friends in one stop. No-action is my vote. Response to Question 5: enforce current laws on the water.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65438
1350	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: do not limit use Response to Question 3: limited recreational use Response to Question 5: enforce current laws	9/14/2009	No			MO	65548
1351	Response to Question 1: No Action should be taken. Response to Question 2: None of the alternatives A, B or C Response to Question 3: All of A, B or C should not be. Response to Question 4: All locations are important to me. And none of the alternatives address. Response to Question 5: Better bathroom faciltys & cleaner ones.	9/14/2009	No			MO	63901
1352	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: Not to limit recreational use Response to Question 3: limited recreational use Response to Question 5: Enforce laws on waterways	9/14/2009	No			MO	65793
1353	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Horse power Limits on River Response to Question 4: Van Buren Mo. to Blue Spings	9/14/2009	No			MO	63965
1354	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Horse power Limits on River Response to Question 4: Van Buren Mo. To Blue Spring	9/14/2009	No			MO	63639
1355	Response to Question 1: I don't think any action should be taken. The river is just fine how it is. Response to Question 2: None, I feel strongly about leaving the river alone. Response to Question 3: All of them. Response to Question 5: The floaters should have more respect for the local boat OP This could be resolved by having less floaters on the river at one time, huge groups cause problems, & trouble	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1356	Response to Question 1: No-Action any other option will harm both the local and state economy. This river is enjoyed by so many people--generation after generation. Let us continue to do that. Response to Question 2: No-Action--Riverways should be protecting our rights and support conservation--the other options are NOT conservation, they are not protecting our river--they are stealing it. Response to Question 3: No-Action--the current regulations are helpful--but further regulations are an unnecessary and Radical option that will not benefit anyone and certainly not benefit the river itself Response to Question 4: From Paint Rock to Doniphan--our families have enjoyed and lived from the river for generations. This is the same as the theft of lands from the indians (the first time) Response to Question 5: No-Action The current laws are great--but anything further would simply be nonsense. I dont see the benefit of taking away a natural beauty, shutting down an entire town--jobs lost--when its simply not realistic.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965

1357	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I believe that we are safe with the motors as is. There have been no accidents that I am aware of on the Curent River. As a matter of fact--I remember old days when we use 20 h.p prop motors and they were alot more dangerous because we had to jump out & pull loaded boats over shallow areas. The bigger motor & jets units are better because they go faster through these shallow areas and are safer than jumping out to pull over shoals.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1358	Response to Question 1: (No Action) Reason being, NO Boating fatalities in over 30 years People are smart enough to be careful in congested areas. NO research showing Enviromental damage from boats Newer bigger boats are safer Response to Question 2: None. The stretch of the river from Van Buren bridge to the Spring boat ramp should be opened to all boat traffic. Response to Question 3: (A, B, and C) Should not be options due to the financial impact on the entire area from Salem to Doniphan. The Riverways was created to Protect are rights of usage not take them away. Response to Question 4: I've Troutt fished at Montarik, and Camps and boat ride below Big Springs. We canoe Jacks Fork and Upper Current. Its all special to me and my family. Please don't take this right away from my children. Response to Question 5: More Boat ramps, open the Stretch from V.B. Bridge to the Spring. Concentrate law enforcement in problem areas. Don't limit everyones rights of usage. (I've never got a ticket in 30 years of boating) why should I Suffer	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1359	Response to Question 1: No-Action How can someone in Denver Co. know what best for us on or the River! Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: Add more Boat Ramps & maintain them.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1360	Response to Question 1: No Action--Plus take the Gap off on the H.P. Limit--No H.P. Limit from Van Buren down Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Any H.P. restrictions on O.S.R Response to Question 4: I feel there should be no restrictions Response to Question 5: Not take the advice of 376 comments	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1361	Response to Question 1: Yes--"No Action" is the Way To Go. Reopen Areas Currently Closed To Public Access. Loosen Up On Existing Motorboat Restrictions. Response to Question 2: None--I Choose "No Action." Response to Question 3: All--I Choose "No Action" Response to Question 4: I enjoy driving all the roads in the park, viewing the river from as many places as possible. Please reopen closed roads. Response to Question 5: Provide more visitor activities related to the natural & folk history of the area.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65588
1362	Response to Question 1: My choice is "No Action." Do not put any new restrictions on ANY ACTIVITIES currently enjoyed. Consider easing up on existing restrictions. Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL--no new restrictions. Response to Question 4: Open up roads currently closed. Make historic sites more accessible. Ease up on current motor boat restrictions. Provide for more diverse visitor activities. Response to Question 5: Provide more visitor activities related to the natural & folk history of the area. Hire locals to demonstrate traditional crafts & life ways.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65588
1363	Response to Question 1: I am in favor only of the "NO ACTION" alternative. Shannon County relies heavily on the tourists for its economy--motels, restaurants, canoe rentals, horseback trail rides & other businesses. Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL The regulations need to be eased up. Sales of boats & motors are drastically reduced, due to possible additional regulations. The economy here would be crushed. Response to Question 4: The "NO ACTION" alternative best addresses the needs of the local population including myself. An easing of current restrictions would make the situation even more agreeable. Response to Question 5: Make the visitor experience more welcoming--from the demeanor of the Park rangers to the variety of activities that could be provided.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65588
1364	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: No added restrictions Response to Question 5: Keep the original plan and follow it.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65102
1365	Response to Question 1: MY CHOICE IS "NO ACTION." SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS WOULD INCLUDE REOPENING CLOSED ROADS, LESS RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLIC ACCESS & MORE ACTIVITIES DEMONSTRATING FOLK WAYS. Response to Question 2: THE "NO ACTION" ALTERNATIVE IS MY SELECTION. THEREFORE, QUESTION #2 DOES NOT APPLY. Response to Question 3: DO NOT CHANGE ANY MORE REGULATIONS. THE "NO ACTION" PLAN IS BEST. QUESTION #3 DOES NOT APPLY. Response to Question 4: I LIKE TO VIEW THE RIVER FROM AS MANY ACCESS POINTS (ROADS) AS POSSIBLE. i ALSO LIKE TO VISIT HISTORIC SITES, AND HOPE THAT THOSE WHICH ARE NOT EASILY ACCESSIBLE WILL BECOME MORE ACCESSIBLE. Response to Question 5: PROVIDE FREQUENT DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE TRADITIONAL OZARK FOLK WAYS--SORGHUM MAKING, WEAVING, BLACKSMITHING, ETC. HIRE LOCALS TO DO THE DEMONSTRATIONS.	9/4/2009	No			MO	65588
1366	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Not to limit Recreational usse Response to Question 3: limited Rec. use Response to Question 5: Enforce current waterway laws.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1367	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Not to limit recreational use Response to Question 3: Limited recreational use Response to Question 5: Enforce current laws on waterways	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1368	Response to Question 1: Absolutely Not! The way to make it closer to what I want is to have "No Action Plan." Response to Question 2: The "No Action Alternative." I also feel that the HP restriction should be removed. I feel that having a lower HP would make it more dangerous for the families. I feel there will be more accidents due to large families trying to motor up our river. Response to Question 3: A, B & C--I have been on	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638

	this river since I was 8 yrs old. I grew up on this river with my sisters & parents. When I then had my children I am raising them on this river. When we motor around & see trash my boys will ALWAYS pick it up. We respect the river as well as alot of other families. Response to Question 4: None at all!! I have always & still am enjoying almost all of the 134 miles of Current River. We like to take our children & just ride because no matter how many times you go you will always see something new. And when my children get excited about being on the river it makes me excited!! Response to Question 5: We just need to follow the rules & use common sense. I would like to see the HP limitation gone. This is the one thing that my family can do together & everyone enjoy it. My boys look forward to the weekend so we can go boating, swimming or floating. I just ask please dont take this from my family! Thank you--						
1369	Response to Question 1: No Action, I See No Need for change. Response to Question 2: Alternate C to reduce boating accidents by establishing 40 H Is Not as effective as providing boating training. Response to Question 3: ALT OPTIONS WITH NON-MOTORIZED should NOT BE ALLOWED TO PASS Response to Question 4: The Gravel Bars are rising due to the erosion upstream. The gravel should be cleared to be removed and used or Pulled to allow for fish to spawn and allow for the banks to be shared. Response to Question 5: COUNTIES APPROVEL to pull and use gravel for road and infastructure improvement.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63664
1370	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Limit to 25 horse--I believe unfair Will damage economic viability of Van Buren & other towns Response to Question 4: Big Springs should be protected. Response to Question 5: Existing limitations are sufficient	6/22/2009	No			MO	63105
1371	Response to Question 1: No Action taken Go Back to No motor restriction Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Remove A, B & C	6/22/2009	No			MO	65560
1372	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Follow existing plan Response to Question 3: No additional restrictions Response to Question 5: Keep the existing plan & follow it.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65043
1373	Response to Question 1: No-Action plus take the H.P. limit from Van Buren down Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Any H.P. restrictions Response to Question 4: I feel there should be no restrictions Response to Question 5: Not take the advise of 376 comments	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1374	Response to Question 1: I would say "No-Action" is the best solution! Response to Question 2: Don't do anything. If you have to restric anything, it should be on the floaters. They are pluggin the river. Response to Question 3: Alternative A, don't take the river away from the locals. People don't have a chance to enjoy it, if they are not on it. Response to Question 4: N.A. Response to Question 5: Maybe some restriction on the floaters, they can be on the river, but there's way to many of them. Especially in the weekend.	6/22/2009	No			DENMA RK	None
1375	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Not to limit Rec. use Response to Question 3: limited Rec use Response to Question 5: enforce current laws on waterways	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1376	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No limitations on recreational use Response to Question 3: limited recreation use Response to Question 4: All 134 miles should be available for use by families for boating, swimming, camping, hiking, fishing, ect. Response to Question 5: Current laws should be enforced	9/14/2009	No			MT	65775
1377	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: There should be no limitations within reason Response to Question 3: Do not limit recreational use Response to Question 4: People have enjoyed these riverways for years with family and frends and that should continue without limits Response to Question 5: Enforce current laws to make the riverways enjoyable for everyone	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1378	Response to Question 1: A minimum is No Action. Response to Question 2: Greater accessability. Response to Question 3: I believe that any Government property should have full accessability with exception to any property that might warrant a threat to National security. Since 1962 or 1964 when a threat of a damm was proposed the USPS. They spent more money denying access. than it would cost to improve access. Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are special to me. as we the people of the United States of America own this ground. Not the USPS. They are a service that was created of the By the people to insure & improve access to the Riverways By all people. Response to Question 5: Of course. All canoes that access the rivers through a private intity should have a barcode on it that is registered to the state of Missouri. With three barcode readers available. 1. at the state level. 2. at the Park service (Park ranger boat) 3. @ the conoe Rental. So that all taxes are paid. All engines whether it is a paddle or a propeller has somebody operating. Common sense rules over stupidity everytime. I think that the USPS should improve access not deny it. Which is what they are proposing. they want to deny use of the propeller and listen to the paddle. All motor driven vehicles are stiffly regulated not canoe paddles.	9/2/2009	No			IL	61554
1379	Response to Question 1: No Action we need to do away with some of the restrictions we already have in place. Response to Question 2: Take no action and add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the current and Jacks Fork Rivers. No because any other alternative adds more restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes, more boat ramps, better trash control and handicapped access areas.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588

1380	Response to Question 1: No action taken Remove curent Restriction's	6/22/2009	No			MO	65456
1381	Response to Question 1: No Action Give everyone the Right to enjoy the entire River Response to Question 3: the restriction's should not be in the alternatives	6/22/2009	No			MO	63601
1382	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I would modify it by allowing the Horsepower Limit to be dropped from Oct. 1st through May 1st. This way boaters that would not normally get to see other parts of the river will have the opportunity. Response to Question 2: None--I do not agree with any of the alternatives--only the No Action. Response to Question 3: I feel that the NPS has not yet created a GOOD preliminary alternative plan. Response to Question 4: The river is the most special to my family and I. If any of the alternatives were to pass this would eliminate my family and I from enjoying the Ozark Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 5: I would like to see the tubers and canoers have to register their watercraft and be held to some of the same standards as the boaters have to follow.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1383	Response to Question 1: No Action. I think the river is great the way it is. All the other alternatives will cost the govt lots of money and won't bring revenue to the small towns. Response to Question 2: No Action--keep it how it is. Response to Question 3: No Action--No restrictions on Horse Power or limitations on recreational activities. Response to Question 4: The Van Buren Are. We have a home on the river and spend every weekend here. We love it but if they take away our boats and recreation we will leave and so will most people causing the revenue in VB to drop considerably. Response to Question 5: if restrictions are put on HP, the areas of the river where it is not regulated will be overcrowded and dangerous. Hire more park service to regulate but leave everything else the same.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1384	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION IS THE BEST OPTION. CAUSE BY BANNING BOATS ITS GONNA KILL THE REVENUE ALL AROUND. Response to Question 2: NO ACTION ITS GREAT THE WAY IT IS. Response to Question 3: NO RESTRICTIONS ON H.P. ON BOATS Response to Question 4: NO JUST KEEP THINGS THE WAY THEY ARE. Response to Question 5: NO ACTION	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1385	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 5: motors should be rated at pump, not the power head! We are all fine tell the govt messes it up!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63945
1386	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C. Response to Question 5: Let the people enjoy the River their way, not yours, this is the U.S.A	6/22/2009	No			MO	63945
1387	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 5: Leave it Alone	6/22/2009	No			MO	63961
1388	Response to Question 1: I think the Federal Government should pack up and Leave and Let the State and the Local people decide, no-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1389	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: The No-Action should be followed & motors should be rated at the pump Response to Question 3: A, B, C The people should be free to use their land! Response to Question 5: The families that use that River should not be punished & be able to enjoy the River with their kids As they Always have!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63945
1390	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: People should have total un-restrive Acess. Response to Question 3: There should be no primitive Areas.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1391	Response to Question 1: "No Action" We have enough restrictions on the river's. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: No New restriction's. Response to Question 4: Camping down Alley Springs and floating. Floating and fishing from Cedar Grove to Akers don't close floating axcess and camping at these places. Thank you. Response to Question 5: all the local people doing crafts and folk ways.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1392	Response to Question 1: No Action we need to do away with some of the restrictions that are on us now. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accessess to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. No, because every alternative adds restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes, more boat ramps and better trash control.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1393	Response to Question 1: No-Action. We need to lift some of the current restrictions. Response to Question 2: to take no-action and add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: upper reaches of Current and Jack's Fork. No, because every alternative adds restrictions Response to Question 5: Yes there needs to be more accesses to the river, more Park Rangers actually on the water Partoling Properly, and less restrictions	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466

1394	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 5: People don't need to bring trash along the rivers.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1395	Response to Question 1: No Action we need to do away with some of the restrictions we have now. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. No, because any alternative adds restrictions. Response to Question: Yess, better trash control and more boat ramps.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1396	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: We Live here. We are not Tourists. My ancesters have Been here over one hundred Fifty years. The Rivers are in worst condition now since The Park Service Took control. Response to Question 3: Closing acess to Riverway Response to Question 4: all of the 134 miles Response to Question 5: Stop Harrasing the Residents of This area, and Start Checking Canoes activeleys	9/2/2009	No			MO	65588
1397	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: not to limit Rec. use Response to Question 3: Limited rec. use Response to Question 5: Enforce current laws on the water ways.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1398	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Not to Limit recreational use Response to Question 3: Limited recreational use Response to Question 5: Enforce Current Laws on Waterways	9/14/2009	No			MO	65606
1399	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Not to limit recreational use. Response to Question 3: Limited Recreational Us Response to Question 5: Enfore current laws on water ways	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1400	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Not to limit recratinal use Response to Question 3: limited recreational use Response to Question 5: Keep Current laws on waterways	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
1401	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Response to Question 3: everything but no action Response to Question 4: Powder Mill is great	8/28/2009	No			MO	65251
1402	Response to Question 1: No Action. I would remove all horse power limits. All you people seem to want to do restrict the locals Response to Question 2: Make it more local friendly, they are the ones that enjoy/use the rivers everyday. Response to Question 3: Any thing that restricts local enjoyment. Response to Question 4: I like upper current Response to Question 5: Ask the locals more for what they think.	8/28/2009	No			MO	63107
1403	Response to Question 1: Definately No Action Response to Question 2: The river and land is for everyone To use Response to Question 3: *Restrictions should not be included in future management Response to Question 4: Do away with the alternatives, Leave the river and forest alone. Response to Question 5: Reinforce that rangers need to be courteous and helpful and not accuse people of breaking laws. I have been stopped numerous times with assumptions and accusations thru the years and at no time was I or we breaking any law	9/16/2009	No			MO	63124
1404	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Further Restriction. Response to Question 3: This is our river Not Your's Leave it Alone. Response to Question 4: We camp out and use the river to swim. Response to Question 5: get ot of woods and Get on the River & watch more whats going on.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1405	Response to Question 1: The only one close would be No-Action, I think we need to stop putting Regulations on Local Entertainment. Down In our neck of the woods this is most of the things to do around here. Unlike the Big cities. And most of the tourist just come once or twice a year. This is our Heritage & way of Life. Response to Question 3: Leave out the clubs like Sierra or others that want to control our life. Response to Question 4: I only use about 40 to 50 miles of it for the most part. My mom was born on the River & had a farm there. So I hate to see a part of my heritage take away or limited.	8/31/2009	No			MO	65560
1406	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: I love the River and live on the river don't change anything. Response to Question 3: Take a lot of pressure off o the Tourist they are not all bad. Response to Question 4: I fish and want to continue doing so. Response to Question 5: Keep it open for all to enjoy	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1407	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on Access and recreational use Response to Question 3: Don't implement any furthe restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I'm concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit various parts of the current river every year. Response to Question 5: *Keep things simple *Keep gov't bureaucrcy to a minimum. *Ensure that all NPS personnel are professional and courteous at all times.	9/16/2009	No			CO	80502
1408	Response to Question 1: No Action we need to do away with the restrictions we have already. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accesess to undeveloped primitive areas Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers no, because any other alternative adds restrictions Response to Question 5: yes, more patrolling and better trash control along riverways	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588

1409	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: We should have access to all areas. We have lived in these hills for 50 years and more.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1410	Response to Question 1: No Action we need to do away with the restrictions we have now. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. no, because any other alternative adds restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes, better trash control, more patrolling on the river, and more boat ramps.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1411	Response to Question 1: No Action -B. I think we need to Reverse current Restrictions! Response to Question 2: Take no action, An we need to add more accesses to undeveloped areas. Response to Question 3: Any new Resrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: Upper reaches Jacks Fork on Current River no, every alternative adds Resricktions Response to Question 5: Yes! -B. more boat access, An Rangers need do more on the River Rather then hidding in Bushes trying 2 write tickets!	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1412	Response to Question 1: No Action. Would like to see more Park personnel in uniform, visable to help inform and add to the pleasure of the Riverways. Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage and access. Response to Question 3: Restrict usage & access. Response to Question 5: More restrooms.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1413	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: No Action! Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action! Response to Question 5: Leave it Alone!!	9/8/2009	No			MO	65440
1414	Response to Question 1: "NO ACTION" is my only & exclusive choice. Do not put any more restrictions on ANY activities currently enjoyed. Even better, loosen up some existing regulations. Response to Question 2: The "NO ACTION" alternative, my choice, does not provide for including items from options A, B or C. Response to Question 3: The "NO ACTION" alternative, my choice, does not provide for eliminating items from options A, B or C. Response to Question 4: The "NO ACTION" alternative could be improved upon by opening up roads which are currently closed, and making historic sites more accessible. Response to Question 5: Employ local people to demonstrate traditional folkways on a regular basis. Have Park rangers be more of a help to visitors rather than give the impression of being only "police."	9/2/2009	No			MO	65588
1415	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I would like the horsepower to read 40 horsepower at the pump. Response to Question 2: I feel very strongly about the NO ACTION it allows equal access for all. Response to Question 3: Plans A, B & C place limitations on access and recreation. Response to Question 4: My family and I have always enjoyed and hope to continue enjoying camping, boating, fishing, hunting, and trail riding. The river is a beautiful place to take your family. Response to Question 5: More and better boat ramps, more law enforcement during heavy use.	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1416	Response to Question 1: No-Action I feel would be the best plan. I think that the Horsepower should be unlimited. Response to Question 2: The current plan allows more people to use the river. Plans A, B & C would restrict people. Response to Question 3: A, B & C restrict the use & access to the river Response to Question 4: My concerns are that the places I have grown-up camping, Hunting, Boating & trail riding are being elemited by your plan's. The river is as nice as I can recall. Response to Question 5: More enforcement of the laws, we never see any Public officer on the river on week-ends in the summer	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1417	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: outboard motors should be left same as they are now. Also no changes to the Big Springs Park Response to Question 4: All Areas in Carter Co. should be left as they are now.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1418	Response to Question 1: The "NO ACTION" alternative most closely embodies what I envision as a PLAN for the next 20+ years. Shannon Countuy is a tourist area, and our revenue comes from motels, restaurants, trail rides, canoe rentals and related businesses. Response to Qesiton 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL--motorboat sales have almost come to a standstill. Outsiders fear they won't be able to come here & enjoy the activities they are accustomed to. We could lose business even before the new GMP takes effect. Response to Question 4: Why change for the sake of change? Things are good now, although an easing of restrictions currently in place would make the situation more economically viable for local businesses. Response to Question 5: Maybe you should look at the situation as though visitors were coming to your home. That is how we welcome people visiting this area. Rules that have no proven need are not welcoming.	9/11/2009	No			MO	65588
1419	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: The Area from Vanburan to Aker's ferry should be left aas is. We all pay taxes & should be able to enjoy the river the same as everyone else. The people in Canoe's are most likely to be the one's that are the problem	9/8/2009	No			MO	63629
1420	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative We need a local advisory board to overssee the park as we had in the beginning. Response to Question 2: I believe it is very important that the original Legislation for ONSR be prserved for the people to be able to enjoy the Park as we were promised when our land was taken. Many of those promises have been broken. Response to Question 3: Alternative A, Alternative B, alternative C The purpose of the Park was to preserve the riverways as well as our culture so that it would be passed on for future generations not make it a wilderness area with a lot of rules and regulations. Response to Question 4: I find the park to be depressing compared to how the area was before the park came. A prime example is the difference in Alley Springs now and when it was managed by the State of Missouri and people resided on the land. If you do not use something you loose it. Response to Question 5: I would like the experience to be a more user friendly Park. Park Rangers need to make their pressence visible and helpful. We should have unrestricted recreation through out the park	9/8/2009	No			MO	65466

1421	Response to Question 1: I prefer Alternative A. Use loss motors. Protect the fisheries, water quality, hell bender. Limit motor noise Protect the resource. I prefer natural experience, I want to hear the wood ducks, herons & crows, instead of motors. Response to Question 2: Eliminate motors if water quality suffers. Keep the river natural, and restrict use if necessary, the river protection should come first. Response to Question 3: Do not increase motor size. Response to Question 4: The Jacks Fork river west & north of Eminence. The upper current between Beal & Waymeyer. Alternative A comes the closest. Response to Question 5: 1) Ban alcohol on river. 2) Limit motor size to 25 HP. 3) Prohibit styrofoam containers. 4) Limit or do not expand parking in overused areas. 5) Increase parking in low use areas. 6) Limit access. 7) Keep horses out of the river.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63965
1422	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 4: I think it is important to keep access points open for people to utilize areas families have used for generations.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1423	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Should be followed Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 5: Why would the govt want to take away their own "brother & sisters" land & enjoyment. Keep your Nose on your own face!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1424	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action plan Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 5: motor should be Rated at the pump. Quit changing the Rules for no Reason other than Communisim!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1425	Response to Question 1: I would advocate no change except to remove the h.p. limit at big springs. There is no logical reason for it Response to Question 2: No Action is the best action Response to Question 3: Alternative A & B look like the beginning of a Federal land grab. Both plans call for big gov. spending, as does Alt. C. Response to Question 4: Just leave it alone	6/22/2009	No			MO	63936
1426	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None, more open. Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All are special, limited Access to these places will not make them special. Response to Question 5: Place more law enforcment along troubled area's.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65588
1427	Response to Question 1: No action, reason Being is because the riverway's are fine the way they are, It take's the economy away from our fine area, and less jobs for people all around the 134 miles of riverways. Response to Question 2: None, more riverways open Response to Question 3: The A, B, C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are special Because I like the view's that you can see in a boat or canoe if taken away, cannot show my Future Family what I was raised around. Response to Question 5: Open the stretch From Van Buren Bridge to Big Spring's Boat ramp, If people take away the Boat or Canoe's off the river what can u do with ur family without goin 100 mile's to take Boat ride or Canoe ride's.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65438
1428	Response to Question 1: No Action leave things as the are now!	6/22/2009	No			MO	64850
1429	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 5: Increase the littering fines. Less covert law enforcement, get out of the woods & become visual presence.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1430	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 5: Leave alone	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1431	Response to Question 1: No Action Every person has the same rights as another	6/22/2009	No			MO	63625
1432	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C. Response to Question 4: I feel all 134 miles of the riverway should be able for anyone to enjoy without any restrictions that would enable anyone to enjoy the Ozarks Riverways Response to Question 5: Instead of trying to make money on the Rivers for the government try to let all people enjoy & if anyone is caught abusingthe priviledges they should be handled individually instead of finger point - group solving out	6/22/2009	No			MO	65456
1433	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: Outboards should not be Restricted. We have lived here and used the river all our life. Now they want to shut it down to locals & use only for canoe use. It's not about the River it's about lots of people & making money.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63660
1434	Response to Question 1: No Action taken Response to Question 3: We should not have a Hore power Limit put on the River	6/22/2009	No			MO	65588

1435	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Horse power Limiting.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65588
1436	Response to Question 1: no change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: my grandparents have a boat & keep things clean but the floaters trash it up. My g'parents spend a lot of money on gas & their boat. floaters don't Response to Question 4: boaters are necessary Response to Question 5: I'd like more places to take my baby so she can go in the water.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63736
1437	Response to Question 1: No Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: Do Not Restrict boaters. It would be a big mistake. Floaters are polluting. Response to Question 4: Park Service provide more places for the public. Most water access is private. Response to Question 5: Keep the boats	6/22/2009	No			MO	63736
1438	Response to Question 1: no changes Response to Question 2: no changes Response to Question 3: boats are not causing the problems--tubers cuss, trash, etc. boaters pick up after them Response to Question 5: more areas where families can go to enjoy the river	6/22/2009	No			MO	65738
1439	Response to Question 1: n/a Response to Question 2: n/a Response to Question 3: tourists are the ones trashing & abusing the riverways boaters clean up after them Response to Question 4: Boaters bring in more revenue than without them Response to Question 5: there is a great need for more public places to the river	6/22/2009	No			MO	63825
1440	Response to Question 1: No action taken Restore River Rights Back to No Restriction Response to Question 2: No Restriction Response to Question 3: A, B & C	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1441	Response to Question 1: No action is my choice Response to Question 2: you should not limit access to Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I need to be able to pull my boat to the river. Response to Question 3: Limited recreational use. I pick up trash everytime I motor the river. It's mine & I love it. For years I've saved many lives by motoring the river and pulling floaters off root wads. Response to Question 4: to have park rangers in a boat or canoe to help patrol the river. Response to Question 5: Provide more resources, Boat ramps, horseback trails, hiking paths	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1442	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: have more public access, suggestions boxes, a box for donations to the access areas Response to Question 3: Save the Boaters! Don't let them become Extinct Response to Question 4: Better public access policed by the parks, even if you charged \$1.00 a car or something Response to Question 5: Conservation officers should also use the non-polluting motors--Set a good example and fine the tubers that leave their crap in the river!!	6/26/2009	No			MO	63146
1443	Response to Question 1: No limits Response to Question 2: No Restrictions or limits on usage Response to Question 3: Any limits on usage Response to Question 5: more access places	9/11/2009	No			MO	63901
1444	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: --Focus NPS resources on the trouble maker --NPS personnel should be uniformed, non-confrontational and business like Response to Question 3: Wilderness section Response to Question 4: --No Action. I visit various parts each year. Response to Question 5: --NPS should not compete with private business --NPS should better plan their actions so as not to waste money	9/16/2009	No			IL	62819
1445	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit various parts of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: --Keep things simple --NPS should describe better details of proposed actions, initial and ongoing costs associated with those actions, reasons for proposed actions and the specific results to be achieved.	9/16/2009	No			CA	94109
1446	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on recreation and access Response to Question 3: No more alternatives should be followed--no more restrictions, rules, etc. Response to Question 4: Current--upper & lower Response to Question 5: --NPS needs to better plan their actions, government can not afford to waste money on actions that aren't worthwhile NPS should avoid competing with private enterprises	9/16/2009	No			TX	77536
1447	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions, less bureaucracy Response to Question 3: More restrictions Response to Question 4: All sections its all related Response to Question 5: --Avoid competing with small businesses --Keep regulations to minimum --Implement measures to ensure all NPS personnel are professional at all times --NPS personnel should be in uniform and visible, non-confrontational or arrogant even when dealing with difficult situations	9/16/2009	No			NJ	08012
1448	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Additional Restrictions on access & recreation Response to Question 3: No more restrictions on recreation & access Response to Question 5: --Remove competition with private enterprise--These counties are some of the poorest in Missouri --Better plan how to spend public money judiciously	9/16/2009	No			OK	74953
1449	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Further restrictions on Access & recreational use Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned w/all parts of ONSR. I visit various parts of ONSR each year. Response to Question 5: *NPS personnel should be visible and deal with situations in a positive non-confrontational way. *NPS should not compete with private enterprises to provide goods and services.	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955

1450	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I visit the lower current of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways each year. Response to Question 5: --Keep it simple --NPS should not compete with private enterprise to provide goods & services.	9/16/2009	No			KY	40208
1451	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 3: Do not implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of ONSR. I visit various part of ONSR each year.	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955
1452	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on recreational use Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 4: I am concerned w/all parts of ONSR. I visit the upper current River every year. Response to Question 5: *Keep things simple *Implement measures to ensure that all NPS personnel are professional & courteous @ all times. *NPS should not compete w/private enterprise to provide goods & services	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955
1453	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No additional restrictions Response to Question 3: Don't introduce additional restrictions on access and recreation Response to Question 4: I'm concerned with all of the ONSR Response to Question 5: --NPS should better describe the details of proposed actions initial and ongoing costs associated with actions, reasons for proposed actions, and the specific results to be achieved --Don't compete with private businesses!	9/16/2009	No			MO	63965
1454	Response to Question 1: Leave as is or reduce Gov. involvement altogether. Dont fix what is not broken.	9/16/2009	No			AR	72560
1455	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access and recreational use! Response to Question 3: No further actions! Response to Question 4: I am concerned with all parts of Ozark Nat'l Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 5: Leave it the way it is! NPS should explain, in detail, the proposed plan to be achieved. I feel that things have been fine in the past & no change is necessary.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63848
1456	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: No Further Restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access and recreational use. Response to Question 5: Keep things simple Keep Gov. bureacracy to a minimum	9/16/2009	No			MO	63841
1457	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use Response to Question 5: Keep things simple Keep gov. bureacracy to a minimum	9/16/2009	No			MO	63841
1458	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions om access & recreational use. Response to Question 3: Don't implement any further restrictions on access & recreational use. Response to Question 5: Keep things semple Keep Gov. Bureacy to minimun.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63028
1459	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No further restrictions should be added on access & recreation. Response to Question 3: Leave as is. Response to Question 4: I don't think officers should hide to catcvh lawbreckers on the river. If they are in plain sight people will not break laws to begin with. Officer should be courteous & respectful. Just protect everyone from harm on all river ways. Response to Question 5: I think the river should be patrolled, due to the people who do stupid things while drinking. However, some of us just drink to have fun, not be stupid. Don't punish everyone for the actions of some.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63848
1460	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Further Restrictions on Access & Recerational use Response to Question 3: Don't implement Any Further Restrictions on Access & Recrational use Response to Question 5: Keep things simple Keep Government Bureacacy to a minimum	9/16/2009	No			MO	63645
1461	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: The public needs to have access to all areas for their enjoyment Response to Question 3: there should be NO primitive areas. They do not provide any good for the area. The land has been preserved approximately the same for 100's of years without your help. Response to Question 4: I feel strongly that I should have access to all areas without restrictions on camping, hunting, fishing, etc. This is especially true for the upper Jacks Fork. Response to Question 5: Please be more coopratve with the local population and visitors to the area. Do not be like storm troopers and spies that you think will help impose more unnessary restrictions.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1462	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 4: I feel strongly that I should have access to camping and fishings without restrictions.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1463	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: There should be no primitive areas. I do agree that too many aTV's are not good because of destroying the the roads.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571

1464	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Am concerned about the NPS closing access rd's in the areas they control. Response to Question 5: No more restrictive changes.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65479
1465	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: --No additional restrictions on access & recreaton Response to Question 3: --Don't implement further restrictions on boats Response to Question 4: Upper & Lower Current Response to Question 5: --Don't compete with private businesses --Put exhibits like Conservation Commission has in Winona --Better planning--don't waste taxpayer \$	9/16/2009	No			MO	63021
1466	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Open up more areas for access. Unlimited recreational access and usage. Make more areas accessible to the handicap visitor. Response to Question 3: Limited Recreational Access and usuage Response to Question 4: All areas are special to me as I am and will always be a resident of Shannon Copunty. I wish to see more areas made accessible to the handicapped population! Response to Question 5: As a parent of a handicapped child, I think no area should be limited to walk-in only. This discriminates against those who can not walk!	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1467	Response to Question 1: No-Action. We need to do away with some of the restrictions that are on us now. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accesses to undeveloped areas Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind. Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. No because every other alternative adds more restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes, more boat ramps, better trash control, and better patrolling of river ways.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1468	Response to Question 1: No-Action. We need to do away with some of the restrictions that are on us now. Response to Question 2: Take no action and to add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas. Response to Question 3: any new restrictions of any kind Response to Question 4: The upper reaches of the Current River and Jacks Fork River. No, because every alternative adds restrictions. Response to Question 5: Yes, more boat ramps, rangers also need to be in boats and canoes patrolling the river to cut back on all the mischief also better trash control along the river.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1469	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Open up more areas for access. We want unlimited Recreational Acess and Usage Response to Question 3: Limited Recreational Access and Usage. Response to Question 4: I am a life-long resident of Shannon County and an avid outdoors man. I plan on accessing parks and recreation areas for the rest of my life. Response to Question 5: I am a handicapped child and I think no area should be limited to walk in only. This discriminates againt me because I require to use a golf cart or motorized vehicle to get around in the hunting woods of my choice.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1470	Response to Question 4: Current River, Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: Don't close down the rivers because it would be a waste and everyone loves our rivers.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1471	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Do not allow too many horses--they tear up the trails, etc. Response to Question 5: Please remember that many people gave up or gave an easement on their property so that the area could be kept natural.	9/16/2009	No			MO	63026
1472	Response to Question 1: No-Action There needs to be controlled gravel removal from both rivers--to maintain the original river pathway. Response to Question 2: Gravel and debris removal from the Rivers must be done in order to maintain the River at its natural Rate of flow and original pathway. Response to Question 3: No more closing of accesses--I love to float the river & want to be able to put in & take out where I please. Response to Question 4: From the headways to Van Buren, MO are my personal favorites--leave them alone--leave accesses open--clear the trees and gravel so it is floatable. Response to Question 5: State, post, and enforce the same laws--drug, alcohol, and conduct as they are in all other parts of the state--River & land.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1473	Response to Question 1: No Action Take gravel out of Both Rivers Clear out logs and Rock to Improve River pathway. Response to Question 2: Keep River's clear of logs & debri. Response to Question 3: No closing of aceesse's Keep open to public. Response to Question 4: Both Jacks Fork & Current River's are nice Rivers they should be keep clean & free of log jam's & debri. Response to Question 5: Keep the drinking and partying at bay enforce the use of alcohol, drug's	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1474	Response to Question 2: No-Action or alternative C should be involved in the future management plan. Response to Question 3: Alternatives A and B should not be included in the future management plan.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1475	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I don't believe waterways need to be SO natural. We should be able to pupll gravel out of the river because many rivers are becoming too shallow. This applies to rivers all over Missouri. Also, fallen trees and such need to be moved so we river-floaters want to have access to spots that are now blocked by debris. I feel that government programs do not need more power. Our "natural" waterways are ugly and deteriorating. Given a few years, nature will kill its own rivers. A little monitering and tending to riverways won't make them less natural, just more enjoyable.	9/16/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1476	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 4: I belive that all closed roads should be reopened to the local folks.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571

1477	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 3: There should not be any more closings of our roads into the rivers. Response to Question 5: Local employees only at all levels	9/16/2009	No			MO	65571
1478	Response to Question 1: No-action--but you should clean up debris like if a tree falls into the river you should let people clean it up. Because I like to float on the rivers. Response to Question 2: You should reinstate the gravel mining of the rivers because soon the rivers are going to dry up.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65548
1479	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. Things have Ben fine. No major Axxwswnra Have Happed In the last 25-30 years. Response to Question 2: NONE. Open more access Response to Question 3: A.B.& C. From First question Response to Question 4: Every one is specal to me and my Famly. This Our Home We Would like to enjoy every Part OF It. Response to Question 5: Please Plase the law enforcement were It Belongs. But we shouldant all suffer. I would like to see No Limet From te Van Buren Bridge to Big Spring.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1480	Response to Question 1: No-Action. The only modify I would like is no alchol on the river.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1481	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None. More open. Response to Question 3: A, B and C Response to Question 4: All are special limited access to these places will not make them special. Reponse to Question 5: Place more law enforment along troubled area's.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
1482	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action limiting H.P. on motors Response to Question 3: any action limiting H.P. on motors should not be included. Response to Question 4: From Big Springs to Two Rivers area	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1483	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I would like the horse-power Limit lifted during the off season. Response to Question 2: I don't like any of the Alternatives the park service hasa came up with. I feel it would limit the use of the river. Response to Question 3: I Believe that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should Never Be turned into a Wilderness Area. No primitive Zones. Response to Question 4: I have live near the Current River most of my life I have Floated, boated, Hunted, Fished, and camped from Two rivers down to goose Neck bay. I used and enjoy the river All year Long. I would like my kids and my Grandchildren to have the same chance. Response to Question 5: in the heavy use Areas I would like to see a present of park employees in uniform. They don't need to be rangers just the sight of park service people will stop Alot of Problems before it starts. The rangers do a good job, but I feel that a visual present would stop most Abuse of the river. A friendly wave or a Kind word would go a long way toward A positive relationship between tourest and locals.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1484	Response to Question 1: No-Action I also think that the horsepower limit be opened during the off season. Response to Question 2: I did not like any of the alternatives presented I feel the they limit the access to the river and parks Response to Question 3: The Current River should not be considered as a wilderness Response to Question 4: I have lived around the river all my life. I have hunted, camped and fished the river. I would like to see all the farmes and old home places opened and managed so my kids can do the same. Response to Question 5: I feel that camp sites need to be kept open and made accessable throughout the park. The old felds need to be cleaned out and put up for bid so they can be formed. More accessable boat ramps need to be put in. The Park Rangers should be more visable in the parks, camp sites and on the river not hiding in the bushes. The Park needs to have a visitor center at every Park not at Headquarters to anser all visitor questions.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1485	Response to Question 1: No Action reason being no fatal accidents on river in 30 yrs Response to Question 2: None and more places open to baot traffic Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: All are special and should be left open for every person to enjoy Response to Question 5: More open access to more places along riverways. More Law Enforcement in area's needed most.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1486	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Action limiting H.P. on motors Response to Question 3: any action limiting H.P. on motors should not be included. Response to Question 4: Big Springs to Two Rivers area	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1487	Response to Question 1: No Action I don't think that the information used for these actiona are accurate. I can't see where anything has been documented Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 5: Almost everyone I know in the Van Buren area love and respect the river. I think that is a God given right to enjoy recreation on current river with their family. Anything less would not be Democratic.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1488	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Action limiting H.P. on motors Response to Question 3: any action limiting H.P. on motors should not be included Response to Question 4: Big Springs to Two Rivers area	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1489	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: No more Restrictions and lift past Restrictions. Response to Question 4: We Do not use Boats on the River but we Do Swim, But will Trickle Down to our retail Business. and effect us as a business Response to Question 5: follow through with some of the Educational Ideas.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638

1490	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: the no glass bottle rule Response to Question 3: national riverways should not be allowed to remove the boats off the river Response to Question 4: they should not ban river access from Chilton Response to Question 5: having educational exhibits on the banks at rivers access informing people about the wildlife and the river	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
1491	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None or C. Don't stick a lot of hidden stuff in the rules. Response to Question 3: A & B Response to Question 4: Paint Rock No Response to Question 5: Add more river access an better access.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
1492	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Jet Pump Response to Question 2: Leave as Is Response to Question 3: Leave as Is Response to Question 4: Owls Bridge down Response to Question 5: Leave as Is	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
1493	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: I think the old restrictions should Be lifted and no more restrictions should Be added. Response to Question 4: Our local Business would Be affected by the loss of Boat Sales. Response to Question 5: do go through with some of the Educational Ideas but let the boat users continue to use the riverways.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1494	Response to Question 1: No Action should be Taken Response to Question 2: None of the Alternatives Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: DO NOT (in regards to "alternatives address them adequately") All locations Response to Question 5: More Restroom's and cleaner Improve Roads boat Ramp's	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1495	Response to Question 1: No changes Response to Question 2: no changes Response to Question 3: tubers polute & boats pick up their trash 4 stroke motors run clean	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1496	Response to Question 1: No-action except I would add put Id numbers on tubes canoes. and how are we suposed to run a Big family of 8 up rive to go canoing Response to Question 2: add numbers on canoes and tubes and how is my dad suposed to run my family of 8 up river in a tiny 25 hourse to camp Response to Question 3: DON'T PUT A LIMIT ON HOURSE POWER. Response to Question 4: Big Spring Response to Question 5: Ban achole and put Id numbers on tubes and canose	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1497	Response to Question 1: No Action Taken Response to Question 2: Restricttions Be Removed Response to Question 3: Anything that would take away my Rights As a Boater Response to Question 4: From Big Springs North I woul like to see the Area open to All Boaters Response to Question 5: Yes stop the litter from tuber's canoers and Boaters	6/22/2009	No			MO	63628
1498	Response to Question 1: No action, the riverways are great the way they are. Response to Question 2: None, I would like to see that half mile stretch from Grand Quarry to the spring opened for boat traffic. Response to Question 3: A, B, C from the first question. Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are special. It is all beautiful and I have trout fished in Montauk and fished at Gooseneck. Response to Question 5: Consentrare your law enforcement in areas you are having problems. My dad and I have lived here by the Current river and never had a citation or ever become close to one. The Current river in Van Buren is a safer part of the river.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1499	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Horse power limits. Keep it 40 hp at the jet in 40 HP Areas Response to Question 4: The whole area is special to myself and my family. But we cannot enjoy hunting, fishing, camping and gigging if it changed in anyway. We need our boat	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1500	Response to Question 1: No-Action Aternative. My family and I have enjoyed the Current River for years boat riding. Their should be no change with the motor horsepower. A better way for the ONSR to be managed is to lower the tube and canoe limit on the river. Response to Question 2: I believe none of the preliminary alternatives should be included. Things are fine the way it is right now. Response to Question 3: All of them. Response to Question 4: Van Buren, MO--Current River Response to Question 5: I think most vistor's in our area are treated great and have good experiences on the river. They come back every year. There is no reason anything should be changed.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1501	Response to Question 1: My idea of a good way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverway's is the No-Action alternative. There should be no horse power limit on any boat in the Current River. There should be stricter limits on how many tubes & canoes are put in the river to float in one day. Response to Question 2: None of them! Response to Question 3: All of them. Response to Question 4: I live in the Van Buren Area.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1502	Response to Question 1: I think NO ACTION is closest to my idea of managing Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It seems to be working as is. Response to Question 2: We need to keep at least 40 HP on the various stretches of the Cureent River. Response to Question 3: Alternatives A & C definitely should not be included. Many times it is the boaters that rescue floaters & canoers that are in trouble. Response to Question 4: Big Springs, Watercress are special and I think they are being handled adequately at the present time. Response to Question 5: Check points could be established along the waterways to ensure visitors are aware of rules and proper patrolling to assist those encountering trouble.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1503	Response to Question 1: No action would work for us. Why ruin a good thing for all. What would help is if the Park Service would stop hiding in the bushes and make themselves more assesable to the public. Response to Question 2: 1st the Park Service should stop only hiding and then writing tickets. We need to keep the river open to the tourists it is a great place to come, the boats are the safest drivers that I have seen on water especally the locol people. Response to Question 3: Plans A B or C--they don't do anything but try to keep boaters off the river. WHY IS IT THE PARK SERVICE WAS ASKED TO HELP SAVE LIVES BUT DIDNT Response to Question 4: Blue Springs, Watercrest & Paintrock are special all those great fishing spots, & gigging Response to Question 5: 1st we need to be friendly and courtious to the visitors. I think that the Park Service	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965

	should also help clean up the river, why is it only local boaters have a clean up day if Park Service is only a ticket writing organization they should GET OUT						
1504	Response to Question 1: No Action should be taken Response to Question 2: None of the proposals A B or C Response to Question 3: All or A B & C should not be Response to Question 4: All Locations south of Van buren Bridge Response to Question 5: Better boat ramps cleaner restrooms	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1505	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN Response to Question 2: NONE OF THE PROPOSALS A B OR C Response to Question 3: ALL OF AB & C SHOULD NOT BE Response to Question 4: ALL LOCATIONS SOUTH OF VAN BUREN BRIDGE Response to Question 5: I THINK LEAVE EVERYTHING THE WAY IT IS.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63873
1506	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN Response to Question 2: NONE OF THE PROPOSALS AB OR C Response to Question 3: ALL OF AB & C SHOULD NOT BE Response to Question 4: ALL LOCATIONS SOUTH OF VAN BUREN BRIDGE Response to Question 5: I THINK LEAVE EVERYTHING THE WAY IT IS.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63873
1507	Response to Question 1: No Action. (Positive Comments) Resources available Provide more resources to present recreationists. Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: Personal Comment Response to Question 5: More Recreational Usage Facilities	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1508	Response to Question 1: No limits Response to Question 2: No Restrictions or limits on usage. Response to Question 3: Any limits on usage should not be included Response to Question 5: More Access places	9/11/2009	No			MO	63901
1509	Response to Question 1: No Restrictions Response to Question 2: Any limits on usage should not be included. Response to Question 3: Any Restrictions Response to Question 5: Remove present Limitations on outboard usage	9/11/2009	No			MO	63901
1510	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Response to Question 2: No limitations on usage Response to Question 3: Any limits on usage Response to Question 5: More Access points.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63901
1511	Response to Question 1: No limits Response to Question 2: No Restrictions or limits on usage Response to Question 3: Any limits on usage should not be included Response to Question 5: More Access places	9/11/2009	No			MO	63901
1512	Response to Question 1: No-action thing are just fine. The river is big enough for everyone Response to Question 2: No-action is the only fair plan out there. A, B & C are to self serving Response to Question 3: A, B or C restrict the use and access to the river Response to Question 4: All of the river is special my Mother and Dad have spent the weekend every Summer with me and my Sister. We can't afford to travel to other parts of the Country. I have enjoyed the river for 23 years. I hope that my children can enjoy Boating, Canoeing & Hunting like I have. Response to Question 5: We need more law Enforcement on the week-ends	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1513	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION--MAKE NO CHANGES Response to Question 2: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: All parts of the River. Response to Question 5: MAKE NO CHANGES.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1514	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B or C. any restricted Recreational use and any restricted access Response to Question 4: We use upper Current River For Hunting, Fishing, and horseback Riding. Plans AB & C would restrict this Response to Question 5: I think things should be Left the way they are so my Family can continue to enjoy the river as I have my entire Life	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1515	Response to Question 1: No Action, I feel the river limits itself, leave it alone	9/8/2009	No			MO	65588
1516	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Restricted Access Response to Question 3: Restricted use & Access Response to Question 4: Alley Spring State Park & Jack Fork from Alley to Eminence Response to Question 5: No Hiding in Bushing & more Access Area.	9/11/2009	No			MO	65466
1517	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None of A. B. or C. Response to Question 3: A.B.C. Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: No	9/8/2009	No			MO	63967

1518	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: more camping facilities more river safety education Response to Question 3: limitations on usage Response to Question 4: We have many family memories and traditions spent along Current and Castor Rivers. We've camped, hiked, floated, boated, fished and lived along these riverways. It would be devastating to take that from our children. Response to Question 5: River Safety education	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1519	Response to Question 1: No-Action--If I were to do anything I would only prohibit shoal runners because they reach speeds that are very dangerous on rivers such as Current River. Response to Question 2: No Action--Current River is a very family friendly place that families can vacation and enjoy nature at its best. Response to Question 3: A, B & C should not be included because many families would no longer be able to enjoy Current River and as families quit visiting many businesses would be impacted. Response to Question 4: My family visits Big Springs and enjoys boating below the Spring. We have a boat with a jet motor that would be prohibited if one of A, B, or C alternatives is chosen. We vacation each July at Big Springs campground and we would have to go elsewhere. Response to Question 5: Many people enjoy the riverways as they are now. There are very few problems and I feel that the riverways should remain open as they are now.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1520	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: free recreational use Response to Question 3: restricted recreational use Response to Question 5: free recreational use	6/22/2009	No			MO	63940
1521	Response to Question 1: I do not agree with any. No-Action is the one I choose. Response to Question 3: No additional motor size restrictions. Response to Question 5: Limit the # of canoes & tubers on the riverways.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1522	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: free recreational use Response to Question 3: restricted recreational use Response to Question 5: free recreational use	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1523	Response to Question 1: No-Action Leave as is, let everyone enjoy river! If there is a problem--put park rangers in that area. Ticket people who misuse the river! Response to Question 2: Unlimited recreational use!! Response to Question 3: Limited recreation! use! Response to Question 4: We raised two children at Ellington. Wwe went to the river every week to boat & swim. Some of our best memories are at a place called Log Yard. Response to Question 5: Provide more boat ramps & bathrooms along the river. Place more trash cans along river--We have picked up other peoples trash left by tubers!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1524	Response to Question 1: No Action--remove the 40 horsepower limits or raise them in such a way as to remove the shoal runners from the river. Shoal runners are capable of reaching speeds that are way too fast for this river. Response to Question 2: No Action--I am married with three children. In our area we have no Disney Land or Six Flags to go to on weekend for family fun. My kids--age 16, 13, & 8 would rather go to the river any day as either Six Flags or Disney Land. Response to Question 3: A, B, & C should definately not be included in the management plans. Most of the communities in this area depend on boating for employment in one way or another. Response to Question 4: No Action--No Changes. I currently have a 115 jet on my boat rated @ 85 hp because of it being a jet instead of a propeller. Put my family of 5 and a cooler with a couple folding chairs in a 25 hp or 40 hp boat and you won't be able to get any place. Response to Question 5: Consider the fact that when people go to the river, they stop at local stores and purchase snacks, sodas . . . or stop by local restaurants and get chicken wings or chicken strips . . . (consider the local economy)	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1525	Response to Question 1: No Action--Remove Hp. Restriction Above Big Spring For 1/2 mile. Response to Question 2: None Not happy with Any of the Alertnative plans. Response to Question 3: Why Take our boats of River so Commercial guided Services could do Float Trips. They could do that Now--No New Rules Response to Question 4: As a Land owner I Am Very Concerned about Bigger Govt. More rules & restrictions--Locals Need to be heard We're here All year Long. Response to Question 5: Boater are good For Local economy So Are Floaters--No changes.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1526	Response to Question 1: No-Action on Current River & Jack fork modify Rymers to Bay Creek to 25 HP Seasonal modify Southern Edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs to no-Limit. Response to Question 2: Alt C--Rymers to Bay Creek Response to Question 3: Current River-- A-B-C Response to Question 5: Open Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs, change to no-Limit. Large Boats will go down river and relieve conjection in gap on Saturdays in summer.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63825
1527	Response to Question 1: The "No-Action" is the close to my idea of the best way to manage the riverways. However, I would like to see the motor restriction the we have now lifted. I don't feel that it was justicfied when the 40 hp limit was instated in the past. Response to Question 3: Adding more restrictions to the H.P. limit. Restricting access to anyone wanting to enjoy the river. Response to Question 4: I live in the area between Bass Rock Estates & Deer Run North of Van Buren. I don't stay in that area during the peek floating times. However, I do launch by boat before the river gets crowder & remove my boat afterwards from that area. A, B, and C effect me most negatively. Response to Question 5: I feel that keeping accesses and having more educational activities should be our goal, not taking away our rights and freedoms to enjoy what we all work so hard for.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1528	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: restrition--of Horse Power and access to the river Response to Question 4: Chilton & Club House and on down Response to Question 5: Keep it accessible	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965

1529	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: I feel that the current plan (No-Action) is working just fine. Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, & C all parts should not be included. No-Action should be taken. Response to Question 4: I love being on all parts of Current river. If you change it, so we can't get on it, my family and I would have no where to vacation or spend time together. Response to Question 5: What about the local people--don't we count. I feel that NO-Action should be taken and No changes made.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1530	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, & C all parts Response to Question 4: I enjoy going to the river just like it is. Don't change anything. Response to Question 5: No-Action should be taken leave it alone	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1531	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, C should not be included. Response to Question 4: All the places are special to me. I feel you should manage this area just like you have been doing. Response to Question 5: what about the local people and economy that this would effect if any of A, B or C passed. Leave it just like it is. The local people have taken care of it our whole lives and I think we should keep on taking care of it. No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1532	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, and C all parts Response to Question 4: I love the river and would like for it to stay the same. Don't change the river. Response to Question 5: No-Action Keep it the same.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1533	Response to Question 1: No-Action is best, the other alternatives are too radical & benefit a few, while alternative A, B, & C, cost gov. money, & help no one, except gov. employees. Response to Question 2: None, the public schools deserve gov. money for nature programs. Teachers who live near river, are capable of teaching this info to youngsters. Response to Question 3: motor boat restrictions for floaters is unfair to all who work hard to afford a motor boat. Boaters spend more money = good economy Response to Question 4: The entire river should be left as is, to let locals enjoy it. Regulations hurt many, help few. Response to Question 5: Enforcement of laws is great as it is. We all work to keep litter out of river, The river has never been better than now.	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1534	Response to Question 1: No-Action--Current River Response to Question 2: Alt C--Raymes to Bay Creek Response to Question 3: Current River A-B-C	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1535	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action limiting H.P. on motors Response to Question 3: any action limiting H.P. on motors should not be included Response to Question 4: From Big Springs to Two Rivers area	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1536	Response to Question 1: No action should be taken Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All of AB & C should not be included Response to Question 4: All locations are special to me. Response to Question 5: Better outhouses	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1537	Response to Question 1: No action is the best solution. Response to Question 2: No action is the most important of the alternatives, but could be included with small alternations. Response to Question 3: Alternative A would destroy the purpose of recreation. If some of the other alternatives would be included in the future management they could be seasonal. Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: As said before the alternatives could be seasonal and for as they already are regional. The tubes and canoes can be limited instead of being unlimited as they are now.	6/22/2009	No			DENMA RK	N/A
1538	Response to Question 1: NO ACTIONS Response to Question 2: NO ACTIONS Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Big Spring to Gooseneck Response to Question 5: Keep the tubers in one section and give the boaters the rest.	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1539	Response to Question 1: No Action on Current River & Jack fork Response to Question 2: Alt. C - Rymers to Bay Creek - only change Response to Question 3: Current River A-B-C Response to Question 5: Open Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs, change to no-limit	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1540	Response to Question 1: No action on Current River & Jacks fork Response to Question 2: Alt C - Rymers to Bay Creek - only change Response to Question 3: Current River A-B-C Response to Question 5: Open Southern egge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs, change to no-limit	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1541	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: AlterNATIVE C. Response to Question 3: A & B Response to Question 4: I would like to see a boat ramp put in at Paint Rock Landing an more parking area. Response to Question 5: P.S. I also would like to fish for 1 hour wihtout being checked 4 times	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
1542	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: More trails, campsites, tourism, and more education on the river Response to Question 3: limiting nonmechanized forms of recreation, closing river access Response to Question 4: Big Springs Response to Question 5: Pollution, River safety education, and more park ranger interaction	6/22/2009	No			MO	63764

1543	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: 1. Replace picnic tables lost due to "100 yr. floods". 2. Re-open campgrounds such as Rocky Creek Boat Ramp. 3. Open & repair CCC Roads for hikeing--such a waste of history to let these roads go into disrepair. Response to Question 3: 1. Limit Boat H.P. to 25 will not work to haul a family of 4. The 60/40 is perfect. Propeller boats won't work, River filled in since the 70's. 2. Do not close more O.R.V. roads--Limits access to a lot of beautiful sights for people who cannot hike. Response to Question 4: The entire 134 mi are beautiful. I feel the attitude of the Park Service has changed over the past 38 yrs from making visitors feel welcome to I don't want you here. Hard working, tax paying people come here for recreation--Make them feel welcomed--After all these people pay your salary. Response to Question 5: Existing Limitations are enough.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1544	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - YOU CHANGE THINGS AND THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN VAN BUREN WILL FEEL NEGATIVE EFFECTS FROM THE CHANGES.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1545	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: more recreation cites Response to Question 3: Limitation on usage Response to Question 5: Park ranger needs to interact with public	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1546	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Since Alcohol was banned in Mo State Parks more drinkers are coming to Current River. Wouldn't mind having alcohol banned in National Parks also. It would automatically cut back on the floaters! Response to Question 3: Limiting horse power to 25. If we want to boat upstream with our grandchildren there are places where the current is so swift. I'm not sure we would be able to make it. Would rather see boats limited on busy summer weekends than have them limited to 25 HP. Response to Question 4: End of Rt. M to the landing. overcrowding of tubers on busy weekends. Response to Question 5: People come mostly for recreation not for history lessons. Not sure if people would be interested in seeing that sort of thing.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1547	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: more camping and recreation Response to Question 3: limiting camping and recreation	6/23/2009	No			MO	63766
1548	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION LEAVE MOTORBOAT HORSEPOWER EXACTLY AS IT IS RATED AT THE PUMP, BECAUSE I USE IT TO TAKE MY FAMILY UP & DOWN THE RIVER & ENJOY FISHING & GIGGING. Response to Question 2: DO NOT LIMIT ACCESS & USE. WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE TAKEN FROM US. Response to Question 3: LIMITING ACCESS & USSE. PLEASE CONTINUE TO LET US USE OUR RIVER TO ENJOY WITH OUR FAMILIES & FRIENDS. Response to Question 4: BETWEEN TWO RIVERS & VAN BUREN. PLEASE LET US CONTINUE TO USE IT FOR HUNTING, FISHING, & BOATING SO WE CAN PROVIDE OUR FAMILIES THE ENJOYMENT WE HAVE HAD FOR YEARS Response to Question 5: PROVIDE MORE RESOURCES FOR HUNTERS, FISHERMEN, & BOATING.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1549	Response to Question 1: no-Action Response to Question 2: no-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C I do not agree with neither of the three choices. Response to Question 4: I feel that all 134 miles are sepecial to me, I have spent my whole life on the river with my family. Response to Question 5: I feel campgrounds near the river should be better well taken care of as well as the boat landings around the river. Some of them are not worth crap and their is no since in that.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1550	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No, all are special to me. I grew up on them and would be strongly offended if we were not allowed to use our boat on it. Response to Question 5: To make the roads and boat landings smoother and easier to travel on.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1551	Response to Question 1: No change I would make no modifications. Response to Question 2: I feel Boats with 40 Hp motors should stay on the river, I personally have helped Floaters uncountabl times with My Boat. Response to Question 3: I feel strongly that this should Not take Boats off the river Response to Question 4: The Van buren area should be th same long term memories. Response to Question 5: I think every one should No what a help The Boats are to Floaters.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63877
1552	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN Response to Question 2: NONE OF THE PROPOSALS A B OR C Response to Question 3: ALL OF AB & C SHOULD NOT BE Response to Question 4: ALL LOCATIONS SOUTH OF VAN BUREN BRIDGE I ENJOY BECAUSE BEEN COMING SINCE I WAS A KID! Response to Question 5: I THINK LEAVE EVERYTHING THE WAY IT IS. BUT, I THINK ATTENTION SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE RESTROOM FACILITIES!!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63873
1553	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Unlimited Access and use. Response to Question 3: Limited Access and use. Response to Question 4: Blue Springs on the Current River. I enjoy the primitive camping with no designated camping areas. I do not like the pay camp sites. Response to Question 5: Making Park Rangers role more focused on helping visitors and interpretation of the areas and less on law enforcement action. Mere officer presence seems to work better than writing citations.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588-9726
1554	Response to Question 1: No, action The rules are fine now, but the riverways need more accesses to the river for more areas. Because conoe rentals are taking up most of the boat ramps and or gravel bars. Response to Question 2: The part of preliminary alternatives I feel strongly for is, No more blocking roads into places for fishing and Hunting. Response to Question 3: The management of national riverways shouldn't take the motor boats off the river, because this will cause problems on the river with locals and non-state people. Response to Question 4: The special places that I'm concerned about is from Van buren all they way to bay creek, if these rules go into effect, other than the rules now people would not come to the rivers and that would knock Rangers out of Jobs Response to Question 5: The suggestion that I would make is there shouldn't be any Beer Beverages on the river. There also needs to be more boat landings along the river so the ones we have aren't so crowded.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588

1555	Response to Question 1: No-Action I think we should leave everthing like it is. And I think we should have more places to Drive to Hunt, Fish, and camp. Response to Question 2: I don't think we should block roads or we should change the motor restriction Response to Question 3: I don't think we should ever bring up the taking off the boat motor off. Response to Question 4: I love to take my Family up the river in my boat & motor Just Float back down & Fish or hunt back down river! Response to Question 5: I would like to see more road & camping spot's on the river And I would Like to see more boat ramps.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1556	Response to Question 1: No Action - Put more accesses on the river for hunting, fishing, and loading boats. Response to Question 2: I don't think road blocks should be put up restricting entrance to camp grounds, and fishing holes. Response to Question 3: I don't feel that its necessary to restrict boat use on the riverways. Response to Question 4: No. I enjoy fishing, swimming, and boat riding. Response to Question 5: I would like to see more swimming spots, and more accesses to the river, and many more camp grounds.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1557	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: My family have went camping on our vacation every year to these rivers and we enjoy it and with any of these actions are taken but not Action it will stop our vacation every year. Response to Question 5: It would be up keep of landings and roads to them and the rivers.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1558	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: more camp sites Response to Question 3: limiting nonmechanized forms of recreation Response to Question 4: My family enjoys camping and floating in the Van Buren area and would hate to see changes take place and the negative effects it would cause Van Buren.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63739
1559	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: more campsites, more trails Response to Question 3: limiting nonmechanized forms of recreation closing river access	6/22/2009	No			MO	63764
1560	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: More tourism, more camping facilities, more river safety education Response to Question 3: Closing river access, limitations on usage Response to Question 4: I have been camping at Big Springs area since I was a young girl. I am afraid drastic changes would be devastating to Van Buren's economy. Response to Question 5: River safety education and Pollution education *More park ranger interaction with visitors	6/22/2009	No			MO	63739
1561	Response to Question 1: The "No-Action" is the close to my idea of the best way to manage the riverways. However, I would like to see the motor restriction the we have now lifted. I don't feel that it was justicfied when the 40 hp limit was instated in the past. Response to Question 3: Adding more restrictions to the H.P. limit. Restriction access to anyone wanting to enjoy the river. Response to Question 4: I live in the area between Bass Rock Estates & Deer Run North of Van Buren. I don't stay in that area during the peek floating times. However, I do launch by boat before the river gets crowder & remove my boat afterwards from that area. A, B, and C effect me most negatively. Response to Question 5: I feel that keeping accesses and having more educational activities should be our goal, not taking away our rights and freedoms to enjoy what we all work so hard for.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1562	Response to Question 1: No Limits. Response to Question 2: No Restrictions or Limits on usage. Response to Question 3: Any Limits on usage should not be included. Response to Question 5: More Acess places	9/11/2009	No			MO	63901
1563	Response to Question 1: No Action. The area is already being managed as it should. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: They are all special to me. I was raised on the river and will always do everything possible to protect it. I find it very offensive that people that seem to be interested in this so called protection are there to visit 1 time a year. Response to Question 5: More park rangers, more citations for Litter and polluters.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65109
1564	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No changes should be made to ONSR Response to Question 4: I have concerns about being able to utilize the area below spring. My family and I have been spending time in that area for years Response to Question 5: No Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1565	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: equal access for recreation Response to Question 3: any limitations to access Response to Question 5: during periods of heavy use, it is rare to ssee enforcement of the few that a rowdy/breaking current rules. --more personnel?	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1566	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Make no changes Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: All parts of the river Response to Question 5: Make no changes	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1567	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: TAKING ALL REGULATIONS OFF OZARK NATIONAL SENIC RIVERWAYS Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: NO	9/8/2009	No			MO	63901
1568	Response to Question 1: No action should be taken. Response to Question 2: None of the alternatives A, B, or C. Response to Question 3: All of A, B, or C should not be. Response to Question 4: All locations are important to me. And none of the alerntives address them. Response to Question 5: Limit the tourist that are allowed on the river. Better boat ramps and more of them. And more parking for boat trailers. More outhouses and cleaner outhouses.	9/14/2009	No			MO	63965

1569	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: Leave IT Alone	9/8/2009	No			MO	65440
1570	Response to Question 1: No Action-- Response to Question 2: No Action-- Response to Question 3: A. B. C-- Response to Question 4: No Action-- Response to Question 5: IF it Ain't Broke Don't Fix it	9/8/2009	No			MO	65440
1571	Response to Question 1: No Action!!! Response to Question 2: NONE of A B & C Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: No	9/8/2009	No			MO	63966
1572	Response to Question 1: No-Action My family and I enjoy going to Current River all year around we enjoy fishing and camping along the river. I would like to see No restrictions but realize this is Not possible because of human Nature. People will always leave trash ext. but at least there will always be others like myself that will come and pick it up. Response to Question 2: No-Action Everyone should have the same oppertunity to enjoy this river and its surroundings. Response to Question 3: (A, B, C) I believe the National Scenic Riverways was formed to potect the rights of the people to enjoy and remember the lives of the Ozark people, It seems someone has forgotten this. Response to Question 4: The River as a whole is very special to me. and as for choices the No-Action is my only choice. Response to Question 5: Bring Back the real reason for the National Scenic Riverways, and that is to open it back up to public use the way it was ment to be Bring back the crafter, such as boat builders, soap makers, mills, ect.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63638
1573	Response to Question 1: No Action, Lift all motor restriction instead of creating more Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All, Only the No Action Response to Question 5: Get Back to original mandates.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63629
1574	Response to Question 1: No Action on unlimeted motor size I can run safer with less wake with my larger motor than with smaller motor. Response to Question 2: Keep All the roads open for access for Hunting, sites Response to Question 3: Plans A, B or C would limit the use of the river to my Family & me. Under the current rules I see no harm or problems with the area Response to Question 4: Wwe enjoy trail riding year round in the round spring are	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1575	Response to Question 1: No-Action, but better control of number of horses at trail rides. Response to Question 2: I believe some areas that not easily accesible to roads could be turned back to natural areas with low impact and no motorized vehicles. Response to Question 3: At this time do not limit the power boat traffic--keep it as in. The local people really enjoy gigging and fishing. Response to Question 5: I really feel that law enforcememt, rangers need to be visible--on horseback like in areas in the Yolla Bollo Wilderness are in Ca. They are always nice to visit with. Also rangers on horseback patrol Cassen State Park Olympics etc	9/4/2009	No			MO	65466
1576	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None of the preliminary alternatives Response to Question 3: No additional restrictions Response to Question 5: Keep the original plan--just follow it.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65101
1577	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Follow existing plans Response to Question 3: No additonal restriction Response to Question 5: Follow existing plan.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65101
1578	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: 40 H.P. AT THE PUMP. FOR THE 40 H.P LIMIT JET BOATS IN THE AREA PROVIDE A SAFETY NEST FOR ALL USERS. IN CASE OF AN EMERGENCY. Response to Question 3: REDUCING PRESENT 40 H.P. AT THE PUMP FROM ROUND SPRINGS TO VAN BUREN. Response to Question 4: 40 H.P. @ THE PUMP IS THE MINIMUM H.P TO POWER THE BOAT THROUGH SHALLOW WATER. A 25 H.P LIMIT ESSENSTIALLY IS SAYING. "NO JET BOATS"	9/4/2009	No			MO	63049
1579	Response to Question 1: I feel No-Action plan is Best for the people & our children that dosen't understand Any of this, or why!! Response to Question 2: The No-Action Alternative. Also the hp Limits should be removed & we should be Allowed to enjoy Our Park the way we want, the way my family has Always enjoyed It!! Response to Question 3: A, B, C - We Are fine the way It Is--Statics show that there Are no Reasons to take our Rights from us, & our children & our communitys!! Response to Question 4: No none at All! I & my family Enjoy most of this 134 mile whether It be floating, boating, hunting or swimming! Leave It & us Alone! Response to Question 5: Just follow the Rules you have now, don't make new ones that take Away our future, Its not As "free" As we think, uh!	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1580	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None, leave the people alone to enjoy the River & camping this does not harm the River for a Boat to go up & down it do not put limits on our access to the River. No-Action Response to Question 3: Should not close any Roads to the River or Horse trails. No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1581	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: More trails Response to Question 3: Limit on river usage Response to Question 4: Blue Springs Response to Question 5: Less stalking by park service	6/23/2009	No			MO	63739

1582	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: all but No Action Response to Question 4: Yes all of them (No Action) for all areas. Response to Question 5: The Riverways should be enjoyed by everybody Boater are mostly Locals and enjoy the Rivers fishing and boating but the conoers & tubers need them. Because they do many Rescues. and save Lives.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1583	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Road Closeing Response to Question 3: limits(?) Response to Question 4: Beter enforcement Response to Question 5: too many tubers in a grupe	6/23/2009	No			MO	63945
1584	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: We Like are River Like it is Response to Question 5: More Recreational usage Facilities	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1585	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are important to me. No-Action is the only alternative that will benifit me at all!!! Any of the other 3 actions would completly remove me from that area all together. Response to Question 5: I would like to see better maintained boat landings and roads leading to those landings.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1586	Response to Question 1: My opinion is the No Action Plan. I love this river & want to raise my children on it someday. I have been on this river since I was 3 months old. Response to Question 2: The No Action Alternative--I think the HP limitation should be removed. I listen to my Great Grandpa tell me stories about what it was like when he was a kid. I would like to see it that way again. Response to Question 3: A - B & C - Everyone is fine the way it is. It would be interesting to see how many of the people that are causing such a problem actually use my river. Response to Question 4: None--My Great Grandpa has been all through the 134 miles of this river. I havent yet but that is one of my accomplishments I would like to achieve. Leave it ALL accessible to our community. Response to Question 5: I dont see anything wrong with the way it is!! I have never had any problems at all while being on the river. We all do our part I feel like. My community, each one that uses the river, does their own part.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1587	Response to Question 1: No-Action give back the 60 hp motor because it helps getting up the river. Response to Question 2: No-Action Free Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Restricted Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: My Grandpa and Mother Live Around This Riverways So did my Dad & Mom as kids and so have I and my kids watch are 42, 35, 34 year old. The river is find Please Leave her Alone. Response to Question 5: People have Always Took care of the River And each other. We don't Need Any more rule's. More Recreational Usage of Facilities	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1588	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION WE ENJOY THE RIVER & BEING ABLE TO TAKE OUR CHILDREN & GRANDCHILDREN THERE IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US. Response to Question 2: DO NOT LIMIT ACCESS, RESOURCES, OR EXISTING HORSEPOWER ON BOAT MOTORS Response to Question 3: LIMITING ACCESS & MOTOR HORSEPOWER Response to Question 4: WE LIVE IN THE LOG YARD AREA SO IT'S NOT LIKE WE VISIT A FEW TIMES A YEAR. MOTORBOATING IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF OUR LIVES & OUR CULTURE. WE HOPE IT CONTINUES TO BE.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1589	Response to Question 1: My idea on the preliminary alternatives would be to choose No-Action. I enjoy the rivers the way they are, and I don't think any changes should be made! I believe this does not harm the environment in any way. Response to Question 2: Do not limit recreational use to the riverways. I strongly think No-Action should be included. Response to Question 3: I think that on the preliminary alternatives that alternative a should defenatially not be included. I think all should be unlimited on the subject of horse power on motors. Response to Question 4: I think all 134 miles are important to me. I don't think my friends and I have a certain special part of the river we like the most. We like all of it. Response to Question 5: Provide more resources to boaters and others. For instance, I would like for all boat landings and roads leading to the boat landings kept up a little better than what they have been recently. I would also like to see better management on keeping people from drinking alcoholic beverages on the rivers.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
1590	Response to Question 1: No-Action is closest to the best way to manage ONSR. No-Action will benefit all users of ONSR. Response to Question 2: No-Action! If regulations were enforced fewer problems would occur. Response to Question 3: Reducing motor restrictions should not be included. A lot of families use ONSR for recreation. Limiting horsepower will limit this ability. Response to Question 4: All 134 miles should be left alone. Response to Question 5: Enforcing current regulations would manage ONSR resources sufficiently.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1591	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action (all parts) Response to Question 3: All parts of A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of the 134 miles are special to me. Do not change access to them. Please continue to leave the riverways as they are. Take No Action! Response to Question 5: Just keep the national riverways as they are.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63901
1592	Response to Question 1: No Action is the best plan of Action for everbody Horsepower limitations should be removed completly As it was prior to the 40 Hp limit being put into place. Response to Question 2: No Action is the best way to Manage for today And in the Future. Response to Question 3: No change in Horsepower regulations, this is the least Hp we can carry a Family safely up stream. Response to Question 4: All Areas should be left As is, to Allow everybody to enjoy using it in the Manner they enjoy. Response to Question 5: We need No more changes. If there Are problems on the water or in the parks. We need to enforce the laws/Regulatations we Already have in pace.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1593	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: Use green motors on the rivers but that should be already happening w/the conservation boats as an example!	6/24/2009	No			MO	65802

1594	With the new State Park being put in, I wouldn't be surprised if they eliminate motors above Round Spring. It's a bit ridiculous of a proposal, maybe have a special zone above Akers in the summer time when the water's low and tourists are out, but still a little ridiculous.	6/4/2009	No			MO	65775
1595	The park service will hold meetings on the new plan at the Van Buren Community Center-June 22nd and at the Eminence High School-June 23rd with both starting at 5:00 p.m. They are also holding meetings in Columbia and St. Louis to get comments from those people about our rivers and motors!	6/4/2009	No			MO	63348
1596	I would hate to be on the park service side...	6/5/2009	No			CO	80002
1597	The people control the gap. Unless the federal govt getsbtheir grubby hands it, any horsepower restrictions will come back to bite them. All those with greater than 40 horses will navigate the gap primarily. It could mean war on the river. Is the park service prepared to tell all of us boat owners who live in vb that we can now not use our boats in the park? That is like a declaration of war on the good people of van Buren and carter county! I'm sitting here on my river property here in vb tonight. I have a lot invested in my boat. I love my freedom of travelling from two rivers to gooseneck. It's one if the few things in my life that I live for. I'm very nervous and frustrated by this latest news. Blazer and xtermontator boats have a lot to lose if we're forces into 25 hp motors. We'll be using riveted jon boats again. If not, I just may be forced into a prop with a lift!	6/5/2009	No			FL	32746
1598	I, like many of you on here, grew up on this river. Back in the day we had a 22 ft. john boat with a 10 horse Evinrude prop motor. That boat was all we needed to fish, gig, and play. I'm not sure what's right for this river in regards to motor size, but I do think some of these big motors are excessive for this river. I mean shoot, you can't water ski on it so why go so big on engine size? BUTCH wrote: <quoted text> THEN GO BUY A WOODEN BOAT, AND SHOVE IT, how can i carry 7 people with 40 hp. not my fault you can't afford a v6. If they take anything I hope they take all boats. then you and your stupid friends can sit around a relive the good ole' days I didn't say a thing about outlawing motors, and you shouldn't assume to know what type of boat I have now. You don't even have respect for people why would you respect a river. Dumbass!	6/6/2009	No			MO	63965
1599	The Park got more than they needed when they restricted the HP the last time. Enough is enough. If they get this, in 5 years there won't be any motors allowed	6/6/2009	No			LA	70515
1600	zeldall wrote: I, like many of you on here, grew up on this river. Back in the day we had a 22 ft. john boat with a 10 horse Evinrude prop motor. That boat was all we needed to fish, gig, and play. I'm not sure what's right for this river in regards to motor size, but I do think some of these big motors are excessive for this river. I mean shoot, you can't water ski on it so why go so big on engine size? THEN GO BUY A WOODEN BOAT, AND SHOVE IT, how can i carry 7 people with 40 hp. not my fault you can't afford a v6. If they take anything I hope they take all boats. then you and your stupid friends can sit around a relive the good ole' days THIS WILL NEVER BE MAYBERRY THERE ARE NO MORE WOOOOOOOODEN BOATS NOR WILL THERE BE! EVER ! forget NOSTALGIA ! THIS IS 2009. Although I would like to see more peoples camping at the bigspring park... when I was a kid there was 500 people there every weekend during the summer... The park thinks we are the problem and the party crowd is running off the families. Well how come the campgrounds in town are booked through summer, and BSP is empty????????	6/6/2009	No			CO	80002
1601	I wish tubes were banned. The tourists cause more harm than my boat! A little civil disobedience is in order if they try to take my boat away. Boats are getting quieter - especially with the new four strokes. More HP does not mean more speed - I need more HP so I can carry my family and get my boat on top of the water. I live in the Gap right on the river. I see many boats. They do not annoy me. What bothers me are the drunk tourists that like to cuss me out when they get to me. Most boaters (with a few exceptions) are not the problem on the river. I take my boat below Big Spring a lot. It is very peaceful. It's more peaceful with all the bigger motors than it is in the gap or just below waymeyer! The dang tourists trash our river and I have to actually leave my river property on the weekends by traveling above waymeyer or below Van Buren to get some peace and quiet. TUBES are what need to be banned - not big motors!	6/6/2009	No			FL	32746
1602	I am urging any and everyone that loves these rivers, that pay taxes so assholes like the park service can have a job to attend these meetings and stand up! What they really want to do is take the river from those of us that know and love it..and utilize our tax money to suit people from St Louis and Columbia. The park service is the reason the river is in the shape it is now. No longer a viable river, but rather one that has filled in with gravel and root wads, that no one is allowed to move and or clean up. I guess they were pretty disgusted, when we continued to run the river anyway. Read the history on the Current as well as the Jack's Fork. They used to move large amounts of timber down both rivers. I have seen the locals be ten times more eco minded about things like trash. So to me its fairly plain and simple..take from those that have worked hard to have something, and give it to the tourists. The fact that you offer the river to us, during off season is just so damn wide of ya! Maybe we will all stop paying taxes for the Park Service from May - Sept. I am a law abiding citizen, but this has just got the very best of me. I'm thinking of moving to Russia, I understand their laws are more liberal than ours! Hook your boats up, bring them to town and let's fight this. We kept them from killing the wild horses, maybe we can all band together and keep this from happening too. One more thing I would like to say.. in my 17 years of running this river, I have participated in over 15 tourist rescues in one manner or another. I have seen heart attacks, strokes, drownings, and near drownings.. I helped.. I have loaned cell phones, ice, sting aid, sunburn lotions and in one case I myself saved a drowning elderly woman.. I had a boat. Any one I know that runs that river would have helped in any manner needed.. because thats what kind of people we are..what now? Going to rely on the Park Service? Stand up! Be counted and heard! Attend the meetings at both VB and Eminence! No one said that! I hardly consider a 60/40 a	6/7/2009	No			MO	65629

	<p>speed boat. It does well to push four adults, expecially if the shoals are shallow. Limits on horse power play a part in limiting speed. I do not drink. I am the average person. One that has worked hard, made my own way, and love the river. I have been and am raising my grand children on Current River. They have been taught to respect, appreciate and enjoy this. I consider myself an average person. I have had many peaceful and quiet days on the current. I have seen Eagles feeding from the river in Nov., as we camped and hunted. I have seen the steam rise off of the spring in the evening, and rise again in the morning. I have no personal vendetta against any tourists, I just try to understand what kind of an environment they live in, and I like the fact that they appreciate this area. We have one of the most beautiful places in the world. I'm just darn angry. I am just tired of being dictated to. I pay taxes, I pay license fees. I pay for my fishing license, I pay insurance premiums, just to enjoy my time on the river. I abide by the rules.. I guess that's just not enough. I still think being offered the river in the "off season" is a slap in the face. Just me wrote: If you choose No ACTION, please state why you have chosen it, and what you would like to see done differently. Not necessary to explain what should be done differently, when one uses the no action status. That's pretty self explanatory! ozark howler wrote: <quoted text>if you cant git your family into less than a 40 hp boat i suggest you git 2 20 hp boats so you will fit under the new restrictions. i live w/motors up my kazoo. when i go to a beautiful natural area like current river it is not so i can see motorboats speeding past all day long! That's why you live in California and we live here. Had we chose to be over populated and live with the noise and fumes and vehicles, we could move to California and live like you. It's people like you that have started this whole mess anyway. Someone that dosen't mind to change an entire areas way of life to suit themselves. Current River Lover wrote: <quoted text> I wonder what makes you think you're not trying to change an area's way of life by choosing no action? Remember, no action means you want more recreation, more people, more boats/motors, etc. Wouldn't that then contribute to over population, noise, and fumes on the river? In my opinion, that's changing an area to suit yourself without any consideration of anyone else who wants to enjoy the rivers. It's the current way of life for all of us here to start with. What part of NO ACTION do you NOT understand? It's apparent that you do not understand the alternatives. If you are whom I believe you to be, there is no need to respond. I'll save what I have for you in person. I think the meeting went very well. If you are asking if there were alot of hell raising going on, the answer is no. The purpose of the meeting was to make the public aware, to answer questions, and discuss the alternatives that are currently being offered up as a matter of public opinion. It seems as if alternative A is the most harsh. This is a proposition to remove all motor boats from the river and restore the rivers to their former "pristine" conditions. The wording they are currently using include Natural and Primate areas. Well wonder what NPS's definition of natural and primitive are? My opinion is that natural and primitive indicates a time period prior to any modern day devices, such as gas powered engines, or even rubber tubes. One best really think this over. As an interest group what could happen here is that everything that is not natural and primitive would be removed from the rivers. Not only does this include boats, but tubes, rafts, kayaks. Definitions are very vague here, and everyone could lose the right to use the river. My opinion is on this particular proposition is that groups that believe they are being shown a preference here, could find themselves high and dry. People that are currently preaching and yelling change must understand that this will not give us "more bathrooms" or trash cans etc. It means the area will be retuned to a natural and primitive state. Meaning NO modern conveniences. Alternative B changes the following places on the river as follows: North Boundary to Akers will be non motorized. Akers to Round Spring will be limited to 25 horse on a seasonal basis. Round Spring to Jerktail would be limited to 25 hp. Jerktail to Two Rivers would be limited to 25 hp. Two Rivers to the Southern Edge of the Van Buren gap would be limited to 25 hp. Southern Edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Spring would be limited to 40 hp. Big Springs to Gooseneck would be limited to 40 hp. Keep in mind that those of us that are now running 60/40's will be illegal. Of all the above choices Alternative C appears to be the least abrasive. This is a 10 hp limit from the North Bounday to Akers on a seasonal basis. I have been told that NPS has set those seasonal basis on the premises that boaters may boat that area from mid Sept - May. Akers to Round Spring 25 horse. Round Spring to Jerktail 40 hp. Jerktail to Two Rivers 40 hp. Two Rivers to Northern Gap of Van Buren 40 hp. Southern Edge of the Van Buren Gap to Big Springs 40 hp. Big Springs to Gooseneck 40 hp. One has to consider this also makes all 60/40's illegal. I think that instead of breaking this down into interest groups, we should all stick together to keep this from happening. There are no "winners" here. I remember when we as locals let the Park Service cut the hp the first time. We all worked to do what they said was better for the environment. We were told what we wanted to hear and assured that the hp problem was satisfied. I remember the promises made in Shannon Co. More jobs for locals, giving guided tours etc. NONE of this h</p>						
1603	<p>BUTCH wrote: <quoted text> THEN GO BUY A WOODEN BOAT, AND SHOVE IT, how can i carry 7 people with 40 hp. not my fault you can't afford a v6. If they take anything I hope they take all boats. then you and your stupid friends can sit around a relive the good ole' days what a dick. i dont think they should change the restrictions now. but i remember the days of smaller motors and longer and heavier boats. so that makes me less than you?</p>	6/7/2009	No			MO	64101
1604	<p>People have different wants and needs. My boat has a 40 horse etec, I don't need anything more than that. If I do, I'd like to have the freedom to upgrade! I spend an equal amount of time below big Spring in my boat as I do above waymeyer. I've found that the boaters below the spring with their big Motors are some of the quietestmost respectful groups of people on the river. I never see any tubes or canoes down there.</p>	6/7/2009	No			FL	32746
1605	<p>Does anyone know the where I can find hard facts on this new proposal? I am wanting something in writing that I can read. Thus far, I have only heard "hearsay" and I would like to read for myself the new regualtion proposal. Also, regarding the meetings they are having - which are open to the public - make sure you know that you NEED to register to attend the meeting. I have heard of a number of locals wanting to attend and i am trying to spread the word that they will be unable to attend the meeting if they are not registered to attend. In my opinion, this is a way for the Parkies to see just how many people are upset about this proposal. I plan to find out how to register on Monday and then run an ad in the Local regarding how to register. The more people we can get to attend the meeting (hearsay says it is Monday, June 22 in the VBYCC) the better off our odds are in overturning this proposal. Everyone realizes that if ANY of the three proposals are granted, sooner or later they will outlaw ALL motors</p>	6/7/2009	No			MO	63385

	to be on the Current. This is just a "less severe" route to enabling their long-term wish.						
1606	<p>There are a few things that need to be addressed at these Park Service meetings. This boat restriction proposal is definately a back door route to eventually stop boating or severly cut it back. Second, if they want to stop the risk and confrontation factor between boaters and tubers/canoers then put us a real boat launch above Waymeyer so we have an option to get above the tourist congestion. The temporary ramp at Waymeyer is not very good and does not have adequate parking for trailers. The tourist come here and litter the river every weekend in the summer, there is trash all over when the tourist are thick. If the Park Rangers weren't hiding in the bushes looking for bikinis or napping and were more visible to the public eye then the trash, biligerent drunk and nudity would be toned down. The best way to deter crime is to be more visible and stop it before it actually has a chance to happen. They have it backwards and hide to let the crime happen, then try and catch the offender or most of the time miss it. Being more visible and public friendly would be a step in the right direction. If the higher ups of the park service really knew how it's agents were in the feild things would definately change. Current River Boater wrote: ... Second, if they want to stop the risk and confrontation factor between boaters and tubers/canoers then put us a real boat launch above Waymeyer so we have an option to get above the tourist congestion. The temporary ramp at Waymeyer is not very good and does not have adequate parking for trailers. The tourist come here and litter the river every weekend in the summer, there is trash all over when the tourist are thick... Build a boat launch above Waymeyer and it's only a matter of time before tourists with boats and motors will be putting in there and you can say so long to the beautiful, mostly locals only stretch above Waymeyer. Next thing you know, outfitters will have permission to put tubes/canoes in there. That boat launch is a terrible idea on many fronts. riverlover wrote: <quoted text>outfitters already put in there DUMA%% and a boat launch with parking is a great idea if one wants to avoid co-mingling of floaters and boaters. The discussion of a new Waymeyer boat landing is upstream from the current 'put in' point at Waymeyer. Outfitters, at the moment, will not be allowed to put in there. juice wrote: who is the parky that was on kfvs12 that is all for boats off the river? if you go to kfvs12.com you will see her You all need to take one big ole breath and stop reacting without thinking or the park won't listen to any of you. She never said she wants boats off the river, she said there are more tubes and there are motor boats, this could cause a problem. She could be implying that there should be less tubes. You all need to better understand what's happening with this general management plan or you're going to end up even more upset than you are now if you respond without thinking. If you all take the stand that no action is what you want, then be prepared to live with those consequences if that's what they choose. You can comment on anything you want from all of the alternatives and not just choose one alternative. If you have a problem with the motor regulations, then say something about that, but don't make a general statement that you agree with no action. That literally means NO ACTION, the park service doesn't have to change anything on their end either. If you want change with the park service you're sure not going to get it by saying you're all for 'no action'. No action in this case is a 2 way street. Info wrote: Just so you know, our problem is NOT the tourists, as much as I would like to blame them. Our REAL PROBLEM is the NPS, and all of the environmental groups.... we are going to have to do is to ALL band together, and beat the NPS, and the environmental groups. They are our enemies, not each other... As a perceived 'environmentalist' and a former active member in 'environmental' groups, I can assure you these groups are doing more to fight the National Park Service than any group and have been for years. In fact, it was the Missouri Coalition for the Environment who sued the National Park Service in federal court for scenic easement violations and won. "Environmentalists" are not friends of the Park Service management and will continue to fight them long after this GMP frenzy. We all have love for the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and ALL of us need to find a way to use that common thread as a way to come together as a group to hold the Park Service's feet to the fire on all issues in the park. Whether your fight is hp regulations or you just want a stretch of the 134 miles of river as a place for solitude, we need to come together and find the balance for all user groups. ps. I'm also a local whose family was one of the first to carve out a living on the Current River. And for those who have not seen other posts from me, I believe boating on the river is part of our cultural heritage. Lady Capt wrote: <quoted text> That's why you live in California and we live here. Had we chose to be over populated and live with the noise and fumes and vehicles, we could move to California and live like you. It's people like you that have started this whole mess anyway. Someone that dosen't mind to change an entire areas way of life to suit themselves. I wonder what makes you think you're not trying to change an area's way of life by choosing no action? Remember, no action means you want more recreation, more people, more boats/motors, etc. Wouldn't that then contribute to over population, noise, and fumes on the river? In my opinion, that's changing an area to suit yourself without any consideration of anyone else who wants to enjoy the rivers. Judged: 1 1 1 Lady Capt wrote: <quoted text> It's the current way of life for all of us here to start with. What part of NO ACTION do you NOT understand? It's apparent that you do not understand the alternatives. If you are whom I believe you to be, there is no need to respond. I'll save what I have for you in person. I know the alternatives quite well and was very involved in the first set of meetings (and stood up for boats/motors on the river). We all have a voice in what could happen on the river and I believe we can voice those opinions without lowering ourselves to name calling and threats. If you're convinced that 'no action' is the right choice for you, then comment accordingly. But understand that no one will want to hear your complaints when the park service management abides by the same 'no action/no change'. Whatever wrote: we all have atv's dummy Sorry to jump in on this one, but the Voice of the Ozarks is working the people who are concerned about the hp regulations. You need to learn more about that group, how they got started, and what their true motivations are. They're speaking to all user groups to band together for more recreation which includes atv groups. Again, you can speak about hp regulations without bedding down with groups you despise. Current River Lover wrote: <quoted text> Sorry to jump in on this one, but the Voice of the Ozarks is working the people who are concerned about the hp regulations. You need to learn more about that group, how they got started, and what their true motivations are. They're speaking to all user groups to band together for more recreation which includes atv groups... My apologies, I thought you said we all 'hate' atvs, not 'have'. While I know many</p>	6/8/2009	No			UN	N/A

	people do have them, most would rather not see large groups of them from Southeast Missouri intruding on spots up river where people boat to get away from the crowds. Ridiculous wrote: <quoted text> ... Futhermore if						
1607	Lady Capt wrote: No one said that! I hardly consider a 60/40 a speed boat. It does well to push four adults, expecially if the shoals are shallow. Limits on horse power play a part in limiting speed. I do not drink. I am the average person. One that has worked hard, made my own way, and love the river. I have been and am raising my grand children on Current River. They have been taught to respect, appreciate and enjoy this. I consider myself an average person. I have had many peaceful and quiet days on the current. I have seen Eagles feeding from the river in Nov., as we camped and hunted. I have seen the steam rise off of the spring in the evening, and rise again in the morning. I have no personal vendetta against any tourists, I just try to understand what kind of an environment they live in, and I like the fact that they appreciate this area. We have one of the most beautiful places in the world. I'm just darn angry. I am just tired of being dictated to. I pay taxes, I pay license fees. I pay for my fishing license, I pay insurance premiums, just to enjoy my time on the river. I abide by the rules.. I guess that's just not enough. I still think being offered the river in the "off season" is a slap in the face. I hear ya!! property was taken from my family some time ago for the creation of the scenic riverways, no big deal, right! Until now, anyway. I am getting tired of all of this. What is this going to solve? I am not opposed to the tourists being there, but there are more important issues, like access. You can't put in near town and run upriver without worrying about your kids getting hit in the nose with a rock. This is an unacceptable compromise. Current River Boater wrote: There are a few things that need to be addressed at these Park Service meetings. This boat restriction proposal is definately a back door route to eventually stop boating or severly cut it back. Second, if they want to stop the risk and confrontation factor between boaters and tubers/canoers then put us a real boat launch above Waymeyer so we have an option to get above the tourist congestion. The temporary ramp at Waymeyer is not very good and does not have adequate parking for trailers. The tourist come here and litter the river every weekend in the summer, there is trash all over when the tourist are thick. If the Park Rangers weren't hiding in the bushes looking for bikinis or napping and were more visible to the public eye then the trash, biligerent drunk and nudity would be toned down. The best way to deter crime is to be more visible and stop it before it actually has a chance to happen. They have it backwards and hide to let the crime happen, then try and catch the offender or most of the time miss it. Being more visible and public friendly would be a step in the right direction. If the higher ups of the park service really knew how it's agents were in the feild things would definately change. This is True!! I love it when I go to put a boat in and the ramp is being used for a beach, and you're a no good motherf---er for asking them to move.	6/9/2009	No			IL	62220
1608	hoozierdaddy wrote: <quoted text> I hear ya!! property was taken from my family some time ago for the creation of the scenic riverways, no big deal, right! Until now, anyway. I am getting tired of all of this. What is this going to solve? I am not opposed to the tourists being there, but there are more important issues, like access. You can't put in near town and run upriver without worrying about your kids getting hit in the nose with a rock. This is an unacceptable compromise. you are so right.	6/9/2009	No			MO	63385
1609	went by the MDC building yesterday. For anyone who wants their voice heard, they really need to attend the meeting at the VBYCC on June 22 from 5-7. You DO NOT need to register for the event, simply show up. They will be taking comments that supposededly will help in the final decision. Also remember, that there are actually 4 proposals - a "no-action" proposal (this is the one I feel that most people would want...take no action and leave the river as is) and then the 3 radical proposals....everything from limiting motors to 25 hp above Waymeyer to no motors at all. If the proposals annoy anyone, please show up at the public meeting.	6/9/2009	No			MO	63368
1610	Im below Big Spings and all you see on busy weekends is all the trash from the floaters. They don't care about the river only how much fun they can have and that is not a problem but don't trash the river in order to do so. When im out gigging the amount of trash that you see on the bottom is amazing. It is not the big motors messing the rivers up it is the floaters that sink that beer can instead of putting it in a sack. That boats below Big Spring are really polite to others and respect others. They don't float into you while you are fishing and laugh or float by and cus at you for fishing in the river. I think that the HP limits below Big Spings are just fine. No one with the big motors run all out only to get through the shallow areas and to haul their family around. I remember when you made 2 and 3 trips to get you family out to the gravel bar now you make one. Seems to me less traveling is better. I can't take off work for this but I hope you that can be there are there.	6/9/2009	No			MO	N/A
1611	This is what the NPS wanted all along although they better look at the total picture what it will do to the local economy. I for one will get a different boat and go elsewhere! If not for river there is nothing down here.	6/10/2009	No			UN	N/A
1612	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 3: Banning boats is wrong Response to Question 4: Van Buren area should have more public access points for visitors, then the parks can monitor and control Response to Question 5: Conservationists should use better motors on their boats that don't pollute.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65803
1613	I am on the river regularly in my boat from gooseneck all the way to two rivers. Most boaters are considerate and do what is right but there is always the few idiots that give everyone a bad name. There is a couple of boats I see constantly that scream back and forth in the gap doing all they can to harass floaters. One boat has a two hundred plus motor on it and the other a plain white forty with no lettering and they do this all day even on Saturdays when the river is cram packed. I would say these two are responsible for hundreds of complaints which lead to crap like this. If you own a boat act responsibly. If you are coming by a canoe, slow to idle if possible until they go by especially if the canoe or tubes have small children in them. There is room for all but like everything else a few ruin it for everybody. The mentality that it is your river is nuts. We need less government regulation for sure. Hopefully they will leave things as they are.	6/10/2009	No			MO	63901

1614	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: How about making those easier to review?! Response to Question 3: Boaters are not the problem Response to Question 5: How about all boats using green motors, including the conservation department!	6/24/2009	No			MO	65803
1615	Boater wrote: I am on the river regularly in my boat from gooseneck all the way to two rivers. Most boaters are considerate and do what is right but there is always the few idiots that give everyone a bad name. There is a couple of boats I see constantly that scream back and forth in the gap doing all they can to harass floaters. One boat has a two hundred plus motor on it and the other a plain white forty with no lettering and they do this all day even on Saturdays when the river is cram packed. I would say these two are responsible for hundreds of complaints which lead to crap like this. If you own a boat act responsibly. If you are coming by a canoe, slow to idle if possible until they go by especially if the canoe or tubes have small children in them. There is room for all but like everything else a few ruin it for everybody. The mentality that it is your river is nuts. We need less government regulation for sure. Hopefully they will leave things as they are. If every boater had as much respect/common sense as you there would be no problems. I have enjoying floating(non powered)the current river for the past 30 years,I feel like it has gotten out of control. Way to many out of control tubers and a few, just a few out of control boaters. To those who say you don't live here,, you shouldn't have any vote on how it is run,,,,, it is a National Park.	6/11/2009	No			AR	N/A
1616	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 3: Don't Ban Boats! Response to Question 4: I think that the tubers & canoers do most of the polluting. The Boaters are the ones to clean it up! Response to Question 5: Have ALL Boats use greener Motors. Open more public access beaches.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65803
1617	Response to Question 1: Where do you find these to read?? I say, No action Response to Question 2: Better public access for visitors Response to Question 3: Do Not Ban Boaters Response to Question 4: Tourist areas like Van Buren and Eminence need more public access Response to Question 5: Have the conservation officers use green motors as well as restricting green motors on the rivers	6/24/2009	No			MO	65807
1618	Any and ALL who have a boat should meet on the river and lets take it back...take it back from the Park Service. They are nothing more than river NAZIS' Let's fill the river with our boats for a day of protest and go ANYWHERE WE WANT. Isn't this the land of the free??? kentucky wrote: I dont think they should do anything to the boats on the river. I was tubing this weekend and got hung up my tube left me i was in the current and if it wasnt for someone in a BOAT that could get to me i wouldnt be here today. Thank you for whoever it was God bless you. If you are the girl that was just past Deer Run that lost her tube you are welcome.	6/11/2009	No			MO	63368
1619	I find this whole topic annoying.....any intelligent person who knows all the FACTS would agree that there are a few boaters who are problems and as has been true since beginning of time, there are some tourists that are problems. Why doesn't the NPS focus on writing tickets and or banning the boaters who are ignoring common safety factors, acting stupid, and leave the others alone? Why shouldn't those that live in, pay taxes, work, and raise their families in VB have a say??? Whoever said that is plain stupid. Of course, their opinions should matter the most--without them there would be no VB, no current river, no one to wait on the tourists in the restaurants, the tube rentals, the motels, the gas stations.....duh! My Dad worked, sold boats, was mayor, served VB all of his life and he would vehemently be opposed to any of this legislation. He would be making sure everyone knew the facts and asking everyone to show up at the meetings and be heard. I ask the same. I don't live there now, but I love VB and I hope that Current River will stay a welcoming place for boaters, swimmers, and tourists forever.	6/14/2009	No			UN	N/A
1620	Brandan wrote: I wish tubes were banned. The tourists cause more harm than my boat! A little civil disobedience is in order if they try to take my boat away. I happen to agree with this post about tubes! A few people make money from renting tubes. I witnessed a scene today that is all too frequent. A woman was standing over at bass rock screaming obscenities at her two children. Including many of the F bombs. Evidently they had displeased her. These kids were under 10 years of age. Her husband was standing right there also. Her voice rang through the valley. She kept on and kept on. A person going by in a canoe said she shouldn't use that language on her kids. Well she completely came undone on that, and unleashed a torrent of @\$%% on him! AND her husband joined in and told the guy to pull over so he could beat the s..t out of him for disrespecting his "relations".... The woman jumped in her tube and paddled off in hot pursuit of the canoe screaming all the way. It was DISGUSTING! This was an extreme case I grant you, but the filthy language, nudity, cigarette butts, and beer cans are something I have NEVER heard coming from the boaters!	6/14/2009	No			MO	63089
1621	Response to Question 1: The best one for our community & our people is the "No Action Plan"!! Response to Question 2: Not a one of them. We should be able to enjoy the river as we always have. If anything at all should change it would be the HP limitation. Response to Question 3: A-B & C--Why are you taking our rights away from us?! Why are you taking family enjoyment out of our families?! Response to Question 4: All 134 miles is very special to me & my whole family from Grandmas & Grandpas, Aunts & Uncles, cousins, friends, Mom & Dad, brothers & sisters. I want to be able to see whatever I want each time I go to the river. That should be my decision. Response to Question 5: Well, honestly just leave it alone. There is nothing wrong with any of it now! This is all the enjoyment that some families have. Current river is where I learned to swim & skip rocks. This is where I want to teach my children to swim & skip rocks!	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1622	This is completely ridiculous I have two wuestions, one is do you think that when they set all these horsepower limits and eventually decide that boats will not be allowed in the summer that the Water Patrol will just sit on the bank or do you think that they will keep their boats? My next question is how many tourists do you see picking up trash out of the river while floating down it. I go out of my way as do most of the other boaters that I know to stop the boat and pick us trash floating in the river. You know as well as I do that the Water Patrol will still be in their boats and the River will have more trash in it than it ever has	6/14/2009	No			MO	65032

1623	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 5: There Are no Reasons for taking the boats off the River, the Govt should leave us Alone.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63940
1624	Im might have my stories wrong here, but I heard that saturday a few tubers got hung up is a tree/root wad, and that one lady could barley hold her head up and was about to drown, thank god casey and cathly terry came up and saved them is there BOATS, but on saturday I did witness a few drunks hung up in the same tree, and Pat the RAT Jackson came up to help but he acted like it just killed him to help the tubers, and I was behind picking up all there belonging that where dumped out!	6/14/2009	No			MO	63875
1625	Response to Question 1: No-Action	9/8/2009	No			MO	65588
1626	Glad to see this much debate. Everyone needs to attend the organizational meeting monday at the community center.	6/14/2009	No			UN	N/A
1627	We own property in this area and love the river in our 40 hp. We have ultimate respect for the river and do everything possible to pick up the stray litter left by the tubers. I would like to add to the previous comments this new regulation would have a devastating impact on the local economy of Van Buren. These people are dependent on local and weekender boatowners. There are no other jobs or businesses to develop in this area, they thrive off river-related activities. Van Buren is already a depressed town, this would wipe it out. The river still has great fishing and it crystal clear when it is not raining. We love the area and hope this regulation will not pass.	5/15/2009	No			MO	N/A
1628	I am certain that the NPS is porposly letting those people that like to float the river and are against boating to be miss lead. The NPS proposals will in-pack the FLOATERS so profoundly that tourism will suffer greatly. the NPS only contoles a small part of the normal floating stetch in van buren. the majority of their float trip will take place in the four mile stretch not cotoled by the NPS. if any one of the proposals take place vertually all boats being used on the river now could be operated only in the section of river around van buren that has the heaviest floater trafic. if these proposals go through there will be a huge increase of casulties on the river.	6/15/2009	No			MO	N/A
1629	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: None. If you cut the Horsepower to 25 there is No way I can take my Family up River, unless I make 4 or 5 trips I can also Tell you, in the Past 20 years of Running a Boat I have saved at Least 15 People. Not from being turned over by Boats But By Floating under tree Limbs or going over Root wads. Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: I have to many to List. I've been on this River All my Life Response to Question 5: If your trying to Limit the Amounts of Boats on the River why is nothing Put on the Plan About Limiting the Amount of Tubes and canoes?	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1630	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Any Horsepower Limits--promote Responsible use instead of excessive Regulations. Response to Question 4: The entire Area is Traditional use for my Decendants who Are Old Settler Cherokee. Access Denial is Disintegrity of Goverment. Response to Question 5: Use Personell and Resources to Maintain safe Access. Fix the Hawes Campground Boat Access	9/11/2009	No			FL	32137
1631	Response to Question 1: No Action Hp changes will hurt being on Current River Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All of A, B, & C Response to Question 4: We are already stewards of the river and help the cleanlyness of the River Response to Question 5: The boat ramp above Weymeyer that was supposed to be installed would take 70% of the boating problems in the gap!	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1632	Response to Question 1: The current policies seen to be working. So I would ask that you choice the No-Action. Response to Question 2: All road's should remain open I'm Handicap an can only Drive my truck in to area's to Hunt & fish. My Son & Daughter both enjoy trail riding in the fall & Boating in the Summer Response to Question 3: A B & C would restrict my ability to use the river Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Two river is my kid's & mine selfs favorite they can boat ride to Williams land & I can drive there and enjoy the river toghter. Response to Question 5: Need more Ranger to enforces the rules on week-ends	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1633	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: everywhere on the river/No Action	9/14/2009	No			MO	63567
1634	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Outboard Motor Horse power should Remain the same. No changes to the Big Spring Area. Response to Question 4: I think All Areas should be left the same As it is Now.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63965
1635	I for one do not see how a hp limit will make the river a better place. Lower HP on rivers only makes for unhappy responsible boat owners and slower moving idiots. Instead I feel that the GMP (isn't that what the new governing body will be?...going off memory from the Current Local) should instead focus on prompt, consistent, and professional enforcement of current regulations. That would make the river a better place for everyone both locals and floaters alike. As it is unless the drunk and disorderly tourists AND the self centered boaters which in all honesty are the minority are made to change their ways, the river will never change even if we are forced to go a little slower.	6/15/2009	No			MO	N/A

1636	Current River Lover wrote: <quoted text> Build a boat launch above Waymeyer and it's only a matter of time before tourists with boats and motors will be putting in there and you can say so long to the beautiful, mostly locals only stretch above Waymeyer. Next thing you know, outfitters will have permission to put tubes/canoes in there. That boat launch is a terrible idea on many fronts. outfitters already put in there DUMA%% and a boat launch with parking is a great idea if one wants to avoid co-mingling of floaters and boaters.	6/15/2009	No			MO	63901
1637	Response to Question 1:No Acitons. We want the motor restrictions to read 40 H.P. at the jet pump. Response to Question 2: Would like to have unrestricted rights and recreation to the National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 3: Part A, B, C they restrict our rights to how we can use the property that I love to use for hunting & fishing. And by closing access to certain roads it limits me to the areas that I can hunt. Response to Question 4: I use the current river from mauntauk to Doniphin from fishing to hunting, AtV's, and jet boating and the only alternative that suits my needs is no action Response to Question 5: I would like to see more action taken back Park Service Agents to limit the drugs & alchol use on the riverways and I beleive they should have drug check points on the river.	9/8/2009	No			MO	65560
1638	I think they should eliminate all vessels. Boats, tubes, canoes. I think we should all body float down the river totally nude and one with nature. Hardy har har.	6/16/2009	No			MO	63901
1639	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None of A B or C Response to Question 3: A B & C Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: That the National Riverways Be Turned over To The Missouri Goverment like it was 40 years ago.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63937
1640	If they pass any of these laws they will ruin the river. LEAVE THINGS THE WAY THEY ARE!!! They never realize that even the floaters and tourist that come to current river don't just come to float and look at the scenery, they also come to meet new people and have fun... The point I'm making is that river is already gets more deserted every year and if they pass those laws then no-one will ever go to the river,,, Maybe thats what they want.. they will regret it once they see how dead Van Buren gets if they do it..	6/16/2009	No			MO	63385
1641	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: motor restrictions should not be instated. Response to Question 4: Van Buren area Response to Question 5: more river access and camping area's	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1642	THIS WILL NEVER BE MAYBERRY THERE ARE NO MORE WOOOOOOOODEN BOATS NOR WILL THERE BE! EVER ! forget NOSTALGIA ! THIS IS 2009. Although I would like to see more peoples camping at the bigspring park... when I was a kid there was 500 people there every weekend during the summer... The park thinks we are the problem and the party crowd is running off the families. Well how come the campgrounds in town are booked through summer, and BSP is empty????????? who is the parky that was on kfvs12 that is all for boats off the river? if you go to kfvs12.com you will see her Ill be up Friday, to pick up 100 forms, I have at least a 100 ppl I work with wanting to fill them out my co-works and there family's, Im not a true local but Im been in the vb area for a long time, I just wish we and the park service could just get along, Ill do whatever I can to help my fellow boaters out!	6/16/2009	No			AR	N/A
1643	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: None or C if there is no hidden clauses. Response to Question 3: A & B Response to Question 4: Paint Rock. No Response to Question 5: Add more river access Would like to fish without being check 3-4 times in 6 Hours.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1644	juice wrote: who is the parky that was on kfvs12 that is all for boats off the river? if you go to kfvs12.com you will see her I only have one thing to say: Get as many comment cards filled out as you can, and make sure to make a COPY of the ones that you fill out.(I was told that the ones that get mailed in, are more than likely going to be trashed.) That way if worse comes to worse we will have PROOF. I personally am going to be taking some to the river with me this weekend, and when I'm there over the fourth of July. I will be asking even the tourist to fill them out, it will effect them also. If we let them (NPS) have any one thing, it won't be long before they will have us off of the rivers completely. Just so you know, our problem is NOT the tourists, as much as I would like to blame them. Our REAL PROBLEM is the NPS, and all of the environmental groups. Boaters blaming tourists, or canoeist blaming boaters, or swimmers blaming horses, that is exactly what they are wanting us to do. They are trying to separate all of the different groups, and get them to blame each other, when what we are going to have to do is to ALL band together, and beat the NPS, and the environmental groups. They are our enemies, not each other. Just so everyone knows, I practically live on the river in the summer. I own a boat, but I also like to take an occasional canoe trip, and I like to ride horses. I have a 60/40 merc, so if any of these alternatives are passed, excluding the no action one, I will be forced to get rid of my motor. I DO NOT want to do that. Now don't get me wrong, I'm not a tourist freak, or anything like that, but if it means getting along with them so that we can keep our rights to OUR rivers, I'll be the first one to volunteer. I just think that we all need to understand who our real enemies are. That being said, have a great night, and FILL OUT THOSE COMMENT CARDS AND GET THEM SENT IN! I have read them all, and have also attended the meetings. Please don't be misguided. I understand that they want to create a diversity of groups, and activities, but what you are NOT understanding is that THEY get to decide WHO gets to do WHAT, WHEN they get to do it, WHERE they can to do it at, and HOW they can do it, and for how long. Do you really want someone to tell YOU: WHAT, WHEN, WHERE, and HOW you can participate in different kinds of recreation? I guess I should have made myself more clear in my last post. I would recommend NO ACTION, with NO limits on RECREATION, USE, and ACCESS. That means for EVERYONE, I'm not just for the boaters. If we can get this done, then we can work on what else we would like for THEM to do for US. As a matter of fact, that is pretty much what question #five on the comment cards is for. They want to know what THEY can do for US, or to HELP US. I think that WE (the people who use not only the rivers, but also the land, weather it be for hunting, camping, horseback riding, four-wheeler riding, driving back roads, etc) should get to decide what is best for all of us, and	6/17/2009	No			UN	N/A

	not a bunch of environmental FREAKS,(that have not even been here, and have no idea what really goes on). It's OUR river, and WE take care of it, and have been doing so for the last 100 years, and might I add, have done an excellent job of doing so, and not THEM. Have you ever stopped to think that the NPS is supposed to be working for US, and its time that they started being the employees, and not the bosses?						
1645	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Big Spring, to Gooseneck, Alley Spring Response to Question 5: No more Rules. We have to any now.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1646	Maybe since the landing is getting rich off of our river they could force them to send a couple of guys out each Sunday to pick up trash.I am a boater and my family does it's fair share of picking up after the tourist why shouldn't the ones that are making the money.Wonder what would have happened to those tubers that got hung in the trees and were rescued by Terry and Cathy if they were not allowed to have their boat in the water?	6/17/2009	No			MO	N/A
1647	Response to Question 1: No Action. Our boat hasa pulled several tubes out of root wads. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Big Springs to Gooseneck We have a large family & camp alot and a 40 horse is just to small. Response to Question 5: Someone should count the actual number of tubes and canoes that are being put on the river and realize that it is over populated w/tubes & canoes. The # that the park is recieveing is not correct. The locals are hear in the winter and support the town & park all year long, by gigging & fishing.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1648	I am not a local but own land in Van Buren. I have a boat with a 60/40 on it. I do not agree with any of the hp alternatives they have in the preliminarys. I also do not agree with the no-action alternative. No-action means No-action what so ever this is about more than just limiting hp on the river. Alternative C with the exception of the horsepower limits an a few other details is probly the way to go.If you go to www.nps.gov/ozar and read ALL the Preliminarys not just the part about hp limits it has some good things in it.	6/17/2009	No			MO	63877
1649	If you choose No ACTION, please state why you have chosen it, and what you would like to see done differently	6/17/2009	No			UN	N/A
1650	Response to Question 1: No-Action is close. Rise limit on Horsepower, because need more horse power to go up River. Response to Question 2: I would like to have more Access to boat docks, & caves educational stopping points along the River way to show our heiritage. Response to Question 3: You shouldn't limit the means that people choise to use the River Preliminary alternitives A, B & C shouldn't be included in the future Response to Question 4: My family enjoy visiting all of the Springs around Van Buren area Big Spring, Water Crest, Blue Spring, Brss rock, Waymeyer & other Response to Question 5: Most everyone gets along & help everyone else on the River NO More rules & regulations	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1651	Brandan wrote: Boats are getting quieter - especially with the new four strokes. More HP does not mean more speed - I need more HP so I can carry my family and get my boat on top of the water. I live in the Gap right on the river. I see many boats. They do not annoy me. What bothers me are the drunk tourists that like to cuss me out when they get to me. Most boaters (with a few exceptions) are not the problem on the river. I take my boat below Big Spring a lot. It is very peaceful. It's more peaceful with all the bigger motors than it is in the gap or just below waymeyer! The dang tourists trash our river and I have to actually leave my river property on the weekends by traveling above waymeyer or below Van Buren to get some peace and quiet. TUBES are what need to be banned - not big motors! if you cant git your family into less than a 40 hp boat i suggest you git 2 20 hp boats so you will fit under the new restrictions. i live w/motors up my kazoo. when i go to a beautiful natural area like current river it is not so i can see motorboats speeding past all day long! Lady Capt wrote: <quoted text> That's why you live in California and we live here. Had we chose to be over populated and live with the noise and fumes and vehicles, we could move to California and live like you. It's people like you that have started this whole mess anyway. Someone that dosen't mind to change an entire areas way of life to suit themselves. don't make me angry or i will tell everyone about current river!! i w/stand on the corner of sunset and vine and hand out flyers extolling the wonders of ozark nat. scenic river ways if you don't be nice to me!! ...who littered my post w/a spam can, burned out bulb and peanut shells? someone better give me a gold star and a heart or i will bring tourist tubers down on you like a swarm of locusts!!!! Lady Capt wrote: <quoted text> You best shhhhhh, or I will remind you why you do not post on the Poplar Bluff forum any longer..capeshe? bring it on, skank! i will post anywhere i want, anytime i want. i am so sick of p. b. i am glad i got on here before i moved back. it reminded me of why i left. i stand by EVERYTHING i ever said so sshhh yourself. i am sick of you republican devils and i hope they ban ALL motors on the current. there. how you like them apples? Lady Capt wrote: Touch a lil nerve did I? I don't like being threatened. Just wanted to make sure we understood one another. "Skank"? Hardly, what are you eleven? i stand by everything i said EXCEPT any threats i made. i lost my temper when i was threatened and reacted w/making threats of my own which i officially retract.	6/18/2009	No			CA	N/A
1652	would like to see all tubers and canoes off the river. they come down sink their cans and trash in the river.	6/18/2009	No			UN	N/A
1653	Response to Question 1: No-Action is close, I would like to have to right to run any size motor I chose on the river, because sometime you need more horsepower depenting on how far up river you're going. Response to Question 2: I would also like to have more access to the River & caves. Response to Question 3: You shouldn't limit the means that people choise to use the River. Preliminary Alternitives A, B or C Should NOT be included in the future Response to Question 4: Friends & Family use all the Spring around from Van Buren to Piedmont, Alleyspring. Response to Question 5: Most everyone gets along on the river. We even pick up Trash on the River. Thing should be left the way they are!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965

1654	Just me wrote: If you choose No ACTION, please state why you have chosen it, and what you would like to see done differently. The river should be for everyone to use. I float, fish, camp and jet on the river with my family. I don't live in the area but love to visit it 1-2 times a year for the past 42 years. In the off season the HP restrictions should be lifted as I would love to jet up to Pulltite like I could in the old days. I have a 16' boat with a 60/40 Merc jet. I avoid the canoe crowd by jetting up from Two Rivers early in the morning or by using the river down stream from Two Rivers more on the weekend. During the week or off season there is really not any problems and the park service should know that!!! I agree with enforcing violaters in boats, canoes and tubes and not making all boaters suffer because of these ridiculous proposals. I'll pray common sense prevails but I have my doubts.	6/19/2009	No			TX	N/A
1655	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: motor restrictions should not be instated. Response to Question 4: Van Buren area Response to Question 5: more camping & river access.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1656	Would someone explain why people in Van Buren are banding together with a group that wants among other things more atvs in the river? I thought people there hated atv's. And another thing why are people saying they want more recreation when the main person getting that money owns all the tube oufits? I thought you all were smarter than that. People will still come if you get rid of some of the tubes and canoes. More people would come if there weren't any atvs allowed. Who wants to hear that noise when your sitting on a gravel bar or trying to fish out of your boat?	6/19/2009	No			MO	N/A
1657	There is not one shred of evidence proving that motor boats hurt the river in ANY way, or that they have a negative impact on the environment.	6/20/2009	No			UN	N/A
1658	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: All the River Response to Question 5: no Big Rafts with 4 or more people	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1659	Lady Capt wrote: <quoted text> Not necessary to explain what should be done differently, when one uses the no action status. That's pretty self explanatory! First of all, NO ACTION, means just that, but you have to realize, that that means no action on their part also. What I mean by that, is they don't have to do anything to make our lives easier, like install more bathrooms, be out in the open, instead of hiding in the bushes, be more helpful to everyone, etc. That's what I meant when I said that you need to tell them what needs to be done differently. (personally I don't like to be floating down the river in my boat, and all of a sudden, you can hear their radios, but you can't see them. I think if they had to be in plain sight, there wouldn't be as much trouble on the river. That's just my opinion though.)	6/20/2009	No			UN	N/A
1660	Just asking wrote: Would someone explain why people in Van Buren are banding together with a group that wants among other things more atvs in the river? I thought people there hated atv's. And another thing why are people saying they want more recreation when the main person getting that money owns all the tube oufits? I thought you all were smarter than that. People will still come if you get rid of some of the tubes and canoes. More people would come if there weren't any atvs allowed. Who wants to hear that noise when your sitting on a gravel bar or trying to fish out of your boat? Have you ever met anyone from van buren ? We want you flippin city hippy mo-fo's to leave us the hell alone and stop trying to change our way of life to fit your misguided expectations, is that so dam hard to understand. we all have atv's dummy for real wrote: would like to see all tubers and canoes off the river. they come down sink their cans and trash in the river. You and everyone else I know , thats a management plan I could really get behind	6/20/2009	No			MO	65615
1661	Response to Question 1: No, action should be taken, boaters should have the same right to be on the river as anybody else. Response to Question 3: No restrictions of horse power or access to river Response to Question 4: Clubhouse, Chilton is most convenient for me to access river Response to Question 5: Have easy accessible ways to and from the river	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1662	I dont think they should do anything to the boats on the river. I was tubing this weekend and got hung up my tube left me i was in the current and if it wasnt for someone in a BOAT that could get to me i wouldnt be here today. Thank you for whoever it was God bless you.	6/21/2009	No			KY	42066
1663	kentucky wrote: I dont think they should do anything to the boats on the river. I was tubing this weekend and got hung up my tube left me i was in the current and if it wasnt for someone in a BOAT that could get to me i wouldnt be here today. Thank you for whoever it was God bless you. I have a favor to ask of you. Do you think that it might be possible for you to get a comment card, and put "NO ACTION" on it. It would be greatly appreciated, and if you would like, you can have your friends and family to do the same. Again, I would like to say THANK YOU, and GOD BLESS.	6/21/2009	No			UN	N/A
1664	Current River Lover wrote: <quoted text> Sorry to jump in on this one, but the Voice of the Ozarks is working the people who are concerned about the hp regulations. You need to learn more about that group, how they got started, and what their true motivations are. They're speaking to all user groups to band together for more recreation which includes atv groups. Again, you can speak about hp regulations without bedding down with groups you despise. It seems that you are unable to discuss a topic without an overnearing opinion. Apparently it seems that you believe that no one else is entitled to an opinion. As for bedding down with people that may well be your down fall, but leave me out of that equasion. Futhermore if you were so "versed" in this entire process then perhaps you should spend your time explaining it to people as opposed to trying to start personal shit with me. It's apparent by your comments about ATV's that you do not live here and my guess is that your knowledge is limited. So find another topic to discuss, someone else to argue with. I plan on discussing this up until the very last day, and I plan on hitting the NPS with at least five thousand NO ACTION petitions. Maybe you could enlighten us all by telling us your experience on the Current, what kind of boat you have etc.	6/22/2009	No			MO	64850

	Otherwise I will take your comments for what they are..meaningless.						
1665	Current River Lover wrote: <quoted text> My apologies, I thought you said we all 'hate' atvs, not 'have'. While I know many people do have them, most would rather not see large groups of them from Southeast Missouri intruding on spots up river where people boat to get away from the crowds. BY MOST PEOPLE YOU MEAN YOU RIGHT.	6/22/2009	No			WA	N/A
1666	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION - WHAT ARE THE LOCALS SUPPOSED TO DO WITH THE MOTORS THEY HAVE NOW? WITH THE ECONOMY THE WAY IT IS, GOING BOATING IS ONE OF THE FEW LOCAL ACTIVITIES THAT CAN BE AFFORDED. WE LIVE HERE ALL YEAR, TOURISTS ARE ONLY HERE 3 TO 4 MONTHS. ARE THEY KEEPING THE TOWN UP? HELL NO! Response to Question 2: NO ACTION. Do the local boat owners ever make a complaint that they had to pull some tubers out of root wads? No they do it out of the kindness of their heart. With smaller motors they won't have the power to haul them out. Response to Question 3: A B C Are we supposed to just go out and buy a new motor just because tourists can't stay out of the way? We don't have the extra money and will just have to give up boating. Is that right? Who's more important? tubers or local citizens? Response to Question 4: BIG SPRING TO GOOSENECK - NO WE HAVE A LARGE FAMILY THAT GOES TOGETHER AND A 40 H WONT BRING US BACK UP RIVER. Response to Question 5: ONLY ALLOW TUBING IN CERTAIN SECTIONS OR FIVER AND MINIMIZE MOTR SIZE IN THAT AREA ONLY. Put a limit on the amount of tubes in one day & there will be room for all. You might need to actually count how many are actually going out. Your tube renters will lie for a dollar.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1667	zeldall wrote: I, like many of you on here, grew up on this river. Back in the day we had a 22 ft. john boat with a 10 horse Evinrude prop motor. That boat was all we needed to fish, gig, and play. I'm not sure what's right for this river in regards to motor size, but I do think some of these big motors are excessive for this river. I mean shoot, you can't water ski on it so why go so big on engine size? you really sound like you know what you are talking about. i guess you can tell us how almost every shoal in the river doesnt have a channel anymore and thats why everyone had to switch to jet motors, or how a 10hp prop is equal to a 25hp jet or a bit bigger, and also how everyone in the community that has a lot invested in their boats will have 14,000\$ boats that wont be worth 2,000 due to the fact so many will be for sale and we are the only area around that runs flat bottoms with jets. also the lost revenue from out of town boat owners will be the first of many factors that will break every river community. the gmp also restrict fishing, horse and atv riding, hunting, trapping, and eventually stop anyone from sitting foot on the senic riverways that we pay tax on. so your right, its not a big deal, dumb ass. how about this, get your 10hp prop and your 22ft wooden boat and take a spin on the current, then decide for yourself what the "big deal" is. sounds like you havent in the last 70 years	6/24/2009	No			MO	63385
1668	Looks like going to channel hull boats and will be running a prop	7/7/2009	No			UN	N/A
1669	Response to Question 1: No Action - I would like to be able to usse any size motor I choose. I have a large family and anything smaller than a 40 HP would NOT permit my family to go boating. Response to Question 2: I would like to have more access to caves, boat ramps, (not between Waymayer & the bridge) and stops for hiking & picnicing. Response to Question 3: There should NOT be any limits as how I can use the river as I live here. Response to Question 4: Cedar Grove, Baptist, Round Springs, Two Rivers, Power Mill, Blue Springs, Paint Rock, Log Yard, Big Springs, Hickory Landing, Cataract. All of these places - my family & I visit, camp & kayak. Response to Question 5: You need to enforce the area between Waymayer & Town where the floaters are. That is where all of the trash, parters, & trouble is.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1670	crackjaw wrote: <quoted text> everyone in the community that has a lot invested in their boats will have 14,000\$ boats that wont be worth 2,000 due to the fact so many will be for sale Cars and boats are terrible investments. In fact, they aren't really investments. Cars are a necessity. Boats are toys. You should see my portfolio of stocks. A boat would have been a better investment. LOL. You had better sell your boats before the bottom falls out.	7/8/2009	No			MO	65775
1671	I have to say that I only tubed in Current River one time, and I was cougtht in root wads in a fast current on the side and my tube came out from under me also. I am not a good swimmer and was starting to panic, I had gotten away from my group and was alone. Someone jumped out of a boat and helped me over to the other side of the river where there was a sand bank I could stand up in and walk out. I never knew who he was, but without him I wouldn't be here to tell the story. This was over 10 years ago, and I haven't floated since. I do have to say tho , I was on the riverfront for the fireworks and I saw a few boats there gassing it back and forth and I wasn't sure the reason for that, except the kids sure loved the waves. Reminded me of being on a drag strip tho !!	7/8/2009	No			UN	N/A
1672	Current River Raider wrote: <quoted text> I have a 60/40 Johnson and if they don't outlaw them too than that's what ya need. I always run below Van Buren from Chilton to big springs park and around gooseneck and It does all I need it to, With just me in it it will run about 40mph and I can put 3 or 4 people in it and It hardly slows it down,, They are good strong motors.. I'll bet 100 bucks your boat won't run 35 mph with 4 people in it,,,unless you have modified your mota. and why do that if 60hp is enough.....	7/8/2009	No			CO	N/A
1673	Response to Question 1: No-action is close, I would like to have the right to run any size motor I chosse. Raise the limit on Horsepower. Need more horsepower to move my family on the river. Response to Question 2: I would like to have more access to caves and boat docks. I also like the idea of the educational stopping points along the riverways to shouw our heiritage. Response to Question 3: You should Not limit the means that people choise to use the river. Preliminary alternitives A, B, or C should Not be included in the future Response to Question 4: Blue Spring, Big Springs, water crest, Paint rock, Bass rock, Powdermill, Log Yard, Waymeyer, Gooseneck, Alley spring. All of these place me and my family	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965

	enjoy visiting, camping & Boating Response to Question 5: everyone gets along and helps everyone else on the river. We all keep it clean and respect its beauty. /No more rules and regulations.						
1674	Response to Question 1: Bo Change or More options Most of Alternave C is Not to Bad, If you Don't put a lot of Rules & Regulations that end up Costing Locals Less access. Response to Question 2: Increase Public Access to all of Current River. Make more Boat Ramps. Set areas for tubbers that don't put them in contest with fishing an the Boats. Response to Question 3: None of Alternative A, OR B, OR C Response to Question 4: Eather No Change or C will surifice But with some xtra work from Park Service. Response to Question 5: If you pass the A & B. someone will be Hurt or drown. The Boats are the Ones who save the Tubber & Canoe Accidents, Since Water Patrol Are Not Allowed to haul them in.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1675	Carrying Capacity and the Riverways question Commentary by ... As I've been doing behind the scenes work keeping this page up-to-date, I got to thinking about carrying capacity. Any hunter or farmer or even pet owner knows what carrying capacity is. It's the ability of the resource to support the number of creatures which depend upon it. Maintaining a good carrying capacity, neither too few, nor too many, is the reason for changes in hunting and fishing limits. It's the reason you can't put 100 cattle on one acre of ground, and expect them to eat only the grass. It's why, when some crazy lady keeps 75 cats in her house, and the stench gets so bad that neighbors can smell it, the authorities are called in. There's a famous essay on carrying capacity called The Tragedy of the Commons, written by Garrett Hardin in 1968. Wikipedia sums it up this way: "The article describes a dilemma in which multiple individuals acting independently in their own self-interest can ultimately destroy a shared limited resource even when it is clear that it is not in anyone's long term interest for this to happen." This seems to be the battle now being waged over the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Ozark Riverways is unusual for a federal park in that it doesn't have just a few access points, say, like Yellowstone. There are many activities permitted under lax enforcement conditions, simply because of the nature of the access and the preferences of the Ozark people. There are some activities, like hunting and trapping, which are generally not permitted at all on other national parks. And there are some restrictions, like the original boat horsepower designations, which seemed prudent at the time. You cannot float a 24-foot Lake Ozark style party barge on the Current River above Akers. There isn't enough water. I started coming to the Riverways in 1969, just before title to Alley Spring State Park was transferred to federal control. I remember when there still were johnboats on the river, when a huge horse ride was 50 horses, there were food concessions in the park, and I can sympathize with people who want things put back the way it was back then. It was easier, simpler, more innocent. But I'm not sure we can go back to the future. There are too many people wanting to all use the Riverways at the same time: Friday and Saturday between Memorial Day and Labor Day. Although I love horses, and sympathize with the trail ride operations, 1000-3000 people and horses is just too many together for the stony-soiled hills and the once low-nutrient stream. I've paddled upstream on the Current enough to make me wish for a motor, at the same time I've gagged on the blue smoke when some irresponsible motorboat owner guns the engine alongside novice canoeists or tubers just because he or she can (that's already illegal, by the way.) I've been disgusted at foul-mouthed, stone-stupid ill-prepared drunks careening downstream in a raft, at the same time I know they bring more money to a poor area like Shannon County than someone as frugal as I do. And then I have a beer that evening at camp. And over the years, the people have changed. Maybe it's just the rise of bad manners and self-centeredness in general, but the good people of Dent, Shannon and Carter Counties have been played for fools by city folk so often that they are now even more wary of outsiders. As they should be. Too many of the vacationers leave their manners at home. Eager to cut loose, they jump the bounds not only of good taste but also of reason. The rivers can accommodate a whole lot more people "leaving no trace" than it can "leaving their trash." You might be able to put four heifers on an acre with fences that won't hold one bull. As someone who's been coming to the Riverways for 40 years, I don't have the moral authority of a native Ozarker who found a way to make a living on this tough land, and stayed. However, as a native Missourian, raised on rock in the Ozark foothills, I greatly admire those people. They have to have a say in the future of the rivers. On the other hand, I've seen enough of the changes over those years that I know what I like, and what I don't -- and what I don't like is the tendency for "progress" to make South Central Missouri just like anyplace else. Sure, modern amenities are appreciated --a warm bathroom beats a scratchy, cold wooden privy in January. But I've seen over that time what too much progress has done to Branson. It's made it a place I avoid whenever possible. It's lost its "Ozarkness" if there is such a word. Back to carrying capacity. I wish the Park Service well, and I'm glad it's not my decision what to propose. Because if it were, I'd just send this verse from John Denver's song Rocky Mountain High: "Now his life is full of wonder but his heart still knows some fear/ Of a simple thing he cannot comprehend/ Why they try to tear the mountains down to bring in a couple more/ More people, more scars upon the land/" -- In then end, if we civilize and destroy the wildness and freedom we set out to preserve, (and this means both the resources, and the emotional affinity people feel for the area) everyone will have lost. NPS General Management Plan Meeting in Clayton June 26 Animated and Thoughtful "Spirited" probably best describes the Ozark National Scenic Riverways GMP meeting on June 26 at the Crowne Hotel in Clayton. Clayton, the county seat of St. Louis County, is about as far as one can get from the placid green peacefulness of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and still be in Missouri. Between 30 and 60 people milled about at any time during the 3.5 hour session, moving from station to station and quizzing park officials in animated conversations, which sometimes seemed to wander along the fringes of the meeting purpose. Most people didn't mind talking, but didn't want their names used in the paper. That was understandable. Since St. Louis is home to The Coalition for the Environment, the L-A-D Foundation and an active Sierra Club chapter, one might expect an overwhelming amount of support for Alternative A – the most conservative option. Those folks were there. "Let's go back to the enabling legislation – back to why this river was preserved. We need to get a handle on the excesses which have taken place since then," said ..., natural resources manager for the L-A-D Foundation. The L-A-D Foundation is the largest private landowner in Shannon County, managing Pioneer Forest for sustainable lumber while allowing public recreation on its land. They have an office in Salem, and a big stake in what	7/15/2009	No		River Hills Traveler	UN	N/A

	happens on Ozark Riverways. I mentioned that I had viewed a DVD copy of a presentation given at a Missouri Parks Assn. meeting backing the restoration view espoused by Alternative A. "Share that," said ..., "Tell your friends to watch the DVD, and write a letter and copy it to your senators and representatives and the governor. Let them know the public is interested in the outcome of this." Thirty years ago, ...had been an activist fighting the dam on the Meramec River. "...moved his canoe off the Meramec, and he's paddling on the Current, now," quipped Although many people were concerned about that the Riverways remain in good shape to be enjoyed by their kids or young relatives, the restoration-preservationist point of view was by no means the only one present. At the station for Alternative B, park employee ...held an animated conversation with a couple. "There are people crossing the river illegally in ATVs on this part of the river all the time. When too many horses come to the park at once, the water quality goes down. We know that. We're not against horses or the trail rides. It's just that they impac						
1676	Response to Question 1: None Response to Question 2: Remove the Horse Power Limits on the Current River, during the Fall, Spring, and Winter and leave it the way it is now during the Summer. Response to Question 3: It should not be aloud to change the Horse Power. Response to Question 4: The part that is special to me and my family is the river. There alternatives will take away from the way we enjoy the river. Response to Question 5: If the mangement plan does anything different than what it is now it should make the canoers and tubers register their watercraft like the boaters do	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1677	Response to Question 1: None Response to Question 2: Remove the Horse Power Limits on the Current River during the Fall, Spring and Winter and leave it the way it is now during the Summer. Response to Question 3: It should not be aloud to change the Horse Power. Response to Question 4: The part that is special to me and my family is the river The alternatives will take away from the way we enjoy the river Response to Question 5: If the management Plan does anything different that what it is now it should make the canorers and tubers register their watercraft like the boaters do.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1678	Taking the Pulse of Opposites: Ozark Riverways opinions vary in Eminence and Columbia "It has to be one of the most challenging natural resource management situations in the United States," observed Columbia resident ... at the June 25 Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan public input meeting in Columbia. Who knows if he's right. But the components of the ONSR debate are profound: local centuries-old families with long traditions of using the rivers and possible National Park Service restrictions, on behalf of the country, which could drastically alter access to those traditions. For an introduction to the General Management Plan and some of the history of the Riverways, visit http://tinyurl.com/lpfucj and select the June 10 document. "Why are you doing this?" a Shannon County resident asked a park employee suspiciously at the Eminence meeting on Tuesday, June 23. The employee eagerly responded that the Park Service creates a new guiding document, a general management plan, every 15-20 years for the park and now is the time for the next one. Each of the meetings, which were held on consecutive nights in Van Buren, Eminence, Salem, Columbia and St. Louis during the week of June 22 had the same open-house format: a welcome table where visitors could ask questions and sign up for the park's mailing list, a three-paneled display explaining the reason for the plan and a contextualization of the current phase in its development, four groups of maps and writing tablets manned by Park Service employees who answered questions about the plan and process and wrote down the visitor's comments, and a center table with comment cards and a box for the completed cards. "Whatever you think we should do," "We value your opinion," "Who knows better than the people who live here?" "These are no preferred alternatives," "Tell me more." Park Service employees were noticeably gracious at the Eminence meeting, which park personnel anticipated to be the most hostile of the five because of the region's history and the fact that the heart of the Riverways courses through the county, the second largest in Missouri. Eminence's 323 attendees were the largest crowd by far for at least the first four of the week's meetings: Van Buren, 265, Salem 116, Columbia 127. St. Louis didn't have numbers by press time. ..., 63, of Eminence, wrote in a letter he brought to the Eminence meeting what proved to be the overwhelming sentiment that night: "I've hunted and fished up and down both rivers my entire life, even while living and working in the city. I would also come in every chance I would get. I tried many things and never found anything that I enjoyed as much." "I just sat down this afternoon and tried to capture what I felt," says ... of his page-and-a-half single-spaced letter, which described his personal history with the rivers. He worked for the Park Service for 32 years and thinks that it was probably good that the park was formed, but feels strongly about maintaining the current level of access to the rivers. In the end, like at least a few in Shannon County, he believes access will slowly be taken away: "They've got to the end of time, and we only have a lifetime." At the Eminence meeting, ..., 46, of Eminence responded bluntly when asked why he supports the no-action alternative, which would continue the guidelines of the current management plan: "Why wouldn't I want my kids to enjoy the river the same as I have?" In Columbia, predictably, the other side to this difficult issue was dominant: manage the rivers for conservation, a pristine wilderness experience. The Columbia sentiment was overwhelmingly for the conservation-focused proposed alternative A, which would forbid jet boats on all parts of the rivers all the time. ... of Columbia said he is in favor of a little bit more of a compromise than alternative A alone offers, but voiced the sentiment that is at the heart of this conflict: "People in San Diego own the river just as much as the people in Eminence. It's a national river." Theoretically that's true, but practically it's Eminence's river, and its management has been and always will be a challenge. ... of Columbia and ... of Hermann voiced similar pro-alternative A sentiments at the Columbia meeting. "There's plenty of other places to take motorboats," sayssays the resource should be more geared to a wilderness experience, "Missouri is one of the few states with a protected river and we should keep them as scenic as we can." ..., Reynolds County Commissioner, Shannon County Commissioners Tony Orchard and Dale Counts and 152nd District State ... traveled to Columbia's meeting to represent what proved to be an underrepresented viewpoint. ..., of Shannon County, pulled his camouflage-painted 40-HP jet boat just outside the Columbia hotel conference center where the meeting was held and ostensibly offered to answer questions about jet boats. He handed out fliers explaining some facts behind his and other Ozark residents' perspective: mainly describing the use and reason for jet boats and some history of the ONSR. The raw comments from these preliminary alternative public comment meetings will be available in a couple of months online. After the comments are coded into a database, a planning team will gather to develop a Park Service-preferred alternative, which will then be presented for a round of public comment.	6/30/2009	No		River Hills Traveler	UN	N/A

	The new General Management Plan, upon approval, is scheduled to be implemented in the winter of 2012.						
1679	Response to Question 1: No-Action - I feel that you are trying to Regulate the river 365 days yr. When tourists are only here 20-30 days year. Put in boat ramp @ waymeyer, it would help separate boat/floater traffic	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1680	Response to Question 1: No Action Big Springs Park shouldn't be a refuge for ticks! Take Alcohol off & solve several problems!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1681	Response to Question 1: No Action - I have lived my entire life on the Current River - hunting & fishing. I served in the military & don't feel I should give up my heritage to Environmentalist. Take Alcohol off!	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1682	Response to Question 1: - No Action - Jeopardizing local people that can't use tubes & canoes tubes & canoes are only used 20 - 30 days yr.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
1683	Law enforcement, boat restrictions top concerns at Riverways GMP meeting in Eminence ... took some notes on behalf of Traveler at the Eminence meeting on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan June 23 and filed this report. Reed Detring, ONSR Park Superintendent, got the open house started with welcoming comments at about 5:30 p.m. He explained the open house format with four stations, one for each alternative - Alternatives A, B, C, and No Action. He urged all attendees to get their comments recorded, and that everybody's opinions matter. By 6:30, approximately 260 attendees had registered for the open house. This was, perhaps, the best method in which to gain opinions from a cross-section of attendees without the fear and pressure of public speaking, and without the dominance of the floor by one or two individuals. There were a couple of resounding issues throughout all of the alternative plans: 1. Law enforcement. Many commented that if we were to enforce the current rules and laws, we may not need stricter laws and rules. 2. Motorized boats. Boat owners want to keep their boats, of course. Some representative comments for each alternative: Alternative A • If you take boats off of the river, you'll take away safety and help for people who capsize and get into trouble. • You can't have regular family camping with strictly limited access of cars and motorboats. • Please don't take the rivers away from the people. They belong to us. Thank you. • Need more law enforcement. • Want roads to continue to be maintained properly. Alternative B • There are areas that are not designated as access points that are busy and overcrowded. Signs are needed at these points. • If you take away some access points, the remaining access points will be overcrowded. • Need stricter enforcement of the laws and rules. • There should be more enforcement of littering laws. Alternative C • Prefer no motorboats above Round Spring. The problem is noise. • Open all former accesses to the rivers to all users. • Maintain current open fields, and reopen previously established fields. • Stricter penalties for polluters and for littering. • Better maintain regulations regarding alcohol use/abuse on the rivers. • More NPS staff on the rivers. • Reopen agricultural fields. No Action Alternative • Limit number of rented canoes on any given stretch of the river. • Require people to abide by NPS regulations. • Restrict ATV usage and keep ATVs out of the river. • No change in HP limits. • Leave rivers alone; no new regs; enforce what you've got. • Fix roads. • Keep 2-track trails and roads open.	6/24/2009	No		Shady Lane Cabins	MO	n/a
1684	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE OF A B & C Response to Question 3: A, B & c Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: NO	9/8/2009	No			MO	63966
1685	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63624
1686	I am a decendent of the ...family that settled this county. It was my grandmother ... and her sisters that sold what was left of the family homestead to the Government so that Watercress National Park could be created.If they could have forseen the mess that has been created they never would have sold the land. The park itself, generally speaking, looks good. However, there are so many tubes and canoes on the river, most years, that local people can not get out on the river to enjoy it. LOCAL ACCESS was the reason Maxine and her sisters sold the land in the first place. They wanted a place that local people could enjoy. You need to drastically reduce the number of tubes and canoes allowed on the river. People floating the river should not be allowed to take coolers of beer etc out on the water. Put a uniformed Officer at each drop off point and arrest any out of town/tube rental outfit, that puts in some where else. Concessions can be sold and the monies used to patrol the river. Keep the drunks and the druggies outahere! If this is done, we can all enjoy the river. Thank you	6/24/2009	No			UN	N/A
1687	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None of A B or C Response to Question 3: A B & C Response to Question 4: No	9/8/2009	No			MO	63901

1688	Having grown up on the upper current 2 miles below Akers at the Conrad Cabin and knowing what the river looked like many years ago before it even became the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and there may have been one or two conoes a week to over 500 on a Saturday, I am in favor of your alternative A proposal. I believe that it will be easier to go from alternative A to alternative B if expansion is warranted. I have lived long enough now to see what an impact and change happened to our peaceful river where you could enjoy all of the natural beauty and then go to a wild weekend of a thousand canoes and see what that can do to a river and its surrounding areas of land and the wildlife and lets not forget the humans and their property on the river. I am very opposed to Alternative C as once you do that their is NO going back --- it is much easier to ease in to this and do the first alternatives and see where it goes. Thank You,	7/4/2009	No			MO	63021
1689	Response to Question 1: No Aciton Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Limited use	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
1690	Please take no further action. Please leave this as they are. We like access to the rivers. We ride horses and we canoe. Please do not make anymore changes that will take away from giving us access to the rivers and the park grounds. Thank you	7/5/2009	No			MO	65571
1691	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. No Limits on Horsepower For motor boats. Do not shut river access points or close roads Response to Question 2: more services Response to Question 3: no horsepower limits Small horsepower motors make a larger wake than larger motors anyway. Response to Question 4: Lower current no boat restrictions Response to Question 5: Perhaps speed limits on river where canoes & boats have the most contact (Two Rivers) but no horsepower limit.	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1692	Gentlemen, I recently read an article in the Reynolds County Courier concerning proposed actions to be taken by the National Park Service. After reading the article in would make the recommendation that NO ACTION be taken. I would like you to know that I was raised in that general area and have spent many days fishing and hunting on the current river prior to the time that it was designated a federal park. Relatives of mine settled in that area shortly after the Civil War and when the park was originated they were eventually forced to turn their land over to the government. I have observed the parks activity over the years and they are steadily attempting to discourage utilization of the area by local residents by constant regulations. The park area draws a tremendous amount of tourism for the local area and helps sustain the economy in what is a low income area. It seems to me that the goal of the park service is to gradually revert the area back to a wilderness area. I believe you need to maintain a balance that will preserve the natural beauty of the area but will allow people to enjoy the area as a recreational destination as well. I have seen other areas that have been restricted to the point where tourism has been curtailed extensively due to lack of access and restrictions and the damage to the local economy has been extensive. The people that utilize these areas are the ones that pay for the improvements and the park keepers salaries who in turn support the local economy. Many of the enviromental groups that influence decisions and want to have exclusive control over these areas constitute a small percentage of the people that are utilizing them. These people would like to have exclusive access and keep all others out. Lets not ruin a good thing, keep the park the way it is. Thanks for allowing this input. Sincerely,	6/30/2009	No			MD	20619
1693	Response to Question 1: No computer Response to Question 2: No computer Response to Question 5: The approach to the management of resources should be to accomodate the other forms of life besides human because we already have most of it - Tread as lightly as possible - bring down the horse & human numbers. Bring down the 4-wheeler numbers - increase NATURE protect it. LOWER machines-	8/26/2009	No			MO	65540
1694	My parents took our family of 8 children to Alley Springs for vacation as it was affordable back in the 1960's and they wanted to teach us an appreciation of the outdoors, nature, water, canoeing, camping, birds, springs, and each other. We learned to listen to the quiet of the woods and hear our hearts and each other. Our bonds as children grew and as parents, we now share that appreciation with our children who as young adults also take their friends camping and canoeing at Alley Springs on the Jack's Fork River. In fact, my brothers and sister were camping at Alley Springs last week with their young children (June 16-21, 2009). We would prefer not to hear ATV's or motor boats when we camp in our tents or pop-up camper. I do not want to worry about horse manure making it's way into the streams where we swim believing the health risks are not so great. To me, less development is best as it will help keep the area pristine, and no gas emissions on the river as well as pollution. I always hoped that there would be a place for our children and grandchildren to learn to appreciate what nature really is, not just a picture in a book, but a babbling stream, fresh air, cold fresh spring water, beauty every where you look and friendly people, not drunken brawls. I hope I'm not asking too much. I definitely do NOT want another Six Flags type area. Please keep us informed. Thank you.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63011
1695	Response to Question 1: No action is the best plan of action. I wish for NO horsepower restriction. Larger motors will NOT affect the riverways. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No horsepower Response to Question 4: All areas should be left as is. Response to Question 5: We need NO more changes.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65619
1696	I could not attend the public meeting in St. Louis regarding the Park Service's managment plan to guide the direction of the park for the next 15-20 years. I prefer Alternative B with these additions: NO BOATS with MOTORS allowed on the river. Discourage rowdiness i.e. drinking, loud music and ATV;s in the area. Horses would not be allowed in the streams. Gravel would be left alone.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63127
1697	Response to Question 1: (No-Action.) We need to Lift some of the Current restrictions Response to Question 2: Too take no-action and add more accesses to undeveloped primitive areas Response to Question 3: Any new restrictions of any kind Response to Question 4: Upper reaches of Jacks Fork and Current River. (No) every alternative adds resrictions Response to Question 5: (Yes) There need to be more accesses to the River, more park Rangers actually on the water patrolling Properly, and less restrictions	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466

1698	Please Please do not change the motor limits on the current river from deer run campground to the ripley county line. we drive from west plains missouri and use the river at big springs boat landing at least 1 to 2 times every month in the summer and once during off season, Our son has a plain 40 jet, son in law plain 80 jet! Brother 80 jet and 2 other brothers with 60/40 jets. Please let us know if we can help patrol the waters to keep the rude and drunken boaters off the river. We stop and float by the tubers, canoeist, and anyone. There are some bigger boat motorist that don't respect the river or the individuals. Please do not change the motor restrictions. Sorry we can not make it to any meetings to voice our opinions. but please consider this email in regards to this matter. thanks again,	6/28/2009	No			MO	65775
1699	Response to Question 1: I don't want them to change anything about our riverways. If it isn't broke, then don't fix it. Response to Question 3: As locals, we should be able to acces our rivers in any way we want. Response to Question 4: No, the entire river is special and I don't see what the problem is. While I do undestand the importance of not polluting our water, the damage is inevitable. Response to Question 5: Leave the resources as they are. If visitors don't like the way things are then they can go home. Why should we change for them?!	9/16/2009	No			MO	65466
1700	I am sick to my stomach from thinking that one day, in the near future, one of the most presious things to me and my family is going to be taken away from us. This river has been apart of our lives for a long time. My grandfather was run off of his land. The same land he had worked and payed for by working the land in the 60's by you crooked snakes. Now the farm that you took from him 45 years ago looks like a jungle and you can't even tell that there was even a farm there. I take my wife and my 5 year old son to the river and try to show them where it once was. And for some reason you people now want to take our rights away even more by taking our boats and motors away from us, or at least cut the horsepower down some more. This is the most comunist thing I have ever seen. This is UNAMERICAN and I don't see how anyone with any brains at all can sleep at night. My son will not be able to enjoy the river like he does now and will probably never get to learn how to gig or run a trolling motor or dig worms or boat ride or sucker fish or any of the things that people have been teaching their kids for years. I thik that you need to leave the river alone.	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638
1701	Dear Superintendent Detring, These comments are in regard to the General Management Plan/ Wilderness Study for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Since ONSR was established in 1964 it has become a popular recreational area for all Americans. The National Park Service was established to set aside and protect America's "crown jewels" and to protect not only the wild character of these special places but to protect native wildlife, water quality, and air/noise quality. To leave these areas in their natural state is your mission. To allow large equestrian rides, ATV's, large motorized boats or motorized watercraft does not maintain ONSR's mission to maintain this park's wild characteristics. For these reasons, I urge you to select Alternative A when making your decision. Sincerely,	7/15/2009	No			MO	65233-1784
1702	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION NO HP REGULATIONS CHANGED Response to Question 2: UNLIMITED USAGE AND RECREATIONAL ACCESS. Response to Question 3: LIMITED HORSEPOWER CHANGES AND LIMITED USAGE. Response to Question 4: WE DO NOT NEED ALTERNATIVES IT IS WORKING AS IS. Response to Question 5: MORE BOAT ACCESSES AND MORE ACCESS TO THE LAND SURROUNDING THE RIVER.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65775
1703	Dear Sir/Ma'am: I would like for you to consider the following measures for the new general management plan 1. Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help restore and maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. 2. Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. 3. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the Rivers' health comes first. 4. Control the frequency and number of non-motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, tubes, etc.) on the rivers to alleviate crowding caused by large clusters of these watercraft closely spaced in time. Way too many people are using and abusing this waterway. Thank you,	7/15/2009	No			MO	65742
1704	Could I get a Current river proposal pack sent to my adress? I would also like to say that we need to keep the river the same as it is except limit the number of rented canoes and rafts. There are too many on the river at once on the weekends.My family really enjoy the area and the solitude we can find there. The motor boats are very disturbing. Thankyou	7/16/2009	No			MO	63116-1208
1705	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: OPEN UP More Area's For Access Also put Park Rangers Back to Helping people on the River & Helping keep Riverways Clean. Response to Question 3: Don't close Any more Roads - Don't make Anymore Restricted Area's - We need Access to All of our land & waterways- Response to Question 4: The Complete Jacks Fork & Current River Area is special to me. I was Born & Raised Here. Please open up these Areas to Fishing & Hunting. I have a daughter that is handicapped and she Loves to Hunt & Fish. And some parts of this Area is totally off limits to her & it shouldn't be. Response to Question 5: As A Parent of A handicapped child. I think no Area should be limited to walk-in only. This discriminates Against those who Can't Walk! They have as much Right to enjoy this Country As Anyone else. You & I should do Anything we can to insure this.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1706	I love the National Scenic Riverways. Truly, the state of Missouri has been blessed by the wealth of natural splendor within its borders. Much of that splendor is encompassed in the National Scenic Riverways. I am a hunter, an angler, a hiker, a canoeist and a horsewoman. I do NOT want the rivers degraded by thousands of horses leaving waste too close to riverbanks. Why not construct trails, stables and campgrounds further away from the river, so that waste would at least have a chance to be filtered somewhat before it enters the river? What is the point of saving a river only to otherwise destroy a river? As for motorized vehicles -- ATVs, motorcycles, 4-WDs, jet boats -- I think they should be restricted to National Forest lands, with the exception of 4-WDs being allowed to operate on paved roads and designated gravel roads only. NO crossing the river, NO access on 'rogue' trails. I am for a jet engine horsepower limit AND an NPS license -- \$100 or \$200 per year -- for river access within park boundaries. No nudity, no beads, no styrofoam and a restriction on number of alcoholic beverages.	7/22/2009	No			UN	N/A

1707	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Van Buren Area - leave as is Response to Question 5: Leave as is - follow the rules already in place	9/16/2009	No			MO	65109
1708	As a life-long resident of Missouri and past floater on the Current River, I feel I am able to responde to your General Management Plan. My husband and I recent alternatives C and B, as we feel over time they would lead to harmful effects on this beautiful part of Missouri. Please consider consider our views and eliminate these proposals.	7/22/2009	No			MO	64056
1709	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: more picnicing areas Response to Question 3: usage limitations Response to Question 5: Park rangers interact more with public	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1710	Please keep the Current and Jacksfork streams natural. Option "A" is the best option, but we also need to keep ATV's and off road vehicles out of the streams. Once you tear up and ruin a natural resource you cannot get it back.	7/22/2009	No			MO	64850
1711	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: more recreation areas Response to Question 5: Park rangers can interact more with public	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1712	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: more camp sites Response to Question 3: Limiting nonmechanized forms of recreation Response to Question 4: my family enjoys Van Buren.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1713	Good Morning, I wanted to voice my concerns about the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. I feel that they are in danger due to excessive access points, atv's and other recreation type vehicles. Offering designated sites for recreation equipment will lessen destruction of natural habitats, aid in erosion control and pollution problems. These rivers have seen too much abuse in the last few decades, hopefully that can be turned around. I support Alternative "A". Thank you for your time and consideration.	7/23/2009	No		Wentzville Parks and Recreation	MO	63385
1714	Re: Comments Concerning General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways: I have visited the Current and Jack's Fork rivers at least once a year for the last ten years or so and love the near pristine quality of these waterways and their surrounding terrain. After reading the alternative horsepower limits for the Current River and Jack's Fork River, I strongly agree with Alternative A in both cases because I believe this alternative will both preserve and improve the unique appeal of them into the future. I also agree with additional suggestions proposed by the Missouri Parks Association to safeguard the Current and Jack's Fork rivers as they attract more and more people in the future.	7/22/2009	No			KS	66219
1715	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: More camping facilities More Restrooms, more boat ramps Response to Question 3: Restricting river access, closing camp sites, discontinuing boating/floating Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: Boating/Floating safety classes Before making any actions you all need to look in to how much money you all would lose doing this.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63755
1716	Caught article KC Star re "comprehensive mgmt plan for Ozark Scenic Riverways". (Current - Jacks Fork) Am MO native. Career in ND. Floated Current 1972 during visit back home. Disgusted even then at inappropriate, ignorant, stupid and disrespectful behavior of so many users. These treasures are NOT waterparks, havens for drunkedness, land ripping motor sports or compost sites for horse hockey, etc. Please be strict. Shut this nonsense down! Get rid of the profiteering parasites. Be damned sure that real estate incursions do NOT happen. Put it on the line against political / chamber of commerce pressures. Let us know of any abuse to you and your professional obligations and I and a few million others will back you!	7/24/2009	No			MO	64063
1717	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL Response to Question 4: All Areas of the River Are Special to me. I have been on this River for many years & Raised my Kids And Now Raising my Grandkids on this River. I have Taught All of Them to Respect & Take Care of the River.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63937
1718	As a lover and user of the outdoors, especially our National Parks, I'm writing to you about the Jackson Fork and Current Rivers. The health of these rivers is of primary importance to me. We should ban ATVs and dirt bikes, close "private" river access roads, control the numbers of non-motorized watercraft, and better administer the easement land bordering the rivers. Keep the pristine flowing waters intact. The new General Management Plan should reflect these actions.	7/24/2009	No			UN	N/A
1719	Alternative A is the best. Alternative B is somewhat attractive, but seems to encourage too much development. Maybe one visitor center in Eminence (or use the old box company camp for this), but no "network of learning centers" and no new trails. Alternative C would be terrible for the rivers. Please close & revegetate all the illegal accesses. Keep noisy stinky vehicles of all kinds away from the rivers. No motorboats or airboats on these precious rivers. They belong on the many big lakes in our state. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	7/24/2009	No			MO	65401
1720	I am sending a more indepth comment but I wanted to be sure someone read my general comment. I am a member of the Sierra Club, Audubon Society, NRDC..some might say I'm environmentalist. I am also an avid horse back rider and I ride two or three times a week in the Cedar Grove Area, and do some riding at the Shawnee staging area. There are many rumors about what various plans might mean, so I can't say which plan I specifically support. I feel in the Cedar Grove area things are fine the way they are except more information needs to be distributed to inform riders and floaters why certain areas need to be avoided. If there are areas that need to be protected, trails should be built around the. Present trails,	7/29/2009	No			UN	N/A

	especially along the river, need to be maintained so riders don't make new trails around downed trees. Charging an annual fee such as the American the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands annual pass (if you charge a daily use fee, I won't be able to ride very often, and lots of locals will just figure out another way to get on the trails). I am very often the only rider at the Cedar Grove area so the damage done by horse back riders there is very minimum..I can see there could be a much bigger problem in Eminence with due to the large number of riders that go to Cross County. But I think more studies need to be done to see exactly what damage they cause. I am very concerned about the welfare of the Ozark Hellbender and other threatened species but it has been my experience that floaters and boaters do more damage than riders, and there have been studies that show that runoff from paved roads and farms from miles away contribute more pollutants and do more habitat damage than the small number of riders at Cedar Grove. I applaud the efforts the Park Service has made in the past few years to get the excess drinking, noise and all nudity off the river..it had gotten so bad I would not take my family floating, and I feel now I can take my grandchildren. Thank you so much for that!						
1721	In any planning for the Current and Jacks fork rivers I strongly urge you to make the cleanliness of the water and the tranquility of the area your top concern. There are less and less places in the Missouri and the world where one can still experience a pristine and natural environment.Please save this one before it is too late. It is essential to the physical, mental and spiritual health of mankind that we still may visit here. Please get all motor boats, jet skis, ATVs and 4 wheelers out of this park, their sound and smell are toxic and offensive. They do not need to be here. Please keep all horse trails a safe distance from the river or demand that riders pick up the manure or wear diapers. There is no reason they should be allowed to foul this clean water. They can go somewhere else to ride, there is nowhere else we may experience water like this.	7/26/2009	No			MO	63111
1722	Response to Question 1: no-action Additional Comments: To whom this may concern. I was born and raised in the Mountain View, Mo. community, I'm 85 yr's old, as a young boy, I swan in eleven point and Jack's fork rivers, fished in both rivers. You could float the upper parts of both rivers, as construction company would remove gravel from the river bed, so the river would flow freely, and you could float the river, But since E.P.A. has stuck thier foot in the river, so the river bed is full of gravel, and brush has grown up on the gravel bars it is almost imposible to float the upper reaches of the river, there is nothing scenic to see any more. I realize there needs to be some reglulations on the river, but to me there is to much, you have taken the freedom away from the people, there was a time I could take my rifle and hunt squirils along the river, as I understand, I am forbidden to do. After reading Ozark National Scenic riverways preliminary alternatives. We don't have any more freedoms, if you have your way. My personal opinion is we managed the states of of affairs pretty good, before you folk's started meddling. I could say a lot more, but I realize you wont even give this a thought! A land owner for the present time, but if you holks had your way, I would be moved out of the Ozarks.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65438
1723	I am completely in favor of any effort to restore the rivers and surrounding area to their beautiful natural state. I support the "Wilderness opportunity." These areas should be enjoyed, but also be recognized for the beauty they represent, and we must take care of this gift or it will be gone. Thank you for your efforts.	7/7/2009	No			UN	N/A
1724	No comments -- Add to mailing list only.	6/22/2009	No			MO	63640
1725	I want to add my thoughts to the debate on how best to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am a lifelong Missourian and have grown up fishing and canoeing many of Missouri's rivers. Basically, I am in favor of strongly protecting the beauty of the rivers and the surrounding area. But I also believe that the facilities in the park today are in need of improvements. I believe horsepower for motors should be restricted as much as feasible, illicit river crossings should be removed, canoe float group sizes limited and the rivers managed to preserve and restore their natural beauty for future generations. Then, within the parks, they should be improved to better welcome visitors so they can understand and protect nature as well. Today, the park's facilities do not match up with the facilities in Missouri's state parks and to Missourians, a state park is our first choice. The showers need to be improved. The campsites should have better access to water and electricity. More cabin and lodging options should be available. People expect a little more comfort than they did a few years ago. I believe this still can be done while preserving the area and reversing some of the recent damage. Thank you for your time.	7/26/2009	No			UN	N/A
1726	Response to Question 1: I don't think anything needs to be changed at this point in time.	9/16/2009	No			MO	65588
1727	Response to Question 1: best action is No Action Response to Question 2: no more rules! Response to Question 3: no further rules Response to Question 4: Love it all Response to Question 5: Don't compete with private enterprise!	9/16/2009	No			MO	63144
1728	I just wanted to express our strong support for Alternative A among the options now being considered by the National Park Service for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways management plan. I want to be able to take my 2 year old son on this beautiful river like my dad did for me when I was young and continues to do. Keep missouri beautiful and clean!	7/29/2009	No			MO	63139
1729	I am a 52 year old St. Louis female that has floated down the Current River off & on for many years. Recently, as in the last 8 years running, my family and friends have planned camping trips at Pulltite campground. We enjoy this weekend very much. My kids have grown up floating down the Current River. We all appreciate and love the beauty of Missouri. I would love for the rivers to stay the same or have tighter regulations. I don't like engines on the river unless it is a coast guard or ranger needing to have better access, and I HATE ATV's. Horses need to be limited because of	7/29/2009	No			UN	N/A

	fecal contamination, an unfortunate fact. Thanks and feel free to contact me, if needed.						
1730	This is a comment on the Scenic Rivers Management Plan. I prefer Option A. Matters of concern and which need additional management are; The number and horsepower of boats on this fragile area needs to be more closely regulated. ATV's need to be kept out of the streams, and horse trail rides need to be kept limited to protect the streams. The rowdy behavior on the rivers has gotten out of hand. A ban on using alcohol while on the river would go a long way in controlling this. The number of illegal roads and access points needs to be closed. The big spring area needs to be designated a wilderness area. Steps need to be taken to protect the wildlife and its habitat. All in all, we need better management of what we have now; one of the nation's major areas of beauty. This is a unique resource which belongs to everyone. It should not be degraded into a water park to please a few vocal people who want to make the river their personal playground and who care nothing about protecting it.	7/30/2009	No			MO	65201
1731	I wish to comment on the National Scenic Riverways Management Plan. I prefer plan A. with wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. I would be opposed to expanding activities on the river such as motor boats with loud engines, ATV's on the river and excessive use of horses. Alcohol is a big problem. It should not be allowed on the river.	7/30/2009	No			UN	N/A
1732	Please include my comments in the review of the proposed management plan alternatives as I was unable to use other submission methods. Thank you: 1) Alternative A is closest to the ideal method of managing the ONSR. Preserving the natural environment is the primary purpose of the ONSR. Indeed, the role of the NPS is to preserve, unimpaired, these resources and wildlife for future generations and ONSR should be an example. Enabling engagement with and understanding of sustainable lifeways regarding the use of the Ozark rivers in its charge should be essential, demonstrable goals of the ONSR in the burgeoning human community surrounding and using it. Parks and other governmental set-asides of natural areas throughout the world are coming under increased pressure by the growing populations surrounding them, and it has been proven that environmental resources are best protected when the people which live near them are actively engaged in appreciating and understanding the need to maintain the health of the ecosystems contained therein as integral to the health of the people themselves. The NPS should recognize the role it plays in helping the encompassing populations understand the significance of environmental well-being, seeing that as a precious resource, and help them engage in protecting the biota which hosts them. 2) Unofficial and extraneous river accesses should be permanently closed. There should be no use by park visitors of ATVs and other motorized off-road vehicles, except on legally-designated, paved and maintained roadways. Horse trail-riding management should be improved to eliminate equestrian damage to streambeds, fecal contamination of waters, and soil erosion. The number and frequency of watercraft should be controlled to alleviate overcrowding. Motorized watercraft should be managed to maintain a more natural condition on the rivers and to minimize the burden that they place on wildlife. Violations of easements and other disturbances listed here should be steadfastly enforced: enforcement now is often terribly lacking. Big Spring, both those areas managed by the NPS and those by the NFS, should be managed as National Wilderness Area and recommended for designation as such by Congress. 3) Alternative C hosts several troubling components, which would set the ONSR on an unredeemable path from which the natural character of the park could not be rescued in the future. Motorized vehicle use for recreation should not be part of the plan: that is better left for concessions outside the park. Activities which encourage disengagement from the care and understanding of the natural environment, such as watercraft which are used for speed, should not be part of the plan. Horseback riding which disregards stream disturbances, bank erosion, and fecal contamination of waters should not be part of the plan. 4) The major springs, Round Spring Cave, and the shut-ins at Rocky Falls are of major importance. The confluence of tributaries with the major rivers are significant features and should be protected from easement infringements and access disturbances. 5) There should be a concerted effort to develop regional stakeholder's interests in sustainably living with the riverways and water resources related to them. The NPS should staunchly enforce violations of motorized vehicle use, river accesses by trailers and equestrian paths, and easement violations, and encourage and work with local law-enforcement to do so as well. The NPS can play a role beyond the typical focus on its parks so as to engender a scientific appreciation of natural processes to which surrounding residents are subject and for which they owe their regional identity and survival. For example, education programs for institutions of the surrounding community should be developed, using park resources as the exemplary subject. This is best done with participation with the community. Partnerships with regional colleges and institutions of higher learning to develop programming such as this, in a form accessible and appreciated by the target audiences, may be beneficial to "buy-in" and "ownership".	8/1/2009	No			MO	63117
1733	Response to Question 1: Upper Current - North Segment - Alternative A. --John Boat motors --more emphasis on exotic vegetation remediation --more interp at Akers Upper Current - South Segment - Alternative B Jacks Fork - Alternative A exc. John Boat motors Lower Current is where no boats belong (below 2 Rivers) Response to Question 2: -Management, improvement of access points. Closure where environ. impact is too negative. -Really rev-up education for trail riders & efforts to keep them where they are supposed to be (more signs?) Response to Question 3: Air Boats - Not any No hunting (exc. shotgun) Stand by the provisions of the easements Response to Question 4: Upper Jack's Fork above Alley Current above Round Springs Response to Question 5: -more fishing -more regulations, more vigorous enforcement to discourage "Party Cove" behavior. -Get exotic plants out of Riverways. -Stiffer laws & prosecution for ATVs & 4 wheelers -more attention paid to littering. Additional comments: I have been visiting these waters for about 50 years. Yes, there was a definite feel of wilderness, but more so a feeling that the rivers ran where people lived and worked. Locals had picnics, family reunions, fishing parties etc at those rivers just like my family did at the St. Louis Parks. I strongly believe the local folks need a real say in what happens (consultation, more than once every decade). As far as the wilderness aspect, there have always been mobile homes along the river, crossings, fields with out buildings, roads, power lines. I don't think it makes sense return to the pre-civil war era. New challenges are ATVs, horses and air boats & fraternity-sorority parties. This is an enforcement issue. ATV's &	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438

	horses could be education also. The park also needs to be more vigilant about access points, new roads, etc. Signage is a tool that would help. I know this is a staffing issue, but I think the ONSR have gotten past the hands off, low profile outdoor experience. We had friends on the Jacks Fork above Alley in July last year on a Saturday. They were city folks from KC. Their children were 11 and 9. They loved every minute of it. To them the river was beautiful, fun, interesting & just enough of an outdoor challenge (caoeing). You can't ask for more than that.						
1734	Response to Question 1: No action! Need more patrolling to ensure everyones safety. Boats jet through floater - to close - to fast. I am a boater and I see thangs that need to be stopped on both sides. Maybe that would help everyone get along. Need good ramp & road at Waymeyer. Tubers need educated on boats and shallow water. Response to Question 2: I think Horse power should be left alone. Maybe we need 30 mph max. Speedometer would still be cheaper than new rig! Take off 40 hp limit below 60 Bridge to relieve parking pressure at Big Springs. Response to Question 3: Big mistake taking boats off the river lots of people helped by boats. Control the trouble makers. Response to Question 4: The wilderness area is wonderful for hiking and watching wildlife Response to Question 5: Mill Creek to congested at times. Need signs posted regulary - Congested area Emergency stopping ONLY. Boat ramps are used for swimming - Need something to get swimmers to move briefly so boats can load & unload. Stop the littering floaters are ruining a beautiful place. Additional comments: Enclosed copy of Letter to Editor from The Current Local, Van Buren, Missouri dated Thursday, June 25, 2009, entitled "Responds to Park Service's Proposed Plans" with comment to "Please read couldn't have said it better myself.": I would like to share my thoughts regarding the General Management Plan proposed by the National Park Service. I find myself wondering, "Why we are in this situation?" I have been told in 2006, 371 complaints were filed with the National Park Service (NPS) concerning the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. What the NPS has led me to believe is that these 371 complaints resulted in the three proposed alternatives (A, B, C) in their General Management Plan. The other alternative is the No-Action alternative (leave things as they are). A phone call to the NPS in Van Buren confirmed there were approximately 1.8 million people who utilized the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in 2007 for all recreational uses. The 371 complaints received total one complaint per 4,852 visitors or less than .02 percent of the overall visitor population. How can such a small vocal minority correspond to boaters losing their options on the river? The NPS works closely with another agency, the Missouri Water Patrol. Some of the complaints received by the NPS were in regards to lewd behavior, underage drinking, and illegal drugs. One responsibility of the NPS is to prevent these sorts of acts from occurring. I pose this question, if you are driving on the highway and you see an officer parked on the side of the road, would you speed? The obvious answer is no. Could better visibility reduce the occurrence of these acts? The NPS needs to put down the Bushnell's, leave the bushes at Mill Creek, and get in people's sight. If the NPS was more visible with its agents, visitor compliance would be greater, resulting in fewer complaints. Another complaint received is in regards to pollution on the waterways. Do we have scientific study of the Current River, concluding that pollution is occurring from the exhaust from boats engines? What is the pollution factor from the tubers? I would also like to discuss the complaints regarding the confliction of user group; specifically, boaters and floaters. The people of Van Buren have two main access points on the river: Watercress and the bridge. Both of these facilities force us to go through heavy amounts of floater traffic to get upriver. However, once above Waymeyer, there are very few tubes or canoes. If the Park Service provided parking and an adequate boat ramp at Waymeyer, there would instantaneously be a separation of users. This would undoubtedly cut back on complaints. Most locals and boating visitors have a boat that is a 40 horsepower engine. We use this river for recreational uses year round: fishing, entertaining, gigging, or simply floating. Depending on which alternative is passed, we could be forced to reduce our motor size to 25 horsepower or, under another propopsal, purchase a motor that is rated 40 horsepower at the powerhead. I think a fish will outrun me going upstream as we all know a 25 horsepower engine isn't going to push a family in an 18' boat. So what exactly is the reasoning for a severe horsepower restriction? Is there even a reasoning? Or is it a percent of the complaints were earmarked toward the boaters? An extreme change like this will cost most boaters a new motor, and a new boat. Van Buren's community desperately needs the tourism revenue it receives. Instead of proposing more rules and regulations to fix the minuscule complaints that are received during the summer, let's keep the present plan, the NO-Action alternative, and do a better job of enforcing it.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63841
1735	The Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to return to its roots, and provide an experience that is healthy, quiet, and secluded. Access has been increased in an unplanned way as I understand it, and this needs not only to be halted, but returned to its prior state. There should be an understanding reached as to how the changes in the river use came to be, and plans implemented to stop this from happening in the future. Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help restore and maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways--except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the Rivers' health comes first. Control the frequency and number of non-motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, tubes, etc.) on the rivers to alleviate crowding caused by large clusters of these watercraft closely spaced in time, and to keep the water within load limits of human impact, in terms of trash and human waste. Designate the Big Spring Natural Area as a wilderness region. The Big Spring Natural Area lies very near the legendary Big Spring and is the backcountry portion of the old Big Spring State Park that has been protected since the 1920's. Preserving this example of native Missouri untouched for future generations is an easy decision and all conservationists should support it.	7/31/2009	No			UN	N/A
1736	I write to urge you to adopt Plan A. I am firmly opposed to Plans C and B. The Jacks Fork and Current desperately need protection and the rules must be enforced. I have watched this area become trashed for two decades. Children who are floating on these rivers are "run over" by bloated and extremely drunk people on the river. It's sickening to witness. The loud and destructive ATV's are nearly as bad, polluting the river, causing extreme erosion, turning the clear water muddy. I urge you to do everything you can to protect this area for future generations.	7/31/2009	No			UN	N/A

1737	I believe the best plan for future use of the park is alternative a. It is important to preserve the quality of the park and diversity of life more than it is important to open it up for commercial profit or business. Thanks for considering my view.	7/31/2009	No			UN	N/A
1738	Dear Mr. O'Donnell, The following are comments from the Environmental Protection Agency Region 7 regarding the National Park Service Preliminary Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Waterway. I attempted to submit them to the website and got an error message which is also included at the bottom of this email. If you could ensure these comments are provided to the right person(s), we would greatly appreciate it. Comments: 1) We recommend that the National Park Service coordinate with both the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and the Missouri Department of Conservation on this issue. 2) The selected alternative must comply with Missouri's water quality standards (WQS), which identify the Jack's Fork River and Current River as Tier III (outstanding natural resource) waters; these Tier III waters are provided additional protection by the State per its WQS regulations under the antidegradation requirements: 10 CSR 20-7(2): (C) Tier Three. There shall be no lowered water quality (emphasis added) in outstanding national resource waters or outstanding state resource waters, as designated in Tables D and E. (D) The three (3) levels of protection provided by the antidegradation policy in subsections (A) through (C) of this section shall be implemented according to procedures hereby incorporated by reference and known as the "Missouri Antidegradation Rule and Implementation Procedure, April 20, 2007, Revised May 7, 2008." No later amendments or additions are included. This document shall be made available to anyone upon written request to the Department of Natural Resources, Water Protection Program, Water Pollution Control Branch, PO Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0176. 3) The Jacks Fork River was listed as impaired for pathogens (fecal coliform was the indicator) in 1998 and 2002. In 2004, a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) was approved which addressed the pathogen impairment. Any development, which would include modification or establishment of NPDES permitted facilities, must comply with the WLA in the Jack's Fork TMDL. The TMDL can be located on the EPA Region 7 Website: http://www.epa.gov/region07/water/pdf/jacksfork_riverfinaltmdl.pdf . Other documents related to the TMDL approval letter etc are at: http://www.epa.gov/region07/water/apprtmdl.htm#Missouri . The TMDL document notes that horses may be a cause of the pathogen impairment. The TMDL states, "Since March 1999, the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS) has conducted bacterial tests at sites in and around the impaired segment of the Jacks Fork. Analysis of the bacteria source tracking information indicates that horses, sewage and cattle were possible sources of the bacteria. It is assumed the source of the sewage is from on-site septic systems, since data indicates the Eminence wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) is not a contributing source. The length of the impaired segment was changed to seven miles on the Missouri 2002 303(d) list due to recent data indicating a fecal coliform problem exists over a broader area."	7/31/2009	No		WWPD/WENF, Water Enforcement Branch	KS	66101
1739	I am writing to inform you of my support for Alternative A of the Preliminary Alternative Concepts. I was unable to access the website to offer my support through that channel. As a long-time floater Alternative A best supports my ideal image of the river's future.	7/31/2009	No			UN	N/a
1740	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None (A B C) Response to Question 3: All of A B C Response to Question 5: See attached Additional Comments: I found it somewhat difficult to obtain all of the information concerning all of the alternatives proposed for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am concerned that some people may not be able to secure all of the information since as you indicate, the various alternatives are part of a very "complex document". I am 78 years old and a native of Shannon County and worked in Conservation related activities for 39.5 years. I attended many of the early meetings at which the prospect of a National Park or Scenic Riverways was discuss. There was both support and opposition for the proposal. Previously, the Corp of Engineers had proposed a dam on the Current River. Many people supported the Scenic Riverways propasal because the Viewed the Riverways proposal as a "lesser of two evils". I love to fish, float and recreate on the Riverways. I currently own a vacation home in Van Buren and also own a Jon boat with a 40 H.P motor, a float boat and a canoe. My children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren all love the Riverways area. We all prefer the No-Action alternative. I have just returned from two-weeks at Van Buren with several of my family members, some of which live in Alaska. We do agree there are some things that need the attention of the N.P.S Law enforcement - Law enforcement seems to be somewhat lacking, especially on wweek-ends and holidays. My daughter and son-in-law were floating on the upper current and were subjected to "moonning" and foul language. They did not see a single Park Ranger from Akers to Round Spring. We have all observed the use of drugs and excessive alcohol many times. Courteous Attitudes of Users - Is there some way you can convince people to be more courteous when using the Rivers? There is a problem with all of the users. I always yield to non-motorized uses when I am on the river with my Jon boat. However, it is difficult to yield when 10-12 tubers or floaters make a "wall" of people in the river that prevent a motorized boat for passing them. Use of existing funding - We understand it will be difficult for the N.P.S to obtain more funding for law enforcement. Therefore, they must use existing funding wisely as possible. While interpretation is an important segment of an outdoor experience, expending limited federal \$ for this purpose may not be the best use of limited funding. We wonder if the N.P.S conducts surveys of the various users i.e. campers, floaters, fishers, etc. My family relatives and friends have been on the rivers hundreds of times and never have been requested to participate in a survey pertaining to the Riverways. We realize it is difficult to manage public areas in manner that is supported by all users. We are pleased the Current and Jacks Fork rivers are being managed by the N.P.S. However, you need to be aware that many of the local people believe the long term objective of the N.P.S is to ban all motorized boats from the Riverways Area. Thank you--	7/14/2009	No			MO	65023
1741	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Don't implement further restrictions on access and recreation Response to Question 3: --No further complicated restrictions --No wildness area Response to Question 4: Jacks Fork Current Response to Question 5: Keep things simple, don't have law enforcement hiding in the bushes	9/16/2009	No			OK	74955

1742	<p>Dear GMP Committee members: As an equestrian trail rider, I believe that trails should remain open to horsemen, and that adequate trailer parking be available. As someone who considers herself an environmentalist, I believe there should be reasonable limits placed on the number of horses that are allowed within a riding party. The number of horses on a single outing, for example, may be too big for the health of the local ecology. I also believe that horses should be limited to trails on which they will do the least damage when weather conditions have downgraded the trail itself. For example, if trails are washed out due to rain, riders should not use those particular trails. However, there need to be trails that are available to riders that can be used alternatively. Trail riders are for the most part, I believe, people who love the environment as much as any other group. Many riders work hard to maintain the health of the trails on which they ride. They enjoy the things that nature has to offer just as much as hikers and campers, and lots of people combine riding with hiking and camping. I think education is part of the solution. If riders understood the effects their rides have on the environment, they might willingly do things to make changes as to how and where they ride. If the "leave no trace" policy can be effectively enforced in western national parks, why not in Missouri parks and forests? If environmentalists, hikers, and others were educated about the needs and viewpoints of horsemen, they might be more willing to see trail riders in a more positive light. To this end, I think that your public meetings may eventually benefit every group. We all need to work together to develop a plan for the future. However, many trail riders have encountered the closing of equestrian trails, the removal of trailer parking, or are hearing of plans for these things to happen. This leaves some horsemen feeling resentful and worried that they will no longer have any place to ride. I am asking you to please consider keeping trails open and to provide adequate trailer parking.</p>	7/30/2009	No			MO	65616
1743	<p>We want you to know we have read and considered the Alternatives A, B, & C. WE SUPPORT the most conservation-minded -- ALTERNATIVE A. WE THINK ALTERNATIVE A is the WISEST choice. We are Stream Team members, have swam and enjoyed the Jacks Fork and Current for many years; have caved, canoed and swam with our children and now with our grandchildren since 1980. We live in the Jacks Fork watershed. WE THINK PLAN A WOULD BE THE BEST CHANCE FOR THE SCENIC RIVERWAYS TO REMAIN HEALTHY FOR GENERATIONS TO COME. When you make final decisions, please know that we strongly wish for these complex ecosystems with karst throughout to be kept in as clean and healthy condition as possible. Recently, on the Current at Pulltight, we noticed alot of gasoline in the shallow water where boats had just been. We also noticed the boats going very fast, with wakes breaking strongly on the banks. For many years, including recently while canoeing in the Jacks Fork, we noticed riffle areas that were really tracked up with ATV wheel marks, banks that were compacted with ATV tracks and no vegetation, and some areas where fish nests usually are that were silted up and tracked over by wheels of some sort of vehicles. WE ARE SADDENED BY THESE DESTRUCTIVE RESULTS OF IRRESPONSIBLE USE OF THESE RIVERWAYS. WE think ATVs are way over-used where they should not be allowed to be driven. When we hike, we appreciate the beauty that is still here as well. But when we find ugly torn up places, and when we hear loud ATVs as well as see trash and erosion that is unnecessary, we wish ONSR could have more FUNDING FOR OVERSEEING AND ENFORCING THE RESTRICTIONS THAT HELP MAINTAIN BEAUTY, FISH POPULATIONS, CLEAN SWIMMING, ETC. WE SUPPORT MORE FUNDING FOR ONSR'S DEDICATED RANGERS AND FOR MORE RANGERS AND OTHER ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES AS WELL AS MORE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES. THANK YOU FOR READING THIS. We can be contacted at: ... As far as the designation of Wilderness Areas, we would like that to take place as much as possible. It would be a Win/Win -- for future generations to have as pristine, and for future tourist economy -- we could be proud to have our state belong to the few that have beautiful remaining places such as ONSR.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65793
1744	<p>Dear park management staff, I am responding to the request for input on management options for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My family and I live in Missouri and are regular users of the Ozark Scenic Riverways. We spend most of our time on the Current River and occasionally on the Jack's Fork. I have been a regular user of these rivers since 1967, which was even before they became designated as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Those who use the rivers now in my family include my wife, my four grown children, and now two son-in-laws. We make at least one family excursion each year and do other trips with friends. Of the three alternative plans for management now being considered, I and the other members of my family all have a strong preference for the riverways to remain as primitive and natural as possible. We greatly appreciate the relatively unspoiled and natural of these rivers and the land that surrounds them. We would like to see as few building and other "marks of man" as we paddle, kayak or otherwise navigate the rivers. We recognize that it is appropriate to have nice campground facilities at various strategic sites along the rivers and are in favor of improvements made to these that do not seriously alter the overall natural character of the setting. We understand that there is a sizeable number of horseback riders who presently make use of the area. We are not against horseback riding in the general area, but do strongly request that they be kept from the river itself to protect the riverbanks and to minimize contamination of the river with excrement. As trails are made for the horseback riders, consideration should be made as to the affects of runoff contamination of the rivers from horse excrement left along the trails or in areas of horse confinement. We believe that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be kept to a high standard for human body contact as many people swim in these rivers. There are many who camp and picnic along the rivers and many, including young children, who swim in these rivers. We advocate for strong protections for these rivers and the streams that supply them with respect to septic and runoff contaminations. While we are not entirely opposed to the use of jetted power boats on the river, we would very much like to see their use be very limited, particularly in those stretches of the Current River above the confluence of the two rivers (Current and Jack's Fork), where the majority of canoers and kayakers prefer to be. With strong preference for a "natural setting" we would very much like to see that offroad vehicle use be kept to a minimum. We believe that it would be very wrong to allow offroad vehicle use in these rivers or even the majority of streams that feed into them. Offroad vehicle use would cause unacceptable damage to the banks of these streams, lead to contamination of the rivers with sediment and petrochemical materials, and greatly destroy the ambiance of this region with their noise. We dearly treasure the Current and Jack's Fork rivers for the beauty and quiet, natural setting that goes with them at this time. We strongly advocate for protection of the water quality and natural setting of these rivers. We would like for the experience that we have had with these rivers to be available to our children's children for as long as that can be possible. We have had multiple discussions on this topic among ourselves and with friends who also use these</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	65201

	rivers. Again, all of us advocate that the rivers be kept as primitive and natural as possible, while there are likely improvements that could be made to selected campgrounds. Thank you for the opportunity to offer this input to the future management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.						
1745	I believe the best plan for future use of the park is alternative a. It is important to preserve the quality of the park and diversity of life more than it is important to open it up for commercial profit or business. Thanks for considering my view.	7/31/2009	No			UN	N/A
1746	Subject: Comments on the General Management Plan / Wilderness Study Dear Mr. Detring: These comments are submitted on behalf of the over 4500 members of the Eastern Missouri Group (EMG) of the Missouri Chapter of the Sierra Club. Members of the EMG have a common interest; we all support the Club's motto "Explore, enjoy and protect the planet" and thus we relish public lands such as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). However we are deeply troubled by various aspects of the National Park Service's (NPS) management of the ONSR. We respectfully submit the following comments for your consideration. First and foremost, we encourage the NPS to recommend that the 3400-acre Big Spring area be designated as Wilderness. We believe this is the ultimate and appropriate conclusion following the initial review of this area in the early 80s and its reassessment in the 90s. Wilderness designation is fully consistent with the four statements that comprise the defined purpose of the ONSR. And as this designation does not include any part of the Current or Jacks Forks Rivers, there are no potential conflicts between this designation and the primary recreational pursuits that are at the core of the ONSR. In direct response to the NPS's query regarding public preferences, we recommend adoption of preliminary Alternative A. We believe it best reflects the ONSR's purpose statement and further feel strongly that Alternative A best preserves this precious resource for the future. We strongly object to Alternative C, which would result in immediate over-development, as well as Alternative B, as it would initiate the process that we believe would inevitably lead towards over-development. And for reasons explained further below, the No Action Alternative is clearly unsound. A serious problem, in no way unique to the ONSR, is the unauthorized use of trails and public spaces by ATV and motor bikes, as well as the lax enforcement which has resulted in widespread disregard of the meager use restrictions that are in place. We understand that off-road motorists have a right to enjoy their form of outdoor recreation where appropriate. But according to current law, ATVs are not permitted in ONSR unless properly fitted for designated state and county roads. Off-road use is wholly incompatible with most of the recreational pursuits for which the ONSR was established to protect. The operation of ATVs and 'dirt bikes' off of any designated state or county road needs to be strictly policed and enforced. The balance of our concerns all relate essentially to historic management practices which either directly or inadvertently result in overuse and resulting degradation of the ONSR's pristine yet fragile environs. The first of those is the need to address the excessive number of river access locations and thus opportunities for river use and abuse. The number of unauthorized access points has mushroomed over the years. Park Service oversight has been lax. Unauthorized bank openings and access roads must be closed. In addition, the very large and overly frequent organized group equestrian trail rides must be restricted. We note with both dismay and anger, that historical mismanagement in this regard has resulted in severe water quality impacts and periods of impairment as a direct consequence of the sheer numbers of animals as the quantity of their excrement exceeds the assimilative capacity of the sensitive environment within the ONSR. Equestrian recreation can be appropriate on the ONSR, however the numbers of horses and location of trails need to be managed in way to protect the river and provide for a sustainable level of recreation. The numbers of human visitors must likewise be restricted to both avoid adverse environmental impacts and restore the quality of the recreational experience. Excessive numbers of people, watercraft and the possessions they bring along, diminish the enjoyment of the ONSR experience, with its traditional emphasis on the natural beauty and solitude of these waters. Likewise, we believe boat motor use and size (i.e. horsepower) should be banned on some stretches and restricted in others, at least as stringently as defined in Alternative A. In some sections, motorized watercraft is clearly incompatible with the "natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings" of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. While not addressed in the draft management plan, we urge you to support the development of a Current River trail, connecting to the Ozark Trail. Last summer you received a report entitled "Current River Trail - A Proposed Route," which was prepared by the L-A-D Foundation and the Ozark Trail Association. That report was the culmination of a broad based, substantial volunteer effort aimed at advancing the conceptual idea to a point where it might transition from planning to actual construction. On September 16, 2008, the Sierra Club's Eastern Missouri Group wrote to you to encourage the Park Service to take action to advance and fulfill this initiative. We ask that you include a position supporting this concept in the next draft of the general management plan. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this stage of the development of a new General Management Plan for the ONSR, and look forward to future opportunities for public input in this process. Sincerely,	7/30/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	N/A
1747	I am a land/scenic riverway easement owner in Carter County and would like to comment about your general management plan. First of all, I am firmly against banning 25 HP motors in the upper river. The river is one of the only forms of recreation for people in the Eminence area and this should not be taken from them. Second, I do not believe from Big Springs south the 40 HP limit is necessary since most of the tubing and floating activity is down to the Van Buren bridge. Also, people from Doniphan like to motor up and experience the scenic riverway and have lunch at Big Springs Cafe and look at the spring. This allows access to more people to experience the beauty of the scenic riverway. These are my comments. Thanks for listening. I would like to be added to your mailing list for information pertaining to this. Thanks, again	7/31/2009	No			MO	63935
1748	Having read the Preliminary Alternatives: River-based zones Maximumize Nonmotorized. Zero? Heavy limits on rentals/concessionaires Promote family activities Provide heavy penalties for illegal acts Take advantage of the Wilderness Act where feasible Horse trails removed from stream beds Restrooms at launch points where feasible	7/31/2009	No			UN	n/a

1749	<p>Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration. Sincerely,</p>	7/31/2009	Yes	388	Audubon	DC	20036
1750	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am adding my comments to the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing;dicontinue gravel mining; and support habitat restoration in this beautiful, sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri rivers. I oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, restrict gravel mining, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment(especially jet boats). Also, enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Also, limit gravel mining. Furthermore, I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude. Thank you for your time.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	63116
1751	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. I strongly urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A in order to begin to restore a more healthy ecosystem and return to the type of use envisioned when the Riverways was originally designated by Congress. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. As a Missourian who still believes the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers are the pre-eminent float streams in Missouri and perhaps in the nation, I am embarrassed by the lax management and inappropriate uses that have been allowed to develop over the years and believe that it is high time that we restore these Missouri gems. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access and to close all "renegade" roads, trails, and gravel bar accesses. It is vital to monitor and enforce easement provisions, and also to prevent inappropriate public access and use of private lands that are under easement to NPS. It is critical to prevent unauthorized ATV use; ATVs and other vehicles should be limited to authorized public roads only. Most vital is limitation of the number of horses that can be in any particular segment of the Riverways at any one time, and the redesign of horse trails to be set back from rivers, creeks and sink holes in order to preclude water pollution and destruction of riparian vegetation. I also urge the Park Service to prohibit the use of recreational power boats above Two Rivers and to establish and enforce a 10 hp limit between Two Rivers and Van Buren (similar to the 10hp limit on the Buffalo National River) and a 25 hp limit below Van Buren. National Park Service efforts to interpret the cultural as well as natural resources of the Riverways and to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures are commendable, but I oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. Finally, I strongly urge NPA to recommend Congressional designation of a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect the de facto wildlands in the vicinity of Big Spring. In summary, I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service and to launch a carefully planned process to restore the Riverways. The beauty of this park is owing in large part to its natural,</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	65203282 3

	undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1752	Subject: Please Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	NV	89129
1753	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: As a former NPS seasonal ranger/naturalist, I write to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have paddled these rivers with Oz Hawksley, who wrote the Missouri Ozark Waterways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. As a long-time canoeist and bird watcher, I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A, which includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, and would be to Aldo Leopold who paddled them in the fall of 1926 (see his Round River). These alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. These rivers are national treasures, not for local residents to overuse and abuse. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these vital Missouri streams but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	NM	87120
1754	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The paragraphs below say it better, but..please we have to keep people from ruining our clear waterways and forests. I have seen flotillas of drunken people trashing the waterways, and tracks where thoughtless ATV owners have been. Everybody thinks "just this one time won't hurt". But it does. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	64151

	<p>Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>						
1755	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am officially offering comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I watch birds in what was once a thriving urban forest here in Kansas City and in the last six years I have done so I have watched the migrant species dwindle mightily. Once we had orioles and more warblers, for example. Alternative A must be strengthened and supported because it includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. The National Park Service is the steward of such lands, or this has been the relationship as I understand it, and this means it must carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. We already have the Lake of the Ozarks for that kind of recreational use and look at the degradation of that body of water. In fact, Missouri is sorely lacking in what I call pristine, peaceful places for people to go who need more true wildness than the Missouri state parks offer. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. My husband and I spent a few nights a few years ago in a so-called wilderness cabin in one of the state parks on the Lake of the Ozarks and the noise from the motors continued unabated all night long. We never returned and have limited ourselves to day uses of nearby parks. If we already live in a noisy city, why go so far to experience more of the same. We miss a more secluded interaction with the natural world. Enforcing scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations is also part of the stewardship of NPS. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs, which is almost a miraculous source of water in this muddy water state. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	64110
1756	<p>Subject: Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am commenting on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	61853

1757	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These waterways have been a great enjoyment in my life as I have enjoyed the beauty of the waterways and the wildlife living there but am saddened by what is happening to it. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Wildlife and their habitat (and our environment) is extremely important to me and humans do not have enough respect for both. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	63123
1758	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Spring. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	63034344 7
1759	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I have been using the ONSR for over 35 years. However the park has deteriorated so badly in recent years that I no longer enjoy it. Motorized vehicles, especially ATVs, are ruining the rivers and our experience of them evn on week days. I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	65203

	designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1760	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A,B,C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
1761	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. These protections are important to me as an avid bird watcher and wildlife advocate. Please protect these wonderful areas from overuse and abuse by the public. Birds lead fragile lives and we must take measures to insure their future so that they will continue to thrive. MKW Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	61530151 9
1762	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. THIS AREA IS PRECIOUS TO US, AND MUST NOT BE FURTHER DEGRADED BY INAPPROPRIATE USE! I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but OPPOSE EXPANSION OF RECREATONAL USE and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, ENFORCE THE CURRENT NO-A.T.V. POLICY, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/23/2009	No		Audubon	MO	65203
1763	Response to Question 1: No ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPORVE AND MAINTINA BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901

1764	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: As a frequent visitor to the National Parks, I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60101
1765	<p>Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. We enjoyed the river and scenery 2 weeks ago and this is so much cleaner than Lake of the Ozarks which we don't go to any longer. Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	63042
1766	<p>Response to Question 1: No ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPORVE AND MAINTINA BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.</p>	6/27/2009	No			MO	63960
1767	<p>Subject: Please Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting</p>	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	64063

	equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1768	Response to Question 1: No ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPORVE AND MAINTINA BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901
1769	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing regarding the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are are extremely important to migrating and breeding birds. So I am requesting that you support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as they further degrade the quality of this important area. Please enforce easements; close unauthorized roads, enforce the no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, close unauthorized access along the rivers, limit building construction and forest clearing, and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. This is an Important Bird Area and needs to be protected. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. Please reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60169
1770	Response to Question 1: No ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPORVE AND MAINTINA BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901
1771	Response to Question 1: No ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPORVE AND MAINTINA BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63961
1772	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. It is important to me, as a resident of Missouri, that this beautiful area and its wildlife be preserved for all Americans. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		audubon	MO	63123640 1
1773	Response to Question 1: No ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPORVE AND MAINTINA BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63873
1774	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	AR	72629735 3

	National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1775	Subject: Please Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This area is an Important Bird Area designated by the National Audubon Society. IBAs have been identified so that we can protect our nation's migratory songbirds. Please choose Alternative A, and make that alternative stronger. The other alternatives are not reasonable options, as they would result in further degradation of this unique area. The provisions I would like to see strengthened are those that would carefully manage access, enforce easements, prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing, and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. Please oppose any efforts to expand recreational use and development in these areas. It is my understanding that National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes dictate that this area be protected in an unimpaired condition. I urge the Park Service close unauthorized roads and enforce a policy that prohibits non-emergency or Park Service ATVs. It is necessary for the quality of the streams and water to limit the number of horses. Please close all unauthorized access points along the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, and close substantial areas of the river to motor boating so those who enjoy quiet areas can enjoy this area. Additionally, please enforce scenic and conservation easements. Riding trails should be moved away from the river and equestrian stream crossings should be limited so that others can enjoy this area. Please designate a special area to ensure the reproductive success of migratory birds and protect sensitive species. A Big Spring Wilderness area surrounding Big Springs would be helpful in maintaining bird populations. The original priorities established to guide the National Park Service are important to the long-term health of national treasures like the Ozark Scenic National Riverways. Please adhere to them and preserve and protect this area for us and for our children and our children's children. Thank you.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	64110
1776	Response to Question 1: No change	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
1777	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing aabout the draft of management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to protect areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I ask you to support and strengthen Alternative A, which provides the bet protection for the rivers and opportunities for regulated and appropriate kinds of recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are not good options, as they would increase current environmental pressures and erode the quality of this significant area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	61761
1778	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I wish to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Please support and strengthen Alternative A, as this offers the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60194

	appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. The National Park Service should carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I strongly endorse National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, the Park Service should close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river also should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I ask that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations, and I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas must be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. It is urgent that you reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1779	Response to Question 1: No Action, raise horse power at jet. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Too many regulations Response to Question 4: Round springs down to Van Buren Response to Question 5: In force the rules that are all ready in affect	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1780	Response to Question 1: No Action, raise horse power at jet. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Too many regulations Response to Question 4: Round springs down to Van Buren Response to Question 5: In force the rules that are all ready in affect	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1781	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Please preserve these beautiful areas they are essential to the natural beauty/I live in the Ozarks and have seen first hand what changes are occuring.We need to keep these areas untoucheed. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	AR	72513940 3
1782	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: It is entirely possible to love and be too close to our natural environment in ways that cause its death. As a biologist I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60516305 9

	the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1783	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Motor boats and Snowmobiles do not belong in protected preserves - at all. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60502
1784	Response to Question 1: No-Action, No limit on horsepower Response to Question 2: Do not limit the use of park one trails, roads inside the NPS Response to Question 3: limited useage of parks and rivers Response to Question 4: All of them leave them alone	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1785	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. It is critical at this juncture you that the National Park Service strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	65807273 3
1786	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I love the Current River. Do everything in your power to protect it. I like to get on the river early to miss all the partiers. I've seen mink, otter and I'd be heartbroken if you let it get worse than it is already. I learned to canoe here. It was my first introduction to wildlife in Missouri. Save it. I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	65401447 8

	are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1787	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1788	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: As a nature lover, I ask that you please protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as well as all our waterways & greenways. I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	TN	37890
1789	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1790	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I recently had the opportunity to visit the Ozarks for hiking and birding. Now I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60641

	Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1791	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1792	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict the number of horses allowed in this area, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	64110
1793	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Several years ago I visited the area and was so impressed w/its beauty and ecological significance. It's also interesting to note that so much American literature is set in this region...it needs to be protected! I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60015
1794	Response to Question 1: No-Action I like going to the river, going for four-wheeler rides and having access to the rivers. Response to Question 2: Unlimited use & access. There should not be a limit on the horse power of a boat motor. They should be able to use whatever horse power they want. Response to Question 3: Limited use and access. Response to Question 4: not enough boat ramps Response to Question 5: More river access to boaters	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1795	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I wish to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	AR	72801710 7

	important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating in favor of quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1796	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: National Park Service: Listen to the taxpaying public of the USA! I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	606391016
1797	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am from nearby Illinois and have often vacationed in these lovely areas! These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are UNACCEPTABLE, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. As we grow as a nation, population wise, I know it is hard to leave seemingly "unused" areas like this to nature. However bird numbers are down all over, and some return to nesting grounds to find that there are fewer nesting grounds each year. There are enough shopping malls and superstores. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60432

	integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration. I appreciate your attention on this matter.						
1798	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Upper Current No Response to Question 5: No Changes	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
1799	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. My family lives in a rural area of Jackson County, Missouri, and everyday we see how housing & business development around us is adversely affecting the streams, timber areas and ultimately the wildlife. I urge you to preserve and restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	MO	64075
1800	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. PLEASE SUPPORT THIS IMPORTANT LEGISLATION TO DESIGNATE A BIG SPRING WILDERNESS AREA FOR PROTECTION AND PROVIDE A PLACE FOR MIGRATING BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE. THANKS!!!!!! Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	TN	38574
1801	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION, raise horsepower at jet pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: too many regulations Response to Question 4: Round springs down to Vanburen Response to Question 5: Inforce the rules and regulations that are allready in effect.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
1802	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	AR	71953

	to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Only considerate human use of the areas for aesthetic enjoyment should be encouraged to sustain the beauty and affect of the park. Thank you for your serious consideration.						
1803	Response to Question 1: No-Action, No limit on horsepower Response to Question 2: Don't limit the use of the parks and roads Response to Question 3: limited use of parks and rivers	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1804	Response to Question 1: No-Action, No limit on horse power Response to Question 2: Do not limit the use of the parks, roads, and trails Response to Question 3: limited use of parks and rivers Response to Question 4: ALL of it leave it alone	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1805	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: ALL NO ACTION Response to Question 5: NO ACTION	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
1806	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am commenting on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Please strengthen and support Alternative A which includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are just plain unacceptable. They would further degrade this already sensitive area. Get the science on this. Birds are indicators of how an ecosystem is doing - but the water is vital to life itself (including ours). We all like the pretty. We all like to "play". But if you don't protect these rivers and springs we won't have the pretty, the playground, or the clean water. The National Park Service was created to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. That's your job. Do it. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	AR	72703
1807	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A. Alternative A includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Please there is so many things we can't afford anymore but nature is the one thing that we can appreciate for free. Don't take that away from us. Thank you for your serious consideration.	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60643
1808	Subject: Support and Strengthen Alternative A of the General Management Plan Dear Superintendent: I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. I urge you to support and strengthen Alternative A,, which includes the greatest protection for the rivers and opportunity for appropriate, managed recreation, and enforcement of regulations. Alternatives B and C and the No Action alternative are unacceptable, as these alternatives would increase current pressures and further degrade the quality of this important area. I urge the National Park Service to carefully manage access; enforce easements; prevent unauthorized ATV use, building construction and forest clearing; and support habitat restoration in this sensitive area. I support National Park Service efforts to connect people and communities to these beautiful Missouri treasures, but oppose expansion of recreational use and more intensive development in areas that, by National Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways policy and statutes, are supposed to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. To stop further degradation, I urge the Park Service to close unauthorized roads, enforce the current no ATV policy, restrict horse numbers, and close unauthorized access points along	7/31/2009	No		Audubon	IL	60302304 9

	the rivers. Some areas of the river should be closed to motor boating for quiet enjoyment. I request that you enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to prevent building construction and forest clearing violations. I recommend moving riding trails away from the river, limiting equestrian stream crossings, and limiting the numbers of horses on the trails where water quality is threatened. Special areas need to be protected to maintain quality habitat within this internationally designated Important Bird Area. I support designating a Big Spring Wilderness area to protect a valued wildlife area in the vicinity of Big Springs. I urge you to reaffirm the priorities originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve them for future generations. The beauty of this park is due in large part to its natural, undeveloped landscapes, diverse wildlife, remoteness and solitude--integral components that must be restored and preserved if these rivers are to remain for the enjoyment of future generations. Thank you for your serious consideration in this matter.					
1809	I am in favor of NO-ACTION for the General Management Plan for the ONSR in Missouri. There are many things heard along the riverways and from local users and residents, including that the NPS establishes a method to get what it wants without the input of others. The forum held in Salem was not conducive to planning, it was scattered and provided a way to say here are the alternatives you have. Why the NO-Action was not given a letter the same as the others is beyond me--other than the communications and marketing people say it is a way to get what you want. I asked if the local rangers and NPS personnel were in attendance at the meeting and were informed they were not there. Not a good way to get the support of those in the community when those responsible for the ONSR are not included in the discussion. When I asked about the funding for the proposals, I was informed NPS not sure if there would be funding. Again, all the more reason to leave as it is. At least we have some idea what is happening. The resources are vital to the local community for recreation, tourism, and visitors. Again, NO-ACTION IS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE. Thank You.	7/31/2009	No		MO	65560
1810	On behalf of our 315,000 members, the National Parks Conservation Association is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. NPCA commends current park leadership for understanding that this park has experienced abuse and neglect for many years and for developing some avenues – through this GMP – to reverse the damage that has been done at this wonderful national treasure. There are, however, critical issues that are not addressed in the GMP that must be dealt with if the rivers are to be protected as Congress intended when authorizing America's first National Scenic Rivers more than 40 years ago. NPCA commends the park service for its approach to public input on this GMP. By holding public meetings in many locations, a wide range of park supporters were able to learn about management alternatives and make comment on the plan. It is evident that current park leadership has prioritized working with park supporters to achieve a new vision for the park. This GMP provides a tremendous opportunity to forge improvements to the park, make provisions for enforcing current National Park Service policy, and develop strong partnerships that will benefit this park and its visitors for many years to come. Change will not come easily, but park management must change if the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is to survive. 1. Is one of the four alternatives already close to your idea of the best way to manage ONSR? Of the three Alternatives proposed in the GMP, Alternative A comes closest to management of the site according to the guidelines Congress set when establishing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 2. Which parts of any of the preferred alternatives should be included in future management of the riverways? Critical components of Alternative A to include in future management are: - Greater opportunity for traditional, non-motorized forms of recreation - Management would close roads and trails that have been illegally developed - Commercial services might be limited or modified along portions of the rivers - Enhance visitor awareness of people's cultural heritage in the area - Big Spring wilderness tract is proposed The above provisions are all consistent with the very purpose and significance of the National Riverways. Especially important to consider in all management provisions at this site is this purpose statement: "Provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the national riverways resources." NPCA recognizes that "a manageable mix of traditional recreation activities, such as floating, boating and horseback riding," as described in Alternative B may be compatible with the desirable goals set forth in Alternative A. If this balance of recreational use is well managed by the NPS and respected by all river users, it could be consistent with the purpose and significance statement above. But in order to achieve a manageable balance of recreation activities, there must be limits set on horsepower, number of canoes/kayaks, and numbers of horses allowed on the river. And a well-funded, aggressive educational component with measurable results must be adopted to educate river users about the importance of preserving the park's critical resources. 3. Which parts of the alternatives should not be included in future management of the riverways? Nearly all of the provisions in Alternative C should not be included in future management of the riverways as they are inconsistent with the purpose and significance statements of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. Specifically, the park service should NOT allow: - More motorized activities of any type on the river: this will compromise visitor safety, and be inconsistent with good stewardship of park resources - Additional boat ramps and trails for horseback riding: with the recent proliferation of access roads to the river, causing severe damage to the riverbank and water quality, there are already many more access points than park plans originally intended - Higher tolerance for resource impacts in more heavily used areas: higher tolerance for impact could cause additional development along the river, and development – especially in the gap – already causes resource damage and water quality issues 4. Are there some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about? Do the alternatives address them adequately? 5. Are there important strategies or approaches to management of resources or visitor experience that should be included? If so, what are they? Specifically, NPCA encourages the park service to: - Set reasonable limits on the numbers of horses allowed on the riverside trails at any one time - Reduce the number of equestrian river crossings - Permanently close all unofficial river access roads. If a new road and trail plan is necessary to achieve this goal, one should be undertaken immediately - Enforce the ban on ORVs within park boundaries - Implement the ORV education campaign, and if necessary, seek partnership support to initiate - Set horsepower limits for power boats as follows: 10 hp limit between Two Rivers and Van Buren; 25 hp limit below Van Buren - Set limits on the number and control the frequency of non-motorized crafts on the river. This will alleviate crowding on the river - Preserve the 3,400 acres at Big Creek as primitive wilderness NPCA encourages the park service to maximize partnership solutions by working with a variety of groups and individuals to solve management issues. The park service and its	7/31/2009	No	National Parks Conservation Association	IL	60603

	friends groups and partners, like NPCA, must make an effort to educate park visitors about the importance of resource protection and good stewardship practices. When necessary, the park and its partners must step up and halt illegal activities and unauthorized land uses. In a publication by Will Sarvis in the University of California Press, the paradox of this site is well described: "On the one hand, the NPS would accommodate hundreds of thousands of tourists. On the other, it would struggle to protect the area's sensitive habitats, which, because of the increased recreational visitation, would create greater human impact." This is a challenge to the NPS and its partners at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as it is at many national park sites. But these are America's first National Scenic Rivers and they need a bold new vision to survive for future generations.						
1811	awaiting scan...	7/31/2009	No		Missouri Coalition for the Environment	MO	63130
1812	<p>For the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall designate for establishment as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways the area (hereinafter referred to as "such area") generally depicted on map numbered NR OZA 7002 entitled "Proposed Ozark National Rivers" dated December 1963 which map is on file for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior: Provided, That the area so designated shall not include more than sixty-five thousand acres of land now in private ownership and that no lands shall be designated within two miles of the present boundaries of the municipalities of Eminence and Van Buren, Missouri. The Secretary, with the concurrence of the State, shall designate for inclusion in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the lands composing Big Springs, Alley Springs, and Round Spring State Parks, and the Secretary is hereby directed to negotiate with the State for the donation and the inclusion of such park lands in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? The Park's management staff is bound by Congress to manage the park in a way that preserves the rivers in a free flowing condition, preserve the springs and caves in the park, conserve and interpret the unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, manage the wildlife in the park, and make provisions for the use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources by the people of the United States. The No-Action Alternative and Alternative C are the only two alternatives that managers could possibly choose. Alternative A and B are too restrictive in respect to allowing the use of the resource. Any effort to curb unruly behavior on the rivers should not be factored in to the General Management Plan. There are plenty of regulations and laws that address that type of behavior and plenty of law enforcement officers to enforce those laws and regulations. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? Interpretation of cultural resources should be the highest priority for the interpretation staff at Ozark NSR. The area is blessed with a culture that few people know about. The park had many cultural areas in the park that included many farms and homesteads. Most of these have been allowed to rot through neglect. These areas should be used to interpret the way of life in the 18th and 19th centuries. Our Ozark Culture and way of life has been, and is being, pushed out by park managers, especially managers that do not have a clue about our culture or just plainly do not care. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? The wilderness proposal should not be part of any alternative. The area proposed for wilderness is already a primitive area. It is not large enough to be considered for wilderness qualities. It should be continue to be a primitive area. Horsepower restrictions on the river should not be included in the future management of the national riverways. For one, the cost of replacing the park's boat fleet would be an enormous burden for the tax payers. Secondly, many users would not be able to enjoy the park's resources, effectively banishing them from the park. The park's enabling legislation prohibits that. Some would say the damage to the resource is a reason to restrict motor size. But that argument is not valid. There is no scientific proof that outboard motors cause any more damage to natural resources than any other recreational activity. In regards to conflicts with other users, that is an enforcement issue. I have spent countless hours on Current River between Powder Mill and Jerktail and have seen only one LE ranger patrolling the river. That person patrolled the lower end from Two Rivers down to Paint Rock. That means there is no LE presence on Current River from Two Rivers to Montauk where the majority of people are located and where most conflicts between user groups occur. These are enforcement issues that did not go away when the first horsepower restrictions were forced on the people and will not go away with additional horsepower restrictions. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? The entire 134 miles of river is special to me. It is where I grew up and where I intend to retire. I want my children and future grand children to enjoy these rivers the same way I have. The park's management staff has the opportunity provide these future generations the chance to get acquainted with their past and use the rivers the same as the past generations. The Organic Act of 1916, that established the National Park Service states: "The National park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations..." That is the way the park should be managed, for our future generations. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? In the 50's and 60's the Army Corp of Engineers had plans to dam up the entire Upper Current River Valley. The people petitioned their congressmen to establish Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The most important strategy or approach you, as the Superintendent, can take is to commit to managing the park for the people. The park was established by the people and for the people and the park must continue to be</p>	7/31/2009	No			MN	56649

	managed for the people. The management direction the park should take, should be the direction the people want and not what park managers want. Park managers should not be dictating that direction. In fact, park managers should not be involved at all. The entire GMP process should be done by an outside entity so there is not the apparent conflict of interest that there is now. The Park's enabling legislation give clear and concise direction on how the park is managed. If you manage it any other way, it will literally take an act of congress.						
1813	<p>Friends of Ozark Riverways Supplement to our Initial Comments Paper, which was Submitted to the National Park Service on July 8, 2009 This paper supplements our initial comments paper, which we submitted on July 8, 2009. In this supplement we re-visit our earlier discussion of problems created by the proliferation of river access road extensions, bank openings, and general bank destruction and misuse, this time, however, with more specific references, examples, and documentation. We begin by taking a detailed look at a one-mile stretch of the upper Current River, where all of the relevant issues of concern to us come together. This stretch begins at coordinates (37.19646N, 91.30407W). Here the river makes a 150 degree bend encompassing a broad, isolated flood plain known locally as Broadfoot field and ends at coordinates (37.19188N, 91.29182W). This area is shown on the U.S.G.S. topographic map below. Heavy black lines are ONSR boundaries. The Broadfoot horse trail fords the Current River at red circle #015 (37.19270N, 91.29282W). Red circle #020 (37.19471N, 91.30259W) marks the beginning of road NPS 140, where a vault toilet is located. Broadfoot trailhead is located adjacent to and west northwest of this sanitary facility. The Current River is approximately 700 feet northwest from the toilet. Red circle #017 marks the approximate midway point of a bank clearing that is regularly used for camping. County gravel road 19-205 runs 3.7 miles from state highway 19 to the ONSR boundary. From there it runs another half mile and terminates at NPS 140 adjacent to red circle #020. This flood plain, the surrounding hills, and the river channel are all quite beautiful, typical of the natural beauty of this Current River country. Broadfoot trailhead & staging area Intersection of 19-205 with NPS 140 at toilet facility NPS 140 appears on the NPS map prepared for public comment on alternatives A and B, "Upper Current – North Segment" from the large, 11" x 17" brochure packet. Here is an enlargement of the Broadfoot area: The closed loop shown on the NPS map above is NPS 140. A smaller closed loop (not shown on this map) extends south southeast from the southeast corner of NPS 140 and runs past an equestrian ford crossing the river at (37.19270N, 91.29282W). View of the Broadfoot Ford loop approaching the ford at left foreground Broadfoot Horse Ford (sign posted at upper right) View of the bank opening from the water's edge A quarter of a mile north northwest from this ford there is a broad, heavily compacted camping area adjacent to the river bank as shown in the next two photos. Picnic trash left on the table & in the fire circle Heavily compacted soil and no ground cover At the river's edge of this compacted area, there are two more man-made openings in the Bank. Here are two photos showing the first opening: Apparent boat ramp opposite picnic table seen from Same ramp seen from the gravel bar below top of the bank At the base of this wild cat ramp is a gravel bar. Photos were taken from the gravel bar at photo point #018 (37.19622N, 91.29467W). The first photo below shows the second opening. A second, somewhat narrower ramp 100' Vehicular tracks of unknown origin beginning at the downstream from the first second ramp Despite these incredible insults to the river bank, the river's beauty can still be seen simply by looking across the river from the same gravel bar. What a difference 180 degrees makes! All of the banks along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers should look like this. Here we have one last image of this mutilated bank and would-be campground, this time from a canoe as it appeared in October of 2006. One look at this photo and one look at the previous photo should enable anyone to understand why Friends of Ozark Riverways are so very, very upset about the way the National Park Service has (mis-) managed Ozark National Scenic Riverways over the past three or four decades. Continuing on the NPS 140 loop, the road veers a few hundred feet away from the river and then returns to a point close to the river about one-half mile further upstream from the camp area. Here is what we see: Looking across this gravel bar from the water's edge, we see what looks like a short but well-used trail. What we find is a collapsed bank with impressions of many horse hooves and two large root runners that had been cut with a chain saw. Perhaps a tree blew down, but, if so, it happened where the ground had already been significantly broken down by horses taking a short cut to the river. Thus, we've seen on the Broadfoot primitive camping area that compaction results in near total loss of ground cover. The area becomes a biologically barren corridor intermingled with remnants of the natural riparian habitat. Such impaired corridors cannot sustain vigorous natural riparian communities. Eventually, they become conduits for non-native invasive species. Native biodiversity is diminished, and restoration of the natural communities then becomes nearly impossible to achieve. This results in significant loss of our natural heritage and denies future generations of its beauty and biological value, an outcome that is forbidden by the enabling legislation. Bank openings are ugly. They despoil the river experience for those who come to this park to enjoy the natural setting, but find, instead, parked mobile campers sitting on the edge of a partially denuded river bank containing unauthorized notches and ramps. Bank openings are usually associated with roads and traces which have been brought from higher ground down to the river. Such roads and trails create vehicular conduits, which, in turn, bring in ATV riders, who frequently drive onto the gravel bars and into the creeks and rivers. Also, pick-up trucks are often parked for the day in clear sight of river floaters. These roads and traces bring in everyone who is looking for a short-cut to the river. If people know there's a way, they will take it, and they will use it, and then they will claim it. Camping has become associated with river access, but it doesn't have to be. Ideally a camp should be close enough to the river to afford convenient access, but far enough away to be out of sight and sound of the river. This cannot be achieved if the river bank is the campground. A primitive camping area established adjacent to the river bank significantly disrupts the natural riparian corridor and generates abusive practices by visitors, who may not even recognize that they are harming the area. We believe that the establishment and maintenance of these areas violates the purposes of the organic act which established the National Park Service, and we do not believe that the congressional act that established ONSR abrogates the fundamental mission of the National Park Service as it was written in the organic act. So, how extensive is this menace of unbridled river access? Let's take a look. In 1991 the National Park Service published a study entitled "roads and trails study and environmental assessment – Ozark National Scenic Riverways". The following analysis of river access points and campgrounds located on the banks is derived from this study. Appendix 3 in this study lists the use and function of every road within the ONSR boundaries. The study also shows the locations of these roads overlain on a U.S.G.S. topographic base map. Using data from this study, we compiled a table of our own based on the uses and</p>	8/6/2009	No		Friends of the Ozark Riverways	UN	N/A

	<p>functions of those roads that provide river access, and we created a set of maps highlighting the locations and sequence of these river access points on the Current and Jacks Fork river segments on ONSR. Our tables also show the occurrence of campgrounds associated with each river access point. (See appendix at the end of this supplement.) In total we identified 97 relevant river access points. The following sets of maps use boat ramp icons to represent official NPS river access points and visitor abuse of the river banks, including abuses which are tantamount to outright vandalism of the park's natural resources. The solution is simple: close all unauthorized river access roads and trails within a minimum distance of 600 feet from the rivers. Even with total closure of these wildcat access points, the density of river access points would still be on the high side as spacing between points would average 5 miles instead of the ideal 7-8 miles. Horse trails that follow the banks of the rivers create linear fragmentation of the riparian corridor, soil compaction and erosion on these banks, and animal fecal contamination of the adjacent waterways. The solution is more complex than closing roads. Horse trails must be re-routed outside of the riparian corridor and far enough away from water sources to avoid significant pollution through the complex underground karst waterways. This is a challenging problem, one that requires careful study by a competent karst hydrologist. It is not a problem for equestrian riding groups to solve. Bank openings and clearings for camp sites create nodal fragmentation of the riparian corridor, soil compaction and erosion on these banks, and human fecal contamination of the adjacent waterways. The solution here is also complex, but in different ways from the re-routing of horse trails. The need is to obliterate clearings adjacent to the banks (including roads, trails, camp sites, and bank openings) and re-vegetate these areas with native plant communities, a task that requires a high level of specialized restoration knowledge and long term oversight. Simple closing of these areas to visitor use would not restore the riparian habitat, and use of fencing for closing such areas would further degrade the riparian habitat by impeding the natural movements of wildlife. If additional primitive camping areas are needed, they should be located out of view and out of sound range from the river. An appropriate standard might be the same minimum distance of 600 feet from the river which we recommend for road closures. It should be noted that these restriction would not apply to or adversely affect the traditional use of gravel bars for tent camping on overnight river trips. BENEFITS The benefits from implementation of these solutions would be enormous. First, the biological integrity of the riparian corridor would be restored. It is very likely that a higher diversity of plants and animals would become more abundant, and a richer heritage of native biodiversity would be passed on to future generations of Americans. Water quality in the equestrian areas would be better protected, especially on the Current River above its confluence with the Jacks Fork. Perhaps even the imperiled Ozark hellbender could begin to make a come back. Destruction of aquatic habitats would be reduced once the vehicular trampling of creek and riverbeds were stopped by the combination of road closures and re-vegetation of bank clearings and openings. These measures taken to restore the habitat value of the riparian corridors would also create conditions that would physically impede access to the rivers and gravel bars by ATV's and would remove horse trails and camping areas from the river banks. Second, the river experience for visitors would be greatly enhanced. River users would see more and a greater diversity of native wildlife. Certainly, the river banks would be more beautiful and more natural. Gravel bars would be more inviting when they become free of truck and ATV tracks, horse droppings, and horse hoof divots. Bird watchers would be more likely to see and hear a greater diversity of birds, and campers would be less likely to be visited by uninvited ATV riders. Third, the cost of monitoring illegal vehicular use of the rivers, resource vandalism, and other abusive practices on the river banks would be greatly diminished once the wildcat access roads were closed. TIME FRAME There can be no question that the use of river banks for unauthorized river access, camping, and horse trails has degraded both the biological integrity of the riparian corridor and opportunities for future generations to enjoy the natural beauty of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The National Park Service has not merely the authority to control these abuses, but, more importantly, they have a statutory obligation to do so. No policy that might be adopted in the new general management plan can abrogate this responsibility. The National Park Service has a standing obligation to protect the physical resources of the park before all else. We therefore urge the National Park Service to immediately begin closing and obliterating all of these unauthorized river access points and any others which may have been created since 1991 as well as primitive campgrounds and sections of equestrian trails that are located on or adjacent to the banks of the rivers, and to begin immediately developing a comprehensive plan to restore and re-vegetate bank openings, ramps, notches, and clearings with native plant communities, all with the goals of restoring the biological and scenic integrity of the riparian corridors within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways and completing this project at the earliest possible time. Comments prepared by ... for Friends of Ozark Riverways APPENDIX Listing of roads cited in this supplement Compiled from the 1991 ONSR roads and trails study Check marks highlighted in red confirming campgrounds associated with river access were added by personal observation on location</p>						
1814	<p>Two summers ago, my extended family and I spent a week camping at a federal park near Eminence. We spent a few days canoeing on the Jacks Fork River, chartering canoes locally. We were all so impressed with the natural beauty of the area and how wonderfully maintained the river was, especially since many of the rivers we commonly paddle in Iowa are dirty and full of litter. All 14 of us agreed we would be returning to vacation in the Ozarks. I just returned to Iowa after a trip to paddle the Current River. Although the beauty of the Current was amazing, I am not eager to return, as the motor boats ruined the day. The smell of burning fuel was off-putting. The wake could have easily capsized less experienced paddlers. But the worst was listening to the drone of motors all day, drowning out the bird songs and insect calls we might have heard. I am certain that noise keeps wildlife away, as it is keeping canoers away. We saw no other canoes that day, but encountered dozens of boats speeding by. I'm not sure how they were able to enjoy the 'scenic' river at those speeds, and they definitely made it less enjoyable for us. There are plenty of constructed lakes available for boaters to have their fun. I know lots of folks that would make the 8 hour drive I did to paddle a river like the Current, but would never waste their time or their tourism dollars to listen to motor boats all day.</p>	8/11/2009	No			IA	50010
1815	<p>... receives your Broadcaster newsletter. He passed it on to me. I tried to comment, per your request, and though I followed the links, when I came to Comment on Document, it took me back to the previous page with no way that I could see to post any comments. I too am concerned for the riverways which are so beautiful and pristine. surely there should be some compromise that could work for everyone. I did not realize that motorized boats would be allowed on any part of the river. And I can understand that overuse by horses could be a big problem. ATVs should be</p>	8/3/2009	No			MO	65711

	definitely restricted. Just wanted to let you know my comments...and that it is hard to give them!						
1816	ONSR, I let the deadline for comment get by me. But I feel strongly on this and must make my thoughts known to you. I support Alternative A using the Natural Zone management plan. I am familiar with the whole Riverways; very familiar with certain sections. I've fished, floated, camped, swam and dreamed about both rivers. The section of the Jacks Fork between Alley Spring and Two Rivers is unusable for me, due to current management plan policies. The idea of allowing motorboats on the Van Buren section(or anywhere else) is insulting to the concept of the national scenic riverway. I live in this area, I understand well the economic and political ramifications of a more restricted management plan, but the economy will adjust and the politics will come around. Thanks.	8/3/2009	No			MO	63935
1817	Ladies and Gentlemen, Of your various proposals for management of this beautiful part of our state, the National Scenic Riverways, I would choose Alternative A because it achieves the greatest reduction in noise level by reducing or eliminating gasoline-powered motors on various portions of the Current and Jack's Fork. I grew up spending weekends fishing and boating on the Gasconade and know full well that Missouri's smaller streams (non-Missouri or Mississippi)can be adequately navigated with a ten horsepower motor. When I was younger, anyone who came down a small river with a large horsepower motor was frowned upon for being an excessively noisy "showboater." Eventually, the loud and disturbing boaters who stirred up the silt and the peace and quiet ruled the day. This has to top or we will not have a single pristine, peaceful river to enjoy. Also, ATV's are ruining our gravel bars and shallow streambeds. ATV's should NEVER be in our streams or on our beaches. Even the horseback riders in outrageous numbers are now running down river banks and polluting our streams with fecal matter. When are you going to set a sane policy and manage our rivers, not for everyone who wants to have fun at the expense of preserving what is beautiful and precious, but for those who want to keep our rivers in their natural state for the purpose of fishing, swimming, rafting, canoeing, photography, birding and other acitivities that do not destroy the rivers? I support any plan that will curtail the motors and ATV's and horses that are ruining our rivers. They are too precious to lose.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63130
1818	Comments by The Nature Conservancy to Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan/Wilderness Study proposal 1) Is one of the 4 preliminary alternatives already close to your idea of the best way to manage ONSR? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? In many respects, Alternative A emphasizes some of the key issues upon which the long-term health of the resources safeguarded by ONSR depend. The Conservancy advocates a greater focus on management of natural communities and biodiversity as well as protecting water quality within ONSR. Reducing negative impacts to the Park by limiting those activities that threaten ecosystem health, water quality and overall conditions of the Park; e.g., excessive horse use, equestrian and vehicular traffic in and near streams, an extensive informal road and trail systems, off-road use of vehicles and ATVs, will provide greater benefit to critical resources while allowing compatible, high quality recreational use. TNC would also like to see stricter horsepower limits as well as areas that are off-limits to motorized vehicle traffic, including motor boats. These off-limits areas should be driven by biological need and critical habitat and spawning seasons, and would include sensitive natural communities such as caves, springs, and locations providing critical habitat for rare and endangered species. 2) Which parts of the any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? TNC believes that the citizens and the resources will be best served through a strong focus on managing ONSR to maintain healthy, diverse, sustainable natural communities and water quality. This will ensure both long term viability of the recreational and economic resources, as well as ensure that the biological systems upon which these depend are healthy. Any threats that degrade the long term sustainability of the system, including unplanned or overused equestrian traffic, boating activities that degrade in-stream habitat or water quality, off-road ATV use, illegal road installations, development in violation of easement restrictions, etc. must be controlled to conserve and restore and maintain the ONSR as a healthy, functional system for both present and future generations. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future of management of ONSR? TNC believes that there is currently sufficient public access to the resources of ONSR, and there is no need for developing more access, which would produce deleterious ecological impacts. Overuse and under-management of public access, particularly in county road construction/ maintenance and illegal roads and trails, already poses significant problems to water quality, sediment levels and nutrient loading associated with erosion and runoff from these uses. TNC does not think there should be an increase in acceptable horsepower limits within the ONSR, since existing horsepower regulations allow more than adequate boat access to all reaches of the river. Higher horsepower motors have higher volume and velocity jet plumes which increase perturbations to in-stream habitat, stir up fine sediments and disturb spawning cycles and invertebrate populations. Increased horsepower limits will likely contribute to higher speeds and increased wakes, increasing stream bank erosion and sediment loads into the river. Maintaining lower horsepower limits will help to mitigate these threats, while still allowing the full range of recreational access. 4) ONSR is about 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? In addition to maintaining the critical watershed of the Current River system in healthy forest cover, the Current River system and its surrounding terrestrial habitats contain numerous features of global conservation significance, as explicated in TNC's Ozarks Ecoregional Assessment. Conservation of these globally significant conservation resources, including unique natural communities, rare species populations, and karst features (caves, springs, sinkholes, etc.) should be a prime goal of comprehensive Riverways management plans and activities. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If what are they? TNC would like to see the ONSR managed to sustain its biological integrity, ensuring the continuity of the resources upon which both the habits and local recreational industry depend. Adverse or illegal uses that contribute to degradation of water quality and biodiversity should be prevented, including	7/31/2009	No		The Nature Conservancy	MO	63144

	aggressive enforcement of appropriate regulations. _____ Dear Mr. Detring: Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments to the General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Current River and its watershed are one of the most biologically significant regions in North America, and support a variety of global priority habitat types, plants, and animals, including some species found nowhere else on earth. These resources also provide world class terrestrial and aquatic recreational sources, and support a vibrant forest products and tourism industry. Maintaining these critical resources requires sustainable management of the Current River system and its watershed to ensure the long term health of the diverse biological systems found here. Both human and natural systems are totally dependent upon the long term health of these resources. Park service management should thus aim to sustain the totality of system components in a healthy condition for the benefit of present and future generations, and ensure that activities which result in resource damage or degradation are prevented or mitigated. In this sense, the Conservancy has no ideological or position regarding any activity - only that it be carefully evaluated for its potential for resource degradation and regulated accordingly. The enclosed comments provide specific recommendations based on the Conservancy's data and experience in working to conserve the irreplaceable resources within the Current River and its watershed. We would be happy to provide more detail at your request. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continuing our history of successful partnership to sustain these critical resources. Sincerely						
1819	I understand that you are still taking opinions on future management of the Current and Jack's Fork. Perhaps there is a specific site for comments but I haven't found it. But I think that all powered land vehicles - ATV's, trucks with big tires, etc. should definitely be kept out of the rivers completely and this includes just crossing them. I also think that, on boats, nothing bigger than a small trolling motor should be allowed. I have a horse but, lacking a horse trailer, have never been to one of the Eminence trail rides. However, from what I hear of them, there are way too many people there anyway for me to enjoy it. I have to admit that horses can really tear up a trail, especially if it is muddy. Although I know many people who enjoy these rides I still think the horse activities should be somewhat limited and horse camps should be far away from the river banks (and perhaps they are, I haven't been there). If there is anything else about these rivers on which you're soliciting comments perhaps you	8/14/2009	No			UN	N/A
1820	Superintendent, Ozark Riverways. There are way too many accesses. There are way too many horses and the accompanying horse flies. There are way too many ATVs in the river and on the shore. There is nowhere near enough law enforcement. Ban motorboats on the upper stretches. I was in Glacier National Park this summer and there was almost no trash anywhere. Not like the riverways.	8/15/2009	No			UN	N/A
1821	Appreciate comment opportunity. A76 not necessary; keep park mgmt under NPS, not contractors, as more responsible. Horsepower/ATVs should be limited so rural riverways should remain more eco and family friendly. More policing re cleanliness and to reduce rowdiness. Thanks for your efforts.	8/17/2009	No			UN	N/A
1822	An article in the Springfield Sunday paper alerted me to the fact that you are seeking input on rules and regulations on the Current and Big Springs area. If you had included an e-mail address you would get a much larger response. I'm not even sure I have the correct address. It took a lot of searching on my part. I would like to voice my concern about even considering keeping it a Circus, i.e. ,4-wheelers, motor boats, drunks. and over 600 horses a day pooping in the streams, and I'm horse lover---have several of my own. KEEP IT NATURAL!!!! That's the way it was first intended, but indifferent , self centered people have pushed and pushed until it is fast becoming another Lake of the Ozarks. It has become a boisterous, wild partying, place to be. People urinating from their canoes, and loud profane shouting is not enjoyable. It used to be a quiet, lovely place for a family to go. All liquor should be banned. There would be a lot less cans on the bottom of the stream if beer was not allowed. It is not necessary to ride horses in the waterways to enjoy the scenery. The commercial riding business won't be out of business if horses are not allowed in the rivers. They, of course, will tell you a lot of sad tales about how their business will suffer, and the whole industry will go broke. The whole thought behind this, and I remember who spearheaded it, was to preserve the beauty and solitude, forever. It has gotten out of hand, and become a party place. Rewrite the laws and make it ,once again, an enjoyable peaceful place that every one can enjoy. The 4-wheelers, and the partying group should let us have at least one place in the state that will be kept pristine.	8/18/2009	No			UN	N/A
1823	I grew up in Missouri and return to float the Current River every summer. I have been floating the Current River since 1972. I remember the locals were not originally pleased that the river was designated a national scenic riverway. "The gov'ments taking our land" etc. After the designation, most public opinion turned positive. It is the duty of the national park service to protect our country's most precious sites and the Current River is UNDOUBTEDLY a national treasure. I have traveled the world and never seen an area like it; the beautiful springs, wildlife and unique habitats are one of a kind. I strongly support the designation of these areas as wilderness areas. I understand people like to use motorboats (I own a motorboat personally and love to waterski) and ride ATV's but there is a time and a place for everything- and the Current River is not the place for these activities and the time to protect this national gem is now. As is true of many of our coral reefs- we are in danger of "loving the area to death". The signs of overuse and misuse are already there. Many people who use the river are just "partying" and could carry on this activity in a less fragile ecosystem (There's nothing wrong with a few brews on the river, but many of the activities I see far surpass this). It takes strength to do what is right and I can only assume there will be a few loud voices that will resist this designation. I beg the national park service to step up to the plate and do the right thing by designating as a wilderness area this one of a kind, irreplaceable resource. It will only be available for future generations to experience and cherish if we protect it now.	8/18/2009	No			FL	32909
1824	I wish to offer these comments concerning the General Management Plan alternatives. I am an equestrian trail rider and treasure riding in the Ozark National Scenic Riverway area. I feel the ONSR should be managed to protect the natural resources while also providing access to recreational activities such as horseback riding. Horseback riding is a long standing tradition and has strong cultural ties to the area. I favor Alternative B to provide a manageable mix to traditional activities. The "Natural Resource Management" within Alternative B seems difficult to match with the additional trails and a network of learning centers. Restoring natural resources to more pristine conditions seems to promote less	8/20/2009	No			MO	6850 Dogwo

	access. I do not approve of making access difficult but do approve of well managed and planned trails to protect and restore the natural resources while still providing access. I favor education and promotion of such outdoor ethics such as the Leave No Trace Stock program of the Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen.						
1825	Supt. Detring: Thank you for the opporutnity to comment on the ONSR General Management Plan. I favor Alternative B to provide a manageable mix to traditional activities. The "Natural Resource Management" within Alternative B seems difficult to match with the additional trails and a network of learning centers. Restoring natural resources to more pristine conditions seems to promote less access. I do not approve of making access difficult but do approve of well managed and planned trails to protect and restore the natural resources while still providing access. I favor education and promotion of such outdoor ethics such as the Leave No Trace Stock program of the Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen. Many equestrians are aging and unable to access the off road or natural areas by foot. I ask that you recognize and honor the fact that horses/mules are a source of conveyance for many. I am a returning trail rider to ONSR, and I can testify it is about more than riding. In addition to appreciating the abiiities of a trusted trail horse, I NEED the experience of the outdoors and all the things in it. I am a life long horse rider, and choose that mode to enjoy those resources. While developing and planning for the future management of ONSR, I ask that you recognize the value to the Park for equestrians who belong to and promote the values of Show-Me MO Back County Horsemen as it pertains to conservation, trail ethics, volunteer service to help preserve our equestrian trails, and our way of life. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the comment period for the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways.	8/19/2009	No			MO	63461
1826	I would like to express my openion on the purposed plan's. I think the NO ACTION plan is the one we need to use, keeping the hourse power limits the same as they are now. and rating the power at the power head. thanks	8/20/2009	No			MO	63638
1827	I,m 60 years old and have been enjoying the scenic riverways for 45years. It would be ashame to ruin them because of ATVs or horses, they are equally destructive. Please consider this a vote to ban them from all of MO streams	8/25/2009	No			UN	N/A
1828	Dear Superintendent: I hope you will do all you can to improve and preserve our incredible natural resource, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The rivers have become polluted and overcrowded as a result of overuse and abuse. We have an opportunity to save this wilderness for all of us and future generations. We need to: Enforce the ban on off-road vehicles in the park! Limit the number of horses allowed on the riverside trails Eliminate some of the access roads plowed into the river! Preserve the beautiful wilderness at Big Spring Enforce horsepower limits of 10hp between Two Rivers and Van Buren and 25hp below Van Buren	8/22/2009	No			MO	65203
1829	To whom it may concern, I am writing this email to voice my support of "Aternative A". I am an avid paddler in the Ozarks and consider the National Scenic Riverways to be one of this region's greatest treasures. I feel that keeping motorized boats confined to as small of an area as possible is in the best interest of the park. Engines lead to inevitable pollution that could devistate the natural beauty this area. I am in full support of the restrictions that have been placed on "rowdy behavior". I appreciate being able to come to a river and enjoy the scenery as opposed to navigating an overcrowded field of canoes filled with kegs and beer bong. I would also like you to know that I am 25 years old. I say this because I want you to know there are young people in support of these rules. The Current and Jacks Forks rivers were my first two float trips when I was five years old. I want my children to be able to enjoy the same clear and cool water that I have been enjoying over the last 20 years. You have done an excellent job in managing the park over these years, and I trust that you will make good decisions in preserving this valuable resource for generations to come. Sincerely,	8/27/2009	No			MO	65802
1830	Mr. O'Donnell, Please don't shot down the trails at Jacks Fork to equestrians or shut down any equestrian trails! I've been trail riding for 45 years. I try to be a responsible rider and try to teach others as well. Take out what you bring in theory, be as unobtrusive to land and water as possible. I love nature more than anyone I know, love it and respect it and need to ride my horse on trails in parks for tranquility and relaxation at every week! There's nothing like it! I also enjoy hiking and biking, I know we can all do this together on the same trails. I see it taking place in St. Louis County. I need to see all types of exercisers/ nature lovers sharing the trails. As for the e coli in the creeks/rivers, I'm not an expert on this, but I feel that there are a lot of animals in the woods, could this be the reason? I don't know, but I've been told that the e coli in the Lake of the Ozarks is 10x worse because of human waste? Please take in the consideration of this country's heritage of horses and horseback riding and keep trails open to equestrians. Thank you for all you do for our Parks, and thank you for your time. Sincerely,	8/28/2009	No			MO	63069
1831	"WASHINGTON – U.S. Rep. ... (MO-...) sent a public comment to the National Park Service on proposed new regulations for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which she cites as a principal tourism and recreational attraction in the Eighth Congressional District. "The ONSR is a stunning natural resource in our state, and it is extremely important that we preserve public access so it can be responsibly enjoyed," ...said. "Many of our communities rely on the ONSR and the people drawn to it for their local economies, and reducing the ability of boaters to visit the area and use the riverways would be a great hardship for them. The guiding principles of the ONSR have always centered around maintaining the public's right to make good use of the riverways – we ought to continue to keep the ONSR open to the public in that spirit." The Eighth District Representative also cited concerns for private landowners along the river in her comments to the federal agency. "Private property owners have a right to easily access their lands, and we have to be careful of any federal effort that would restrict them. This is about keeping the balance between a healthy, scenic, natural resource and a public commodity that is being kept open and available for taxpayers to enjoy," ...said. Excerpts of ...'s submission to the National Park Service for the public comment period follow: As with many of our National Parks, a natural tension has risen between those who would prefer to the NPS to focus on "managing wildlife" (often in the most extreme manner) and those, like myself, who prefer the NPS to focus on	9/1/2009	No			UN	N/A

	ensuring access and enjoyment of these public parks by the taxpayers of Missouri and the nation. After reviewing the proposed alternative General Management Plans, I would urge the National Park Service to adopt the No-Action Alternative. The ONSR should be allowed to expand recreation activities, in a safe and responsible manner, to provide individuals a broad selection of activities. Overly aggressive limits on horsepower may also pose safety and access concerns, especially when areas of the river subject to higher regulation isolate areas in which general use is allowed by these proposed plans. ...none of the proposed alternatives address the impact on the local communities and counties along the ONSR. Vibrant and even thriving local partners are essential to fulfilling the goals of the National Scenic Riverways system, however, it is not clear to me that the National Park System is even allowed to consider the surrounding, local economic community in their decision-making process. Managing wildlife, preserving the environment and providing recreational activities do not stop at the Park Service's gates. The taxpayers who travel to and from the region will base their enjoyment and impression of the environment on more than just the river itself; a functioning local economy is important to achieving the shared goals of this interconnected community. I would hope the concerns of local government are heard and addressed during this process, so they do not have to be carried to Washington in another process.						
1832	Dear Sirs: I am opposed to any kind of motorized boats on the Current River. I have been floating the Current since the early 70's. It breaks my heart to see thoughtless fools trash the river. I personally saw a group of young idiots carry kayaks up to Pulltite Spring and then try to paddle down to the river. They tore up a lot of wattercress along the way. I wanted to beat the hell out of them, but cooler heads prevailed. When I first began floating the Current, It was like stepping back in time. There was a lot more wildlife then. I always collect garbage from others and deposit it at the take-out. I wish more people would do that. I think it is up to the paddlers to keep it clean. Maybe education is the only way to make this happen. Perhaps a little talk from someone from the outfitter's before each trip might help. ? Keeping the river clean will help the outfitters. People will not want to come there and rent canoes if the river is not kept clean. It is in their best interest to help anyway they can. I hope the river can clean itself as it has for years and years, but we need to help.	9/1/2009	No			IN	47250
1833	Sirs: I believe the National Riverways should not make any changes to the way it is being run. "No Action" is my opinion.	9/1/2009	No			MO	63901
1834	Hello, i am in favor of "No Action". I have grown up here all my life and the thought of not being able to go gigging, taking my family on a jon boat ride, gets me pretty upset. Only the people who live in this area should be listened to, not the ones who come here just for vacation. We live here, its a way of life for us. We clean trash out of the river after they leave for the summer. Its part of our home and should not be restricted from us. I can think of at least 10 times growing up that i have saved a tourist or child in a canoe that flipped. I would not have been able to without my jon boat. We are the keepers of this area, they are just on vacation. Also, i dont believe the park service should be hiding in bushes. It leaves a bad impression on people and is tacky.	9/3/2009	No			MO	63965
1835	Please use the "NO Action" Plan. I would rather see no tourist on the river than be run off it ourselves. We did not elect to turn the river into a park so that the government could abuse its authority and take it away from us. Remember? Limit the tourist, limit the number of tourist with boats, but do not limit it to the locals. We have earned our rights. Earned them..	9/3/2009	No			MO	63965
1836	Dear Superintendent, I would like to comment on the General Mangement Plan on the Ozark National Riverways. As an avid outdoorsman I can fully appreciate the balancing act you face in satisfying the disperate interests involved in the Ozark riverways. I'll keep my comments short and direct. I would encourage 1.) No outboard motors on the Current and Jacks Fork primarily to keep the rivers quiet and pritine.2.)No A.T.V.'s for the same reasons as above. 3.)18" size limit on smallmouth bass to promote better growth of the species and improved fishing. 4.)Severly limit horse crossings because of sediment damage. Thank you for your time and trouble.	9/11/2009	No			UN	N/A
1837	Dear Reed Detring, Ozark National Scenic Riverways Superintendent: Please protect our beautiful Ozark riverway treasures. To me this includes eliminating the illegal motor accesses, and controlling the number and locations of commercial trail rides and motor boats. The Big Spring remnant wilderness needs to be protected as Wilderness System by the Park Service and Congress. Thank you for your service in taking care of theses natural wonders. Sincerely,	9/11/2009	No			MO	65202
1838	Our Ozark rivers are a state treasure that is being ruined by drunk, drugged, or just rude people. Most rent canoes or rafts. I can't speak with any authority on the Jacks Fork or the Current, but I know the Meramec around Sullivan and Bourbon is far worse over the last 10 years, especially the last few years. Perhaps some of the riff-raff that was run out of the National Park has now taken up residence in the Meramec. Maybe it's just coincidence. But I do know that when I'm on the river this is what I see or hear: cursing, often extremely loud cursing, often directed at strangers in belligerent tone drunk or drugged behaviour urinating in the river women flashing or asking for beads littering of the river or shoreline I see less families, especially on the weekend. When I do see them, they are usually visibly stunned or disgusted. Here are some random questions. Do we need to rent thousands of canoes in the first place? Who sets the limits? Are there limits? Can small streams support thousands of canoes and rafts in a given day? Are the canoe liveries owned by people with influence in the State Legislature? How do they have the right to ruin the experience for every one else? Do the different radio stations have a permit to allow thousands of drunks on a small stream such as the Huzzah? Do they even need a permit? Why can't there be 3 beers per person on a rented watercraft? If 6 people get on a raft with 72 beers, does any reasonable person think they are not going to have a negative impact on the environment and others enjoyment of the river? And what about protecting the safety of the drunken floaters? Drunken people drown a lot more than sober people I suspect. Does it really make sense to have jetboats with 200 hp engines on an Ozark stream? Is this just all about money for the canoe liveries, and secondarily the boating interests? I'm all for people and companies making money, but it needs to be balanced for the common good when it comes to the environment and everyone's right to enjoy the outdoors, correct? It's embarrassing how we treat our rivers in this state. I had a friend from Idaho visit a year ago, and he couldn't	9/9/2009	No			UN	N/A

	believe what he saw...and that was on a Wednesday.						
1839	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I, members of my family, and many friends are frequent visitors to this area and favor this area primarily because of the relatively pristine condition afforded it by its designation as a National Scenic Riverway, a rarity for the mid-west. I have property in the Shawnee National Forest in Southern Illinois and can testify to the tragic degradation which has occurred to the few "pristine" areas due to overuse, lax enforcement of existing use restrictions, particularly with regard to equestrian use. I would encourage the developers of the new GMT to seriously consider the "no action" alternative with the caveat that it embrace strict adherence to the congressional mandate "(to) preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, freeflowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins; (and) (to) provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the natural riverways resources. Of particular importance are limiting ATV (and motorized vehicles) to county roads; limiting the number of horse trails and the size of equestrian groups and keep such trails in areas that minimize degradation of the area (such as ridge tops) and by minimizing river crossing. I also favor wilderness designation for the Big Springs Natural Area. I would also echo the concerns delineated in the Summary Newsletter #3 Spring/Summer 2009. Thank for you consideration.	9/9/2009	No			UN	N/A
1840	Reed Detring, Superintendent NPS My husband and I have been floating the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for over 40 years. We have been very concerned about the condition of the ONSR for quite a number of years. It seems there is very little management and the area has been overused and overrun. We feel the NPS has turned a blind eye to the erosion of the river banks; overuse of gravel bars and camping sites; ATV tracks near the banks and into the water - we've actually taken pictures of as many as 9 ATVs on the gravel bars looking for a way into the river; damage of the land and plants from the huge horse rides. Can these rivers sustain this lack of management and overuse? I'm quite certain they can't! Please, please help those of us who really care about this Missouri treasure, so that our children and grandchildren will have the opportunity to experience what for so many years was an unsullied natural area. Thank you.	9/9/2009	No			UN	N/A
1841	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? Option A would be the closest to my idea of the optimal way of managing the ONSR. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? The aspects of Option A which I most liked were the exclusion of motorized watercraft on Jacks Fork River, and the expansion of the non-motorized watercraft zones on the upper Current River. The limitations on ATVs presented in Option A also appeal to me, as a regular user of ONSR. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? Any expansion of ATV use in ONSR I feel should not be included in future management plans. I have personally witnessed innumerable violations of current ATV regulations by users in ONSR, so expanding their acceptance seems to me an implicit reward for bad behavior. I understand that not all users abuse the ONSR ATV regulations, but I have personally far more individuals breaking these regulations than obeying it. Moreover, ATVs are extremely hard on natural resources, disturbing soil, causing erosion, an destroying floral and faunal communities. I personally worked for a graduate student in the Boone National Forest of Kentucky, examining fish populations and species composition in small streams. Streams impacted by frequent ATV use frequently had lower species counts and density, and three streams we were unable to sample due to the volume of suspended mud in the stream. Sedimentation of this nature has a profound effect on fishes, invertebrates, vegetation, and other organisms, and permitting such activity in the ONSR would run contrary to the preservation and protection of the property in an unspoiled condition. Another issue I have regarding the expansion of ATV privileges within the ONSR is simply one of regulation. While working at Boone National Forest, was that ATV users had established a clandestine network of unregulated and unknown road systems which Forest Service personnel were unaware of, and which were unpatrolled by any law enforcement agency. Such circumstances make it easier for a whole host of illegal activities to go on, namely the production and trafficking of illegal drugs such as methamphetamine and marijuana, and could put other resource users at risk of confrontation with criminal elements. I'm simply not convinced that expanding ATV privileges in the ONSR is worth the environmental and public safety risks, not to mention the increased costs associated with patrolling and monitoring ATV user activities, maintaining designated trails and closing illegal trails and river crossings, restoring illegal trails to a relatively undisturbed condition, etc. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? On the Current River, I most frequently visit the upper Riverways, from Tan Vat Access downstream to Cedargrove, as well as the area from Aker's Ferry to Pulltite. I visit the Jacks Fork River usually two to three times a year, and most frequently stay at Bay Creek or Rymer's. I think increasing the amount of "natural" designated area in these areas would adequately address issues I've seen there, particularly with ATV misuse. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? I think more education and outreach could hlp, particularly between conflicting user groups, would be beneficial. Finding a way to frame management strategies as "what's best for the resource," as opposed to a battle between urban and rural interests would also help. Ideally, I would implement some sort of registration system for ATV users, in which they must complete some sort of training to operate ATVs in the ONSR. Hunters are required to be trained, and boaters are required to be trained, I don't think it would be unreasonable for ATV users to take a training course, illustrating what impacts their recreation has on various biotic communities. Users would be mailed a sticker (similar to the "Be Safe" hunting stickers), which must be affixed to their ATV. I think this could potentially reduce bad behavior in the Scenic Riverways, as well as provide a means to track repeat	9/11/2009	No			UN	N/A

	offenders.						
1842	Outside of your current planning process, I'd like to make four specific suggestions. • We need more manned visitor centers, in the park. Please study the Buffalo National River and South Fork of the Cumberland which are similar to Ozark. • Don't go any longer without creating a scenic overlook on the Devils Backbone above Akers. Contact me for specific suggestions. • Buffalo has a program for artists to stay in the park for periods of time. We need something similar. • Do some different things such as a few rangers on horseback - plans should include more than policy and facilities.	9/15/2009	No			MO	63957
1843	The new General Management Plan can and must do better than its predecessor. It must include measures to more strictly enforce existing park policies and regulations. * Keep ATV's and motorized vehicles only on legal county roads and enforce laws that achieve that. * Create a detailed plan to eliminate unauthorized roads and trails that reach the water's edge because they introduce additional vehicles, excessive runoff and pollution, weaken riverbanks, destroy wildlife habitat, and degrade scenic vistas. * Pursue a wilderness designation for the Natural Area at Big Springs so that future Americans can enjoy native Ozark wilderness. * Explore solutions to reduce congestion on the Riverways to maximize enjoyment of the natural features and native wildlife of the rivers. * Locate horse trails on higher ground so their use does not destabilize banks, increase erosion, and damage riparian habitat. Minimize horse trail river crossings to reduce damage caused at these locations. * Establish a system for limiting the size and frequency of horse trail parties to reasonable numbers at one time that do not strain capacity of the natural systems and cause excessive damage to banks, soils, vegetation, habitat, and water quality. * Monitor and minimize human waste pollution by improving signage, educating users about toilet use in the Riverways, and insuring adequate, safe, and clean facilities designed to have minimal impact on the scenery and ecology in the Riverways. * Expand and improve partnerships with residents and organizations to promote the natural, scientific, and cultural heritage of the Riverways. For 50 years I have spoken out and stood up for the need to preserve national parks, wilderness, and more. Please do what is necessary to preserve our national treasures. I am too old to stand up forever. I will speak out forever. thank you	9/13/2009	No			UN	N/A
1844	I recently received an email from a friend which notified me of possible changes to the management plan of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Unfortunately, it was past the deadline to respond. However, I would like to give my input anyway. As a Missouri Ozarks native and frequent camper and kayaker, I strongly support management that will maintain these waterways and surrounding areas as wilderness which is kept as pristine as possible. I do not want to see large motorboats, ATV's or commercialization in these natural areas. There are plenty of other appropriate places for those activities. We need to preserve what little we have left of our natural, native Ozarks.	9/24/2009	No			UN	N/A
1845	Dear NPS Management: I understand you will be holding meetings throughout the state, and in particular at Eminence and Van Buruen to get opinions on whether or not to allow motors on boats on Jack's Fork and Current River. I was born and raised in the Summersville area and grew up on the two rivers. We come back every year to camp a couple of times or so through the summer and I still love the rivers dearly. I don't consider myself a tourist, but a native that comes home. I have always been opposed to motors on those rivers. It was a sad day to see them come. I can't be at the meetings coming up but I would like to express my opinion because I know the locals will come out in groves in favor of the motors. When you live there continuously, you forget just how fragil those rivers are and how important they are to the tourist industry down there. Here are my reasons for opposing motors: 1. They are noisy! There is nothing like enjoying a peaceful time on the river and here comes a motor you can hear for a mile up the river. Many times they are smoking from oil use. 2. They erode the banks with the waves they make. No doubt about it and all you have to do is watch the bank of the river when they pass. 3. About 5 years ago I was down at Aker's Ferry when a man was attempting to bring his boat out of the water on a steep bank and he sunk the motor into the river. Oil and gas spilled out on the river and was visibly everywhere. He and his buddies were drunk and laughing, I was biting my tongue. If this happens once, it happens more often than we think. Gas, oil and fish do not mix. The pollution alone is one darn good reason to keep them off. 4. They don't call it the "Scenic Riverway" for nothing, how can you enjoy the scenry when you are speeding up the river? What is the point of having motors on those rivers anyway? If they want to use their motors, they can go to the lake. 5. The sound of a motor scares the fish away for those fishermen who are peacefully trying to fish on shore or on a boulder in the river. I'd like to see the rivers year-round be off limits to anything but canoes, kayakes and tubes. I hope my opinion will count. Thank you for your time. Sincerely,	6/9/2009	No			UN	N/A
1846	Hello, I was not aware of last nights meeting, I personally think that no action is needed other than making sure that people do not litter. Missouri is a beautiful State and needs to stay that way naturally. My family has been in Missouri for over 150 years and has ties with Jesse James and Walt Disney. Let us keep the Missouri that they remembered and that Disney loved so much that he modeled his Main Street USA after. Mark Twain even made remarks about how beautiful Missouri was, and loved his childhood so much that we still read about it today. Please don't spoil Missouri's natural beauty with sidewalks and motorways. Thank you,	6/26/2009	No			MO	65203
1847	My input - keep the park as uncommercial and undeveloped as possible.	6/23/2009	No			MO	64113
1848	NPS, I was wondering if it was part of the new management plan to extend the horsepower limit to referenced portion of the river. I have enjoyed the river since I was a child, but I am sad to say that the drinking and fast boats has ruined what was once a majestic stretch of the river. It has gotten to the point that many are afraid to bring their children to the river due to drunk boating and over powered boats that have invaded. The tragedy this weekend is a classic example of what occurs when a recreation facility is out of control. My family owns property along the river as well and the area where I grew up swimming in no longer safe on the weekends due to the extremely fast and dangerous boat traffic that gets	7/20/2009	No			UN	N/A

	<p>within a few feet of the bank. As an avid fisherman I have also witnessed the steady decline in the quality of fishing along the river. There was once a day when you could float or tie up at virtually any hole and catch a "keeper" smallmouth, now you are having a good day if you catch one along a two or three mile stretch of river. Some argue that the fast boat traffic doesn't affect the fish population that will have to be decided by biologists, but one doesn't have to be a biologist certainly does have an effect on the quality of fishing when boat are zooming by at speeds of over 60 mph on a river that is only a few hundred feet wide in places. As a Masters Degree holder in Civil Engineering I understand the concept of risk management better than most. It something I deal with on a daily basis, having to explain to client the potential risks associated with a decision and the measures that can be taken to avoid these risk. To avoid risk is costly, but as engineers we are required to do it constantly in spite of the expense. Many times risk aversion is redundant and would seem unnecessary; however, history has taught engineers the consequences of not adverting risk in the form of catastrophic failures and loss of life, thus the costs and redundancy are justified. The same can be said for the horsepower limit, it will be costly to our freedom to give up something that really is a fundamental right. At this point though I would say the cost of the conservative approach is justified when you compare that to the risks avoided and the redundancy of it is necessary given the lack of common sense and education when it comes to fast boats on the river. I do not know what can be done, but I was curious about the new management plan and whether NPS had jurisdiction that far south. Thanks.</p>						
1849	<p>Mr. Detring, A "hardcopy" of the attached comments is being sent to you via US Mail, but it occurred to me that you may wish to forward these to Denver or DC or other far-flung (and generally to be avoided) places,hence this electronic copy. On behalf of the Osage Group of the Sierra Club, with over 1000 members, responsible for an area from Shannon County to the Iowa Border, and including the towns of Rolla, Columbia, and Kirksville, these comments are submitted on the Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. While it is recognized that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers – the Ozark National Scenic Riverways – are of considerable interest to the residents of Shannon, Carter, and Dent counties, it should also be taken into consideration that the Current and Jacks Fork and surrounding lands are owned by citizens throughout the United States and managed for them by the National Park Service. These rivers "belong" to the citizens of Bellingham, Washington, and Key West, Florida, just as much as the citizens of Eminence, Missouri. Please review our comments carefully. These represent the consensus of caring citizens of central Missouri. Thank you, ----- Osage Group Sierra Club – Comments on the National Park Service's Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Local emphasis on rivers of national importance The United States Congress passed a bill designating the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) in 1964 and then-President Lyndon Johnson signed the enabling legislation into law. The designation specifically mandated that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers (the ONSR) be preserved and protected. The Missouri congressional delegation (US Senators and US Representatives), the Missouri General Assembly and the Governor of Missouri approved of the federal action. After some discussion between agencies (primarily NPS and USFS) and influential individuals, it was determined that the ONSR would be a National Park, operated and managed by the National Park Service. Both the Jacks Fork and the Current Rivers are also listed as Outstanding National Resource Waters (as is the Eleven Point, as a National Wild and Scenic River), and, as such, are afforded the highest levels of water quality standards and the highest levels of protection. It is somewhat ironic that the Jacks Fork River, downstream from the Route 19 Bridge (the Danny Staples Bridge) at Eminence to the confluence with the Current River is on the "impaired waterbody" list (sometimes called the "303(d) list" in reference to Section 303, paragraph (d) of the federal Clean Water Act). The Jacks Fork does not meet Water Quality Standards – specifically what is referred to in Missouri rules (CSR 10-20.7) as Whole Body Contact, and in the goals of the federal Clean Water Act (Section 101) as "recreation in and on the water". A national scenic river and one that has the highest level of protection is impaired!! The Current and Jacks Fork rivers, composing the ONSR, as national rivers, are owned in common by all citizens of the United States – by residents of Portland, Maine, to San Diego, California and everywhere in between. Therefore, it is troubling that the NPS/ONSR* gives much credence to local, self-serving interests in Shannon, Carter, and Dent counties of Missouri. Apparently, the NPS feels that the few hundred residents of south-central Missouri who attended the "Open Houses" outweigh the interests of millions of Americans. This is contrary to national interests. While a relative few citizens - representing local self-serving interests - claim that ORV usage, horse rides, and large motorboats are economy boosters, facts and data are not supportive of these assertions. Much more revenue flows into Shannon County coffers from low-impact, non-motorized users (primarily those taking float trips) than from the high-impact uses. More and more low-impact users have become disenchanted with the management of the ONSR, which seems to cater to high-impact users, even though such use is highly detrimental to the local economy. High-impact users assert economic benefits only as a way to promote their interests – and the NPS/ONSR would do well to ignore such false claims. When it is considered that Open Meetings held by the National Park Service to solicit comments were held in Van Buren, Eminence, and Salem to the exclusion of Springfield, Joplin, St. Joseph, and Kansas City, this over-emphasis on local, self-serving interests becomes even more troubling. Again, the ONSR is a National Park, belonging to all citizens of the United States. Interestingly, the westernmost open meeting was held in Columbia, Missouri. The entire western portion of the State of Missouri was apparently deemed to be unimportant. It is likely that citizens of the western half of Missouri are not even aware that a Preliminary General Management Plan is being considered, and, worse, that their comments, while welcome, are NOT being sought. It is sad that the National Park Service seems to be catering to the wishes of elected officials in the US Congress, the Missouri General Assembly and in the counties of Carter, Shannon and Dent, who have, in turn, responded to the wishes of the local high-impact users.. However, given the heavy emphasis placed on local, self-serving interests and the abject failures of the National Park Service to take action against clear violations of federal law, that conclusion is inescapable. The primary directives of 1964's enabling legislation were to "protect and preserve" these national rivers and the lands, caves and springs of the area. That has not occurred, primarily to acquiescence by the NPS/ONSR to local self-serving interests. This document will detail failures of the National Park Service to "protect and preserve", will detail ways for the NPS/ONSR to correct a negative image and to restore the Rivers to their 1964 condition. Horses Of all the problems that are currently present on the ONSR, none are more pressing than horse use. This includes the numbers of</p>	7/15/2009	No		Sierra Club	UN	n/a

<p>horses, horse trails and the contamination of the Jacks Fork River. However, akin to other problems, all of the subcategories are linked. It is a matter of public record that the Jacks Fork River, below the Danny Staples Bridge in Eminence to Two Rivers, is on the Impaired Waterbody list, unhealthy at many times for human contact. State and federal agencies have documented the contamination. Essentially, the Jacks Fork has a high bacterial level and the harmful bacteria – E Coli 0157:H7 – can cause a variety of human illnesses, from quite minor infections of wounds to bloody diarrhea to death. Minor infections and minor flu-like illnesses are generally not reported, mostly because no doctor is seen. The state and federal Water Quality Standards establish a level for a healthy, adult male as no more than 126 Colony Forming Units per 100 milliliters of water (stated scientifically as 126CFU/100 ml). Any amount above this level is deemed to be unsafe for "recreation in and on the water". While the impairment is well-documented, so is the source. Various studies by state and federal agencies (including DNA testing) have established that horse dung is the major source of impairment. It is a embarrassment to the State of Missouri, the Environmental Protection Agency and the NPS/ONSR to allow a major national river, and one that is afforded the highest water quality standards, to be so contaminated that it does not meet one of its designated and beneficial uses. To allow horses to continue to foul the water is abhorrent; to allow more horse dung to enter the water is abhorrently paradoxical. Solutions have been proposed ranging from drastic (prohibition of horses on ONSR lands and water) to relatively benign (move trails away from the Jacks Fork and disallow crossings). Otrails created by those vehicles. Much of the ONSR lies within Shannon County, and the Commissioners of that county have shown only disdain for the "preserve and protect" dictates of the NPS/ONSR. While some of the activity has garnered some public attention – such as the Shannon County Commissioners claiming the existence of a road through the newly created and under development Current River State Park, much of the illegal construction activity has flown under the radar. To the credit of the NPS/ONSR attempts were made to enforce prohibitions on constructing roads within ONSR lands and, in particular, roads that cross the Current River (the Jacks Fork valley walls are steep and in many places sheer cliffs, so the issues of illegal roads and trails apply primarily to the Current River, which is more amenable to road and trail construction). These attempts to enforce existing laws and regulations were thwarted by a US District Attorney, who has since resigned. Unfortunately, however, the NPS/ONSR seems to have given up and has become an apologist for those creating illegal roads and trails. Roads and trails through the ONSR lands and waters are very destructive of the environment of the area. Trash and litter are seldom a problem with hikers and backpackers, simply because not much can be carried and therefore not much can be discarded in the woods.. Not so with motorized vehicles. Illegal roads and trails are strewn with trash. Vehicular traffic is disruptive of wildlife – birds and terrestrial animals flee at the sight, sound, and smell of vehicles with gasoline engines. In addition, illegal roads create openings where other illegal uses take place. At Flying W, for example, there are ORV tracks through old fields with resultant destruction of native vegetation, even though signs are posted that "vehicles are restricted to designated roads". Many such roads to and across the Current River have been constructed where no roads or crossings ever existed. Such is the case at what is called Flying W and at Lewis Hollow. Flying W is particularly egregious as the NPS/ONSR had plans to create a campground at that site – but due to actions by the Shannon County Commission, such plans were abandoned. There was an old road and a low water river crossing at Lewis Hollow, but the site of the original crossing (so long ago that it is lost in time) was approximately 300 yards upstream from the current constructed crossing and due to shifts of the river is now about 6 feet deep. The present river crossing at Lewis Hollow consists of removal of trees and brush, cutting a road through the river bank, and building up the river bed with loads of gravel. The road is on private lands, ONSR lands and the crossing is through the Current River. There are other equally illegal roads and trails on ONSR lands and through the Current River. Many of these have been created simply by repeated usage by ORVs. Others have been deliberately constructed. While the Enabling Act of 1964 did envision allowing landowners and farmers to access their lands and crops by crossing the Current River, that private use has been asserted as a public use by the Shannon County Commission. The NPS/ONSR needs to recognize these claims for what they are: bogus. All roads and trails that did not exist in 1964 should be closed, re-vegetated, and violators prosecuted. Easements So-called Scenic Easements have been issued by the NPS/ONSR in lieu of outright acquisition of the lands in question. Each of these easements has generic language, and each has unique characteristics. These unique terms and conditions were negotiated between the landowner and the NPS/ONSR. However, the NPS/ONSR has in some situations enforced the negotiated conditions when landowners violated the terms. In other situations, the NPS/ONSR ignored egregious and blatant violations. The NPS/ONSR must vigorously and consistently enforce the terms and conditions of each Scenic Easement. Water Quality With the exception of motorboats with polluting emissions and the impairment of the Jacks Fork by horses, the water quality of the ONSR remains fairly good. There are problem, however, in major tributary streams. These problems may be traced to illegal sand and gravel mining and to illegal road building. There are two major tributaries with the name "Big Creek" that enter the Current River. One Big Creek comes in from the West, originates in, and flows through, Texas County. Approximately 5 miles from its confluence with the Current, just above Akers Ferry, a massive sand and gravel operation has decimated Big Creek, and it is probable that loosened sand and gravel and loosened sediments entered the Current River, impacting water quality. The other Big Creek, originating in Dent County, but the bulk of which is in Shannon County, enters the Current River from the East, downstream of Round Springs. In attempts to prevent flooding on a county road, the Shannon County Commission conducted an immense and unpermitted channelization and manipulation of Big Creek, and loosening sand and gravel from what was the creek channel, entering and impacting private lands without permission. That sand and gravel with concomitant sediments entered the Current River, causing at least temporary degradation of water quality. Upstream of the "Prongs" where the North and South forks or "prongs" of the Jacks Fork join at a low-water bridge known as Dixon Crossing, in 2004 the Peirce Township of Texas County channelized and manipulated the South Prong of the Jacks Fork. The loosened sand and gravel – with sediments - from the old river channel washed downstream and entered the waters of the Jacks Fork River within the ONSR, resulting in a degradation of water quality. It is likely that this sand, gravel, and sediments covered and smothered aquatic macro-invertebrates and the spawning areas of the fishes that inhabit the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. In order to protect the water quality of the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, it is necessary for the NPS/ONSR to become involved in activities that have an impact on water quality and to prohibit such activities that</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>have a likelihood of lowering or degrading water quality. The enabling legislation authorizes the NPS/ONSR to do exactly that. Party behavior We wish to commend the NPS/ONSR for its recent steps to prohibit drunkenness, nudity, profanity and other "R-Rated" behavior. While it is realized that young adults like to shed inhibitions, and a remote waterway seems to be a good place for such lewd behavior, it must also be realized that many folks, including families, seek out quiet and solitude. In addition, children should not be subjected to such behavior. The NPS/ONSR must upgrade its attempts to quell unruly rowdiness. Of course, such should never have been allowed to occur and prevention would have been easiest to enforce. However, the NPS/ONSR must now take steps to ensure that the ONSR remains family-friendly and such rowdy behavior should be prohibited. Wilderness The Osage Group of the Sierra Club is part of the Missouri Wilderness Coalition and, as such, supports more federal wilderness designations in the State of Missouri. The reasons for creating more wilderness areas are stated succinctly in the statement of the Missouri Wilderness Coalition and we see no need to duplicate that statement. Suffice it to say: We adamantly support the creation of the Big Springs Wilderness – and support this being done via an act of the US Congress (as in Alternatives A and B) rather than administratively (Alternative C), since it is very difficult to repeal or rescind Congressional actions, but administrative ones can be undone with ease. Low-impact usage The ONSR is much loved and therein lies a problem. If large portions of Alternative A are adopted by the NPS/ONSR, low-impact (daytrippers, float and camping, tubing, rafting) use will increase, since many low-impact users avoid the ONSR because of ORVs, water-quality problems, large jet-pump outboard motorboats, rowdiness, and contamination from horse rides. But, an increase in low-impact users has potential to damage the very reasons that cause such users to flock to the ONSR – a classic example of being "loved to death". Fortunately, however, the NPS has much experience with such overuse and has taken steps in several national parks to limit such damage. In national parks such as the Great Smokies, Grand Canyon, Canyonlands, and Yellowstone, registration is required and the numbers of visitors are, in many cases, limited. Therefore, we must reluctantly endorse that such a system of visitor limitation be established on the ONSR. This would be relatively easy to implement and enforce, since the places that low-impact users enter the water are easily identified and a limit could be easily imposed. We, however, do not know and consequently do not advocate any specific number, but the NPS/ONSR should closely monitor existing and increasing low-impact uses, and take preventive action – BEFORE damage occurs. Overall Recommendations The Enabling Legislation, passed into law in 1964, mandated that the ONSR be preserved and protected. Special mention was made of the caves and springs of the area. But the area bears little resemblance to what it was in 1964. Yet that is exactly what was to be preserved. Therefore, we support Alternative A, with the additions and reasons stated above. The "No Action" alternative essentially locks in existing situations, and is unacceptable. Many aspects of the current situations violate the mandates of the enabling legislation. Alternative B is a weakened version of Alternative A and is generally unacceptable – although certain portions which mimic Alternative A, such as the federal designation of the Big Springs Wilderness, are acceptable. Alternative C supports high-impact recreation, much development and is unacceptable. Given that it does NOT "protect and preserve" the ONSR, portions are not only unacceptable, but likely violate the mandate of the enabling legislation.</p>						
1850	<p>We must save the Ozark Scenic National Riverways By ... Editorial Board Now is the time to save the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Clear spring-fed waters flow through hills and forests, past stunning bluffs, and trickle over gravel bars. Beyond being a nature preserve, the 35-mile-long riverway was set up 45 years ago to keep alive the Ozarks traditions ' hunting and trapping, fishing and canoeing. The beauty of the Ozarks is an important part of Missouri's heritage, and more than 1.7 million tourists take it in every year. About 300,000 visitors are expected this month alone. The riverway is a valuable addition to our national park system, created to protect pieces of America's wilderness so that people for generations to come can enjoy them. But the Ozark National Scenic Riverway in southern Missouri is being abused. The damage must be stopped before it becomes irreparable. Among the needed actions: µBlock the all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) that race along the streams. µLimit the numbers of trail horses polluting the ground. The largest trail ride center near the Jacks Fork (just outside the national park) offers 3,007 horse stalls. That could hold five times the number of mounts in Lord Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade." µClose the more than 100 illegal access points to the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, which make policing the park far too difficult. Park officials note that the pristine beauty of the area is still a draw. But part of the national park, a stretch of the Jacks Fork River, is listed as an "impaired waterway" by the U.S. Geological Service. That stretch of water is polluted by an incredible amount of horse droppings. At a recent discussion in Kansas City, friends of the park equated the horse population to plopping a city of up to 20,000 humans on the banks. As one park lover noted, "The rivers aren't set up to handle the current poop-ulation." Horse owners and riders, of course, disagree. Carolyn A. Dyer, an owner of Cross Country Trail Ride, notes that water testing shows horse droppings have a lot of company in the rivers. "Horseback riders are very conscientious about packing out what they pack in. It does not include manure, but neither does the hiker or floater pack out their human waste." But it is a problem. Park officials rightly have no interest in banning horses, but they believe they need to have a better idea of exactly how many are in the area, and when, and exactly what they're doing. Beyond horses, the peaceful nature of nature is constantly disrupted by the noise of motorized vehicles. The Columbia Daily Tribune recently noted that, "Float trips by gaggles of intoxicated young men and women have led to an 'anything goes' attitude." Park officials say the Ozarks has some problems common to all national parks that butt up against national forests (the Mark Twain National Forest, in this case). National forests are open to ATVs. The Ozarks waterway, except for in very specific situations such as official crossings, is not. But it's relatively easy to mistakenly or intentionally jump from the national forest to the waterway. It becomes a problem when visitors do this with small ATVs, motorcycles and even large off-road trucks on illegal entries. These illegal access routes threaten a number of endangered plant species. They also make it impossible to control access to the rivers, meaning it's impossible to control behavior on the rivers. Keeping ATVs out of the riverbed requires rehabilitating the shore lines and closing all but the official access roads. A big first step: Ozark park officials are putting together a comprehensive park management plan to clearly assess risks and damage. Park spokesperson Elisa Kunz said the plan will help officials figure out "who is using the park to make a profit, and who is operating on park land. We're trying to get a handle on what exactly is going on." Getting a handle on the situation doesn't mean locking people out, not at all. "We need to strike a balance between the people enjoying it and people destroying it." This</p>	7/18/2009	No		Kansas City Star	UN	N/A

	park is too beautiful, and too important to Missouri, to risk. So let's save it now, before saving requires even more drastic steps.						
1851	Ozark National Scenic Riverways getting \$2.6 million boost Some \$2.6 million in federal stimulus money will help the Ozark National Scenic Riverways employ more people and complete much-needed maintenance projects this year. The benefit of this boost will be felt not only by visitors to the national park, but in many ways by local residents, according to officials. "These are projects we had already recognized the need for, but that just weren't funded," said park superintendent Reed Detring. "This is an investment in our park and will help stimulate the local economy, providing for some day labor positions, as well as contracts for our new projects." Funding for the four projects is equal to 40 percent of the park's annual budget of about \$6.5 million. The money is provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and must be allocated by March. The park will need 96 summer seasonal employees to complete both this work and routine maintenance, compared to the around 70 normally hired each year. The riverways' permanent work force is also about 85 percent local, with about 85 percent of the annual budget used to pay all salaries. All ARRA projects meet the criteria set forth by the federal government, including that they generate the largest number of jobs in the shortest period of time, be ready to go quickly and are visible infrastructure improvements. "They want us to spend this money as quickly as we can," said Rusty Rawson, supervisory facility operations specialist. The largest project brought about by ARRA funds is the replacement of underground wiring at Alley Spring and Round Spring, Detring said. Both systems are quite old and require a great deal of manpower to maintain and make repairs. There are 29 campsites with electricity at Alley Spring campground and six at Round Spring. Electricity is also needed for facilities such as restrooms, showers and amphitheaters. A plan to rehabilitate the Chubb Hollow trail and its features will require five temporary employees on a one-year appointment, Detring said. The project will include work on bridges and stone tread, as well as removal of some vegetation. A separate list of flood and related damage has been compiled and work will be completed under a third project. The list includes numerous small repairs throughout the park, including at Big Spring, Round Spring and Sinking Creek, Detring said. The fourth project will address paving issues at Alley Spring, work that has to be done periodically, according to Detring. Repairs will be made throughout that area, including the campground and ranger station. Riverways staff say they are working to schedule projects around busy visitor times as much as possible.	7/18/2009	No		Daily American Republic	UN	N/A
1852	Hello and thanks for your efforts in protecting our parks and the ozark nat'l scenic riverways. I am from St. Louis and use the rivers very often with my friends and family - it is a treasure. To keep it simple I will use bullet points to express my opinions. - No additional development on or near the rivers. - Thus far, it has been managed well so I lean to remain the same. - Do not take away camping or floating but restrict the use of motors upstream and restrict livestock and horses crossing in areas but river. - Add more areas to the wilderness and park designation so as to protect the areas from development. Allow limited use such as floater fisher access, some camping and some horse trails but strictly controlled. Thanks again !!!!	7/20/2009	No			UN	N/a
1853	The Current River & Jack's Fork Rivers are truly gems, worth preserving, great for birding. There's also some marvelous cave in the area. I favor Plan A. Limits on the horse power of motorized boats does a lot of good. Adequate easements are important & these could be improved. Limits on off trail vehicles should be stronger. This is what I feel should be done to preserve the area & allow more people to fully enjoy it for years to come	7/15/2009	No			MO	63139
1854	Dear National Park Service: As a lifetime Missouri resident, I am in favor of Missouri Wilderness Coalition's proposal to designate seven new Wilderness Areas. This will help protect the areas by limiting or eliminating damaging activities and uses. I love the quiet and undisturbed beauty of the outdoors that exists in Missouri. I urge you to support this and any other effort to protect our Missouri lakes, rivers, streams and woods. Sincerely,	7/15/2009	No		Missouri Wild	MO	65804
1855	Please do not restrict the horsepower of boats on the current river at big spring to goose neck! we will be glad to help keep the rowdy behavior under control and report any we see immediately to the nps. we have used the current river all of our lives and would like to see safety but we and all our family have 60/40's and 80 hp jet motors and we would not be able to go on the river let us know what else we can do to help keep the river safe and reuseable for centuries to come thank for listening	7/3/2009	No			MS	63935
1856	... has canoed the Current River since 1966 . He is on a stream team. He does not likes it is trashed up. Cabins are being put up on lands that are not suppose to have them, meaning, the scenic easement lands. ...is former president of Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club. OWWC.	7/13/2009	No		Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club	MO	64117-2825
1857	Please put this email in with public comment record. I think it is a good point expressed byMs. ... Thanks for all your help in this process. --- Just read the article. The reporter got my message a bit wrong. Though motor boats can be an issue they don't seem to be per se. It's the conditions that roads themselves create that can really damage the river especially over time by becoming conduits for pollution- increasing runoff and the like. He assumed I was talking about motor boats when I was talking about roads. Is it because that is why the access points were created? I do agree that we have very responsible boaters and I would agree that I have not seen that boaters are impacting the river in a negative way. Thank goodness. --- I attempted to contact your office this afternoon to discuss the present GMP alternatives for the ONSR. For background purposes, I am an attorney in Southeast Missouri who has been asked to speak on behalf of the local Southeast Missouri recreational users of the ONSR. I am pleased to report many recreational users from all activities, including hikers, hunters, atv riders, floaters and motorized vessels have shown great concern over the proposed alternatives. Everyone is excited and motivated at an opportunity to voice their opinion within the present public comment period. The purpose of our meetings is to try and educate everyone that all recreational uses can be accommodated within the ONSR without placing an uneven burden upon one particular use. After speaking with multiple individuals who used the river for non-motorized activities, I	7/9/2009	No		Kennedy, Kennedy, Robbins & Yarbro, LC	MO	63901

	was delighted to hear their change of opinion once an educated response to their uneducated position was received. After reading the article by Mr. ... today within the Southeast Missourian, I was taken back by your bold assertions concerning the devastating effects to the environmental conditions of the ONSR by motorized recreational users. As I am sure you are aware, no studies have been performed on the ONSR properties which suggest or support your position. In fact, through the process of speaking with several hundred, if not thousands, local recreational users over the past few weeks, I suggest that the local motorized vessel users go out of their way as stewards to assure the park is maintained in a refuse free and clean environment. I invite you to come yourself to our area, and would be happy to accompany you through the riverways so you can observe the same. Nevertheless, I recognize your position as a noble one, and assure you it is also a concern of the local residents. The local residents have long family histories within the ONSR, and want nothing more to see the riverways continue in a pristine condition. They want to continue their recreational uses, and do so in a responsible manner. All I am asking through this email is to limit those comments you make to those which have an actual basis, and discontinue the utilization of spreading false information to reach your objectives. I would appreciate the opportunity to see if there exists any middle ground for which we could work from to make the riverways an environmentally responsible and user friendly location for years to come.						
1858	National Park Service officials are considering whether to return the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to their original states or if visitors would rather see more development. WATER WEIGH-IN A Columbia open house on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways proposals will be from 3:30 to 7 p.m. Thursday at the Courtyard by Marriott, 3301 LeMone Industrial Blvd. Meetings across the state are being held to gather input for a new management plan for southern Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and Columbia residents will have a chance to weigh in during an open house Thursday. "We just want to hear what people's primary goals and objects are ' the needs and wants for the use of this river," said Patty Dorris, an assistant to park Superintendent Reed Detring. Three plans are being considered, and a fourth option would leave current management practices in place. Alternative A calls for a return to a quieter, less-crowded area, much like the park was when it was established in 1964. That plan de-emphasizes motorized boats and promotes traditional activities such as camping and floating. Illegal roads and makeshift trails would be closed in hopes of preventing illegal ATV or off-road vehicle use. By contrast, Alternative C would allow more development of the 80,700-acre park, with additional horse trails and boat ramps. Under that option, larger boats would be allowed. Alternative B is a blend of the two, calling for a mix of recreational activities with an emphasis on educating the public to better appreciate the natural resources. Ken Midkiff, conservation chairman of the Osage Group Sierra Club and Tribune columnist, said he favors a return to the land's original condition and that park administrators have an obligation to preserve and protect the area. "The culture was not supposed to have been changed," he said. "This was supposed to have remained as it was in 1964. Here we are 45 years later now trying to get it back to that state." Midkiff's primary concern is the number of horseback riders who cross the river, polluting the waters with the E. coli found in horse excrement. One 8-mile stretch of Jacks Fork River has been deemed an "impaired water body" because of fecal contamination. "Everybody knows the source of the problem, but so far the only thing to be done is wringing hands and saying, 'Isn't that awful?' " Midkiff said. Although none of the plans directly calls for a decrease in horseback riding, Alternative A would close some river crossings and would limit commercial services, which could cut down on the number of large-scale trail rides, he said. Park officials have already implemented policies in response to feedback in recent years. Overwhelmingly, people have complained about the party atmosphere on the rivers and have asked for a more family-friendly environment. To accomplish that, the park has outlawed beer kegs, beer bong and Jell-O shots and has implemented new noise ordinances. "The things people saw on this river was appalling ... indecent behavior, public nudity, horrible language being shouted at families," Dorris said. "People were coming to this river because nobody else was putting up with it, so it was happening here. Well, we don't want it to happen here, either." -----Comments "...the park has outlawed beer kegs, beer bong and Jell-O shots..." Rolling On The Floor, Laughing My (rear end) Off!!! - "Both Phases I and II water-column sampling indicated that fecal coliform densities tended to increase to sometimes unacceptable levels during trail rides, but the exact causes for this increase and the sources of the fecal coliform bacteria were not positively identified." http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2006/5161/pd... So I guess it isn't so obvious where the E Coli comes from. If people don't like the party atmosphere then go someplace else. - As an avid floater, I, for one, would love to see the waterways returned to their natural state. Fist fights and public intoxication are not my idea of a good float. In the past 20 years it's gotten where weekdays are your only option for a peaceful float. I don't have kids, but I wouldn't want to take them if I did. - So since you don't like the atmosphere you wish to ruin it for everyone? How grown up of you - Ruin for who? The drunkards who can get drunk anywhere? Or the people trying to enjoy the river? - I would also like the Jacks Fork and Current to return to their natural states. They are the great treasures of Missouri, and there is a reason that the Current is called by many "the best river to canoe in North America". The drunks and partiers already have ruined the Huzzah and Merrimac. They can have their broken beer bottle littered, filthy river. The Current is still reasonably clean and uncrowded, keep it that way. - Ruin it? These rules only apply to the rivers on the Ozark Scenic Riverways. There are plenty of other riverways for the rowdy drunks to make fools of themselves. I floated the Current this weekend, and It always amazes me that some of these people who are so drunk and stoned can even make it down the river alive. - I grew up in the area and would like to see an attempt to return the rivers to the way they used to be. It was once a beautiful relaxing place but lately has become overrun with activity. - I have to say, I would love for boats with motors to be banned from most of the river. Those waves can turn a canoe over eaily. These water ways are some of the best in the world for canoes. The water is clear and moving at a nice speed. Such a beautiful place please don't ugly it all up. I'm going next week and hope to float without hearing the motor boats. If I wanted to hear and see those I would go to a lake. - Jacks Fork. Horses=Horseflies. Misery Much? - settingitstraight, Having had an inside seat into the TMDL listing, believe me, it is well known and test results performed by MDNR are statistically significant beyond the 90% threshold. If I'm not mistaken, DNA ribotyping has confirmed the source beyond any reasonable doubt. USGS doesn't want to take the heat that will come from pointing a finger, so they punt to MDNR, whose responsibility it is to develop a plan for correcting the impairment. MDNR is loath to mess with a long-time business and the equestrian community, so they drag their feet. - I disagree quite often with ... But on this	6/23/2009	No		Columbia Daily Tribune	UN	N/A

	<p>issue, I agree with him. I have floated the Current many times, mostly the upper end, from Baptist Camp down thru Akers, Pulltite, and the Presley Center. Beautiful floating. I would like to see it kept as clean, natural, and undeveloped as possible. I see no need for a motorized boat - the river is swift and narrow, it ain't the Lake of the Ozarks. ATVs have no place in the river, either. As for the rowdiness, well, that is another issue. I enjoy a barley pop or few (even some homemade native beverage) on the river, but don't like the disrespect for fellow floaters that overconsumption can bring out in a few bad apples. Seemed to me, the last time I floated there, NPS rangers did a good job keeping folks in line. If people want a canoe-mounted version of the Party Cove, they can go to the Huzzah and Meramec. I don't even have a problem with some reasonable regulations on the commercial trail rides, if that causing a problem with the water quality. Let's just not get carried away with them. I have floated the Gasconade and the Osage Fork past many an old Holstein cow or two. When it is 100 degrees in the shade, they like that cool water, too. - ... says... These were designated as national scenic riverways because they are national treasures. They need to be treated as such. I don't necessarily want Ken Midkiff in charge of river usage, but the truly rowdy idiots need to be relegated to the Niangua and th</p>						
1859	<p>Proposals call for balancing preservation, recreation on the crowded Ozark National Scenic Riverways Posted 10:36 a.m. Wed. June 24 - When the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established in 1964, the Current and Jack's Fork rivers were clear spring-fed streams with unique natural features. The local population and visitors fished and explored these streams from flat-bottomed johnboats and canoes. The rivers are still clear and spring-fed, but times have changed. Canoes and johnboats float the rivers, but they are accompanied by rafts, kayaks, and inner tubes. Mountain bikers and organized horseback rides use the nearby trails, and ATVs go off-trail. In 2007, the 80,000-acre park area was visited by 1.7 million people. Yellowstone Park, at 2.2 million acres, had 3.1 million visitors that year; Great Smoky Mountain National Park, at 522,000 acres, had 9.3 million visitors. These numbers calculate to 21 visitors an acre in the Ozarks, 1.5 visitors an acre at Yellowstone, and 18 visitors an acre in the Smokies. This is one heavily used park. And much of that use is concentrated on 134 miles of river less than 50 yards wide. The Scenic Riverways legislation charges the National Park Service with preserving the free-flowing Current and Jack's Fork, while providing opportunities for recreation. According to Elisa Kunz of the Park Service, the tension between preservation and recreation is inherent in the "Organic Act of 1916" that established the mission of the Park Service. Devising A Management Plan Because of the number of people using the park and the new ways they're using it, the National Park Service is considering whether changes need to be made to preserve the resources. It is developing a 20-year general management plan for the Riverways. Currently the Park Service has proposed three options for change and is inviting public comment on the alternatives at meetings across the state. The alternatives are based upon a zoning concept that looks at the entire park to decide what is the best place for each activity. Many activities, such as canoeing, swimming, fishing, hiking, and camping, are part of all the alternatives, including the fourth possibility of no change. The three alternatives range from preserving the kind of recreation in the 1960s, with large stretches of the rivers reserved for non-motorized use, to more trails, campgrounds with amenities, and even ATVs on designated roads. Under the plan emphasizing development, only 10 percent of the rivers would ban motorized boats year round. The two more natural-based alternatives include designating 3,400 acres near Big Spring as a wilderness area. This acreage does not include the river, but is about 2.5 miles down the road. It has been undisturbed forest for more than 100 years. It adjoins 3,200 acres of the Mark Twain National Forest land that is also being proposed as a wilderness area. A special act of Congress would be required for either or both of these lots to be designated wilderness. A BIT OF HISTORY ...of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment is encouraging everyone to get involved in the process, either by attending a meeting, or by commenting on the National Park Service website . Smith thinks that "Missourians get it. They understand that our resources once destroyed cannot be restored." History would tend to bear her out. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was the first national park of its kind and has been the model for other protected rivers, such as the Buffalo in Arkansas and the Saint Croix in Minnesota. Missourians were behind the creation of this protected area. The Army Corps of Engineers had proposed to dam the rivers for hydroelectric power. The local population, along with conservation groups, chose to keep the rivers the way they were --- as free-flowing streams to be boated, fished and used in the traditional ways. For example, local churches have long used these clear rivers for baptisms.of the National Park Service explained that the agency's role is not only about preserving the physical resources but also about preserving the cultural heritage of the region. Missouri had already established state parks at Big Spring (1920s), Alley Springs (1920s) and Round Springs (1930s). These parks were incorporated into the Ozark National Scenic Riverways at its dedication in 1972. Getting it right The devil is in the details. ..., a Poplar Bluff lawyer, speaks for the Voice of the Ozarks organization. This group's vision is to preserve the riverways in such a way that the individual's right to traditional use of the park is unrestricted. He particularly objects to the proposed horsepower limitations for motorized boats. Currently, a johnboat can carry a load of four passengers upstream. However, he says, if the 25 HP limit is imposed, only two people could make it upstream -- a deterrent to outings enjoyed by many Ozark families. He points out that motorized clean-up crews go up and down the river every week, and that these boats have never been shown to harm the environment. Other groups and individuals have their own concerns. Horseback riding has gained popularity in recent years, and organizations such as Show Me Missouri Backcountry Horsemen want to develop more trails in the park. Drunken and rowdy behavior on the rivers concerns families and those who float for a chance to encounter nature. The National Park Service would like to see people give their opinions and explain why the Scenic Riverways means so much to them. Kunz emphasizes that they are not looking for votes on the alternatives, but reasons people prefer one alternative. A single preliminary plan will be put forward in 2010. It will be evaluated regionally and nationally, and more public input will be solicited. The Park Service will implement the final general management plan around 2012-13.</p>	6/24/2009	No		St. Louis Beacon	UN	N/A
1860	<p>Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: No Change Response to Question 4: No Change Response to Question 5: No Change</p>	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638

1861	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: No Change Response to Question 4: No Change Response to Question 5: No Change	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
1862	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: No Change Response to Question 4: No Change Response to Question 5: No Change	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
1863	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Leave things alone. Leaving things to the canoe's is not the answer to your problem. Response to Question 4: My family was one of the group of people the park service pushed out of their homes. My grandfather even died shortly after he was forced from his lifes work. Response to Question 5: Just common courteous. If you have a spill clean up your mess.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
1864	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt A. Response to Question 4: None! Response to Question 5: More Law Enforcement!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63846
1865	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt A. Response to Question 4: None! Response to Question 5: More law enforcement!	7/31/2009	No			MO	65692
1866	Response to Question 1: No action required Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All	7/31/2009	No			MO	64093
1867	Response to Question i: No-Action. This plan seems to be working for me.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
1868	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - LEAVE THE RIVER REGULATIONS AS THEY ARE. - WE DON'T NEED MORE RED TAPE. Response to Question 2: DON'T CHANGE ANYTHING - LEAVE IT ALONE. Response to Question 3: RESIDENTS OF THESE RIVERS SHOULD NOT LOSE ANY OF THEIR RIGHTS (FISHING, BOATING ETC.) TO PLEASE ANYONE ELSE! Response to Question 4: THE WHOLE RIVER IS BEAUTIFUL & SHOULD BE ENJOYED BY ALL - NOT CLOSED OFF OR REGULATED FROM US OR OUR CHILDREN. Response to Question 5: ONLY PEOPLE WHO ARE BEHAVING DANGEROUSLY (AS TO POSSIBLY HARM OTHERS) - SHOULD BE TOTALLY BANNED FROM THE RIVERS.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
1869	Response to Question 1: No-Action Only: Make No Change to the existing plan. Response to Question 2: No limitations for Public access to our Rivers or Roads to the Rivers. Open current closed Roads. Response to Question 3: No Horse Power limitations to motorized Boats. No limits on public access by all vehicles Atv's & Boats Response to Question 4: The Current & Jacks fork Rivers. No Action plan is the only plan that will be good for our local people that enjoy our Rivers. Write more tickets to people littering & bringing illegal drugs on our rivers. Hire more Park Rangers to take care of this problem.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
1870	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL	7/31/2009	No			MO	64083
1871	Response to Question 5: Enforce the rules & regulations we have now & I think the visitor & the native to the area will both have a good experience.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65020
1872	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Reducing 40 hp at pump on motor	7/31/2009	No			MO	63701
1873	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Reducing 40 hp at pump on motor	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
1874	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: all	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
1875	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: all	7/31/2009	No			MO	64093

1876	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: NONE No Action Response to Question 3: we should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No Limit on the pump on motors Response to Question 4: All of it is special. - Leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river. Response to Question 5: Park Rangers should be seen on the river Get toucher on people trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			MS	38801
1877	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: NONE - No Action Response to Question 3: we should be Able to use All the land and river as it is now. No Limit on the pump on motors Response to Question 4: All of is special - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river Response to Question 5: Park Rangers should be seen on the river Get tougher on people trashing	7/31/2009	No			AL	36445
1878	No responses given to questions.	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
1879	Response to Question 1: No Changes	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
1880	Response to Question 1: Alt. A No ATV No Power Boats	7/10/2009	No			MO	63011
1881	Response to Question 1: Alt. A No ATV No Power Boats	7/10/2009	No			MO	63011
1882	Response to Question 1: No Action Needed	7/10/2009	No			MO	63301
1883	Response to Question 5: No action	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
1884	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None - Leave the rivers alone - no changes. Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren 17 Bridge to 2 Rivers Response to Question 5: Please leave the rivers as they are.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65466
1885	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None - Leave the rivers alone - no changes. Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren 17 Bridge to 2 Rivers Response to Question 5: Please leave the rivers as they are.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65466
1886	Response to Question 1: No-action alternative Response to Question 2: I don't feel future management is necessary over or above what is currently being done. Response to Question 3: I do not feel the park should close roads or make sections of the river prohibited to motorboats Response to Question 4: All river ways in this area are special to the locals & they would like them left as is. Response to Question 5: Leave things as they are.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
1887	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: There should be no talk of or Plans to Remove or limit the Number of wild horses in the park, the fields should be left for their grazing areas Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: open more River access Roads	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1888	Response to Question 1: No Action Taken	6/27/2009	No			MO	63755
1889	Response to Question 1: Take no action!	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
1890	Response to Question 1: Take no action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33967
1891	Response to Question 1: Take no action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33913

1892	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION.	6/27/2009	No			FL	33901
1893	Response to Question 1: Take no action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
1894	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63638
1895	Response to Question 1: No Action please	7/28/2009	No			MO	65775
1896	Response to Question 1: No-Action No limited Horse Power	7/28/2009	No			KS	67133
1897	Response to Question 1: No Action Needed Response to Question 2: No Action Needed Response to Question 3: No Action Needed Response to Question 4: No Action Needed Response to Question 5: No Action Needed	6/23/2009	No			MO	65438
1898	No responses to any of the questions.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63021-1830
1899	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION	6/27/2009	No			FL	33907
1900	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33913
1901	Response to Question 1: No-Action Plan	6/27/2009	No			MO	63965
1902	Response to Question 1: Take no action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63965
1903	Response to Question 1: Take No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33931
1904	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION	6/27/2009	No			MO	63953
1905	Response to Question 1: No action - rate horsepower at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: we need more road access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
1906	Response to Question 1: No action - rate horsepower at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: we need more road acce	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
1907	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63664

1908	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
1909	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/14/2009	No			MO	63901
1910	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
1911	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63060
1912	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
1913	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65806
1914	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			IA	50265
1915	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65804
1916	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65804
1917	Response to Question 1: No Action.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
1918	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65803
1919	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65807
1920	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65804
1921	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65814
1922	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65807
1923	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65807

1924	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
1925	Response to Question 1: (No Action)	7/31/2009	No			MO	65038
1926	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65803
1927	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
1928	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			IA	50042
1929	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
1930	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	64012
1931	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65360
1932	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
1933	Response to Question 1: (No Action)	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
1934	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
1935	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
1936	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63775
1937	Response to Question 1: No Action!	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
1938	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
1939	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841

1940	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65571
1941	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/28/2009	No			MO	63960
1942	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			KY	42086
1943	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
1944	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
1945	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
1946	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
1947	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
1948	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
1949	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
1950	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63755
1951	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63801
1952	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63965
1953	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63965
1954	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
1955	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33931

1956	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466
1957	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65714
1958	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65714
1959	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33905
1960	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
1961	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63801
1962	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	65588
1963	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	63965
1964	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	65588-9203
1965	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	63841
1966	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	63960
1967	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	63960
1968	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	65588
1969	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
1970	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63755
1971	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937

1972	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65714
1973	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			FL	34677
1974	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			KY	40447
1975	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			FL	34677
1976	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			OH	43209
1977	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			OH	45243
1978	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			OH	45243
1979	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			OH	45243
1980	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			IL	60043
1981	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			OH	45243
1982	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65781
1983	Response to Question 1: I would say alternative A is closest to my ideal. I am a canoe paddler who camps on gravel bars. I've done this for 40 years. I'd like to keep doing it. Response to Question 2: Long, quiet stretches of river, given over to canoeing, fishing, & camping. Drunken parties need to go somewhere else. A bar perhaps. Response to Question 3: I would hate to see a restrictive permit system put in place. If there are too many people, start by reducing the number of out fitter canoes. Limit Alcohol & stop the drugs! Response to Question 4: Long, slim fishing boats are what I remember from 40 years ago. Round Spring to Two Rivers is my favorite part of the river. Twenty-five horse motors & long, slim boats for 2 or 3 fishermen won't be a bad place to start. Response to Question 5: All the things that are real problems are already against the law. NPS needs to run more patrols (2 a day on every part of the river where problems exist.)	7/1/2009	No			MO	63069
1984	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: No more Horsepower limitations on motors Response to Question 4: Waymeyer to Big Springs. No the alternatives do not help. This is an area used to party, alcohol, drugs on weekends for tourist all about money to polititions Response to Question 5: do away with drugs and alcohol on the river and you will eventually will get the right group of people on the River who care about It.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
1985	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate hores Power at Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more read acc. & landing	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
1986	Response to Question 1: No action - rate all horsepower at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: we need extra road access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466

1987	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Keep ALL roads which allow access to national riverways open. Response to Question 4: Upper current river. Response to Question 5: Organize volunteer groups to help the Park Service keep Riverways clean and trail maintenance (such as Back Country Horsemen, etc.)	7/31/2009	No			MO	65560
1988	Response to Question 1: Yes. By far I prefer the "NO-ACTION" Alternative (NAA). Overall, Park ecosystems show no signes of significant degradation with this Alternative. The NAA could be modified by setting up programs to demonstrate "special things" about the park as in Alt. B. Response to Question 2: 1) Greater development of "Designated Horseback Riding Trails". 2) Special Feature Tours (Alt B). 3)Always keep the rivers open to Floaters/Canoers/Kayakers and boaters using outboard motors. 4) Continuous crackdown on lewd behavior on rivers. This will keep Jacks Fork and Current Rivers as Family Friendly. 5) designated river crossing points for horseback riders. Response to Question 3: 1) Outboard engine horsepower should be measured at the prop or jet, not the head. 2) Big Springs should not be made into a wilderness area. 3) Closing trails & roads in an attempt to keep people from having access to rivers. Response to Question 4: My major concern is Finding ways to minimize conflicts between power boaters and Floaters to avoid accidents. Response to Question 5: Coordinate with MO regulators to establish comprehensive rules over all jurisdictions of the Jacks Fork & Current such that conflicts between Floaters and motor boaters are minimized.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466
1989	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles Response to Question 5: Keep our horsepower limit 40 at the pump	7/31/2009	No			MO	65785
1990	Response to Question 1: No Action- Response to Question 2: Does not need to changed at all. Response to Question 3: All Jack Fork & current River Response to Question 4: Jack Fork & Current River - Need more Park Service employees to better manage River way's & recreation Areas.	7/31/2009	No			VA	23320
1991	Response to Question 1: A COMBINATION OF NO-ACTION AND ALTERNATIVE C COULD BE A GOOD PLAN. Response to Question 5: REMOVE AND/OR CONTROL THE AMOUNT OF GRAVEL/SAND & ROCKS THAT IS FILLING THE RIVER BED AND VALLEY. SEE ACCOMPANING SHEET.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65588
1992	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles Response to Question 5: Keep our Horse power Limit 40 at the pump.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466
1993	Response to Question 1: STRONGLY FAVOR A. WILDERNESS & WATERSHED AREAS THAT REMAIN RELATIVELY UNDAMAGED IN TERMS OF NATURAL ECOLOGY & POLLUTION NEED SERIOUS PROTECTION IN THE FACE OF HUMAN IIMPACT & DEVELOPMENT. Response to Question 2: LIMITED, CONTROLLED & SUPERVISED ACCESS GUIDED TOURS FOCUSING ON QUIET, SLOW-PACE, NATURE RESPECT & APPRECIATION FOR ALL - INCLUDING WILD THINGS. Response to Question 3: CREATION OF MORE ACCESS & DEVELOPMENT ZONES WOULD BE VERY LIKELY TO INCREASE ENVIROMENTAL HARM Response to Question 4: ANY & ALL CURRENTLY UNDEVELOPED AREAS Response to Question 5: PROMOTE VALUE OF QUIET, SLOW, NATURAL EMPLOYE MORE GUIDES/RANGERS/CARETAKERS	7/28/2009	No			UN	Unknown
1994	Response to Question 1: "No Action" rate HP at the Pump Response to Question 4: I like Round Springs to Owls ben Response to Question 5: more Road Access & A better Boat Ramp at Round Springs	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
1995	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B- and C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles is special to me Response to Question 5: Keep our horsepower Limit 40 at the pump	7/31/2009	No			MO	65785
1996	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles Response to Question 5: Keep our Horse power limit 70 at the pump	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466
1997	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION. THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPROVE AND MAINTAIN BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEE'S. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901
1998	Response to Question 1: "No Action" rate HP at the Pump Response to Question 4: I like Round Springs to Owls ben Response to Question 5: more Road Access & A better Boat Ramp at Round Springs	7/30/2009	No			MO	63901
1999	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: I feel the Horse Power should not be regulated the river will do that. Response to Question 4: Twin Rock - a special place for family to go. Please refer to letter attached. Response to Question 5: refer to letter attached	7/28/2009	No			MO	65571

2000	Response to Question 1: (No Action) - The Park Service has already went way to far. Taking away public rights of certain boating rights and closing off vehickles use in certain areas. All actions should be voted only bo local county Resadents Response to Question 2: (No Action) Park Service has went too far (Stop) Response to Question 3: Don't play Games with the Horse Power Ratings. If the power ratings are changed or dropped to a lower rating it will only mean more boats to transport the same people from Point A to Point B - Meaning more boats on the river. Response to Question 4: The Complete Ozark National Riverways is special. I donot want to see it become a place where every area is a pay to camp area. Some people including my family injoy Primitive Camping, Atv Riding - Horse riding & gravle bar parking & Peacefull Evening Cook out and every one picks up after their self. - Keep it clean Response to Question 5: Train National Riverways Rangers to use respect and comon sense and be polite when aproching a fisherman or camp area or Atv or boating operator. They need to treat public with care & respect. The County People - working People Pay all costs-Paying taxes. For National Riverways Questions or Concerns contact me at.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
2001	Response to Question 1: A - But listen to the locals. The trail ride operations present some problem, but education will remedy them. There are good people, who want to enjoy the beauty of this area. I pass them on the roads see them in the park--& they are always polite & well behaved. Better than week-end tourists. Response to Question 2: Limited road access & limited motorized boating. We have massive recreational XXX? in this state for motorized boating. If it becomes too popular in these small streams, it will disrupt every other use. Same going for off the road ATV's. Response to Question 4: Above Big Spring Response to Question 5: Do pay attention to local opinion. I know some of them want motorized boating & I disagree. The XXX? locals don't make a problem. Talk to the horse people.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63122
2002	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: TWO RIVERS TO NORTHERN EDGE OF VAN BUREN GAP Response to Question 4: TWO RIVER TO GOOSE NECK Response to Question 5: --OPEN MORE TRAILS TO ATV'S, DUAL RIDER ATV'S & SIDE X SIDE VEHICLES. --MORE OPEN EXPOSURE OF WATER PATROL ON THE RIVER. --EQUAL RESPECT & RESPONSIBILITY OF TUBER'S, CANOERS & BOATERS --MORE CONCRETE ACCESS POINTS.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63051
2003	Response to Question 1: No-Action 40 HP Limit On All of River, and more Boat landing so you can access River at Different places as avoid the canoe & tube areas. Have glasses on floater safty and how to store there gear sure they Do not lose so much in the River	7/14/2009	No			MO	63775
2004	Response to Question 1: No-Action - make 70 Hp limit on River from Owls Bend to Gooseneck and add more access. Make sure the litter and alcohol laws are enforced. Have floater and Boater Safety classes. Have more water patrol on the River.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63701
2005	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: You can always add more educational--cave finding tours--more ranger-led demonstrations in varied locations Response to Question 3: changing/eliminating/reducing the use of an activity already available Response to Question 4: I do not believe that eliminating/changing restrictions on motorboats would benefit Response to Question 5: Educate canoers/rafters - in Paddle Guides, on bus as they are being taken to river explain that boats are allowed here (certain areas) and here's how they work - going slower created bigger waves, etc. . .	7/14/2009	No			MO	63076
2006	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION. THERE IS PLENTY TO DO IF YOU LOOK FOR THE INFORMATION AND I DO NOT THINK IT'S FAIR TO INTERFERE WITH OR PUNISH THE LOCAL POPULATION WHICH UTILIZED THE RESOURCE ALL YEAR. Response to Question 2: EDUCATIONAL AND GUIDE SERVICES. I DO NOT THINK THIS WILL HAVE THE DRAW OTHER ACTIVITIES DO. MAYBE PROVIDE BETTER INFORMATION FOR WHAT IS ALREADY AVAILABLE. ECONOMICS OF THE AREA SHOULD BE CONSIDERED. Response to Question 3: PUTTING AN UNFAIR BURDEN ON JET BOATERS, WHO IN MY EXPERIANCE HAVE BEEN MORE CURTIOUS AND LESS ANOING THAN CANOERS. Response to Question 4: THERE MAY BE ROOM TO CLOSE THE RIVERWAYS TO MOTORIZED TRAFFIC ON THE HIGH USE HOLIDAY WEEKENDS DURING THE SUMMER. Response to Question 5: PROVIDE CLEAR INFORMATION ON LOCATIONS AND HOW TO ACCESS CURRENT HISTORICAL AREAS. HAVE CANOERS AND JET BOATERS MEET AT CANOE RENTAL LOCATIONS TO GET ALONG BETTER.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63016
2007	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Better enforcement of litter pickup would be a noticable improvement. I believe this is most abused by the tubers/floaters that take food & drink and then dispose of them in or by the river. Response to Question 3: No changes in motor boat access and motorboat horsepower allowances. Response to Question 4: No Action Needed.	7/14/2009	No			IL	61554
2008	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free Access & Recreational usage Response to Question 3: Restricting Access & Usage Response to Question 4: The boat we use has a 40 HP at the pump motor, and we wish to be able to continue using our motor. Response to Question 5: A few more restrooms & trash cans.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65580
2009	Response to Question 1: No Action. Remove horsepower restrictions on boat motors and zones. Response to Question 2: Unrestricted access and usage are important to this specially legislated riverways because nature is to be enjoyed, not zoned, limited, nor restricted. Recreation in the Ozarks can help people have a true appreciation for nature. Response to Question 3: Restricted Access and Usage are not in accordance with the recreationist protective enabling legislation. Response to Question 5: More visible Park Service employees who are net there to harass and write tickets to people, but to help and provide information. No hiding in the bushes nor spying on the current river.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
2010	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: NONE Leave as is! Response to Question 3: Boat & motor should be on the river any time Some one wants to boat ride or fish the river should not be just for tourist to use! Response to Question 4: Some of the Best Farmland in MO. is on the River's you took that at least let the Local's Boat Ride & enjoy it. Response to Question 5: NO	7/14/2009	No			MO	65588

2011	Response to Question 1: No Action. The ONSR have all the Best Farm Land. The People That Live here Now rely on the Visitors to Make a Living. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action. I Live in the Eminence Area. I have hunted and Fished the Current and Jacks Fork All my Life (60 years). I Am a Disabled Veteran From Viet Nam and the river is one place I can Go and relax. Response to Question 5: I have a Jet Boat. I have Never had Any trouble with canoes. I slow down for canoes or other boats wave and speak to the people. No-Action.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
2012	Response to Question 1: Rate Horse Power at the pump. No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC - Restrict Access to the River. By lowering horse power will make the boats less safe for our friends & family. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Paint Rock for fishing and boat riding. Round Springs down is also good for gigging. So by lowering Horse Power will make these things almost impossible to achieve. Response to Question 5: More boat ramps are needed from Round Springs to Log Yard and with putting the boats in & hanging up in the gravel causes more problems than what you would think	7/14/2009	No			MO	63629
2013	Response to Question 1: I do not have a good knowledge of the Park. My main concern is the change in the Horsepower Limits of the motors. The main concern is the Reduction of H.P. Limits from Big Springs to Goose Neck. I feel this will hurt Carter Co. (an economically Depressed Area). And will force the people with Larger motors to the Doniphan, Mo Area. Doniphan has already seen a very large increase in Floaters & Boaters. To force these Additional Boaters south would create more congestion & Dangerous conditions. Response to Question 2: I believe there has to be some type of Balance & common sense approach. If Any segment gets completely out of control than some Rules & Regulations Need to Apply. (ie the River will only hold so many people on a given day. Only so many horses can be in a given area.) I do strongly feel the Park should be protected & managed for the maximum use possible. Response to Question 3: Changes in the Horsepower Limits I strongly feel they should be Left the same. The Lower part of the River (Big Springs to Goose Neck) draws a lot of Boaters to an economically Depressed Area. This Area is not used by very many Floaters or canoeists and I cannot see Any Good Reason to change this H.P. Limit down. To 40 H.P. A small motor overloaded will do more damage than a Large motor. Response to Question 4: I only use the lower part of the River. We enjoy motoring up to Big Springs, having lunch at the Lodge & Returing to the Doniphan Area. I do have a Large outboard however with 4 people my boat is Not overloaded and does much less damage to the River than what a 40 H.P. would with 4 people. Response to Question 5: I do feel that the River ways should be protected & managed for the maximum use without destroying this Natural Resource.	7/14/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2014	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION, I would like to see more emphasis on fishing. I understand that stocking of fish and all game regulations are set by the State, but I think the Park could make more boat ramps like the one at Two Rivers And Big Spring. We need One A Powder Mill and Roberts field for sure. Response to Question 2: No Action seems to be the only option for anyone who doesn't believe in more motor restrictions. Response to Question 3: NONE OF A B or C Response to Question 4: I Am strongly concerned for ALL of the Riverways. Again the only Alternative is NO ACTION. Response to Question 5: I think more bulletin boards, park consessioniers and Rangers should stress the importance of Canoes and jon boats users being more considerate of each other. Please read the inclosed letter, which was also sent to my two Senators and my Congressman.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
2015	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE FROM CURRENT POLICY We do not need any additional restrictions passed down from the federal bureaucracy. Enough is Enough. Response to Question 2: NO CHANGE FROM CURRENT POLICY Response to Question 3: NO CHANGE FROM CURRENT POLICY Response to Question 4: NO CHANGE FROM CURRENT POLICY Response to Question 5: NO CHANGE FROM CURRENT POLICY	7/14/2009	No			MO	63755
2016	Response to Question 1: No action: Keep HP rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: No action - Love the WHOLE river. Please leave it alone. Response to Question 5: Build boat ramps & more bathrooms/showers	7/14/2009	No			MO	63139
2017	Response to Question 1: No Action: Keep HP rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: No Action - LOVE the whole river. Please leave it alone. Response to Question 5: Build boat ramps, camping hook-ups, more bathrooms.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63130
2018	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. BETTER LITTER ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE A NOTICEABLE IMPROVEMENT. TUBERS/FLOATERS SEEM TO ABUSE THIS THE MOST. Response to Question 3: NO CHANGES IN MOTOR BOAT ACCESS & MOTOR BOAT HORSEPOWWER ALLOWANCES. Response to Question 4: NO ACTION NEEDED.	7/14/2009	No			IN	46307
2019	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Stronger Enforcement of Litter pick-up Response to Question 3: No changes in motorboat Access And motorboat Horsepower Allowances Response to Question 4: No Action NEEDED.	7/14/2009	No			IN	46307
2020	Response to Question 1: No-Action - my ideal would be to put it back to the way it was before modifications were put into place. I know that's not possible. So, I prefer to leave it just the way it is. Response to Question 2: Leaving it the way it is & "enforcing" the rules & regulations that are already in place. Response to Question 3: Should not lower the motor limits any lower than they are now. Response to Question 4: I married a man that was born & raised on Current River. My children grew up loving & respecting the river. So, ALL of it is a concern to me. All the rules in place NOW should be enforced & Nothing else would be needed. Response to Question 5: If all rules & regulations were enforced the visitor to the ONSR & the native of the area woud have a good experience.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63937

2021	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Horsepower measured at Jet Response to Question 3: A,B,C should not be included Don't want Wilderness Areas Response to Question 4: Enjoy Boating, fishing, camping and Giggling year round from Powder Mill to Gooseneck - HP restriction would limit our family recreation. Response to Question 5: Alternative A,B,C restricts Local Residents by HP and Recreation opportunities for 365 days to benefit tourist 24 days - weekends - 4 weeks - 3 months manage your resources by controlling noxious weeds, they are more destructive than Boats!!!	7/14/2009	No			MO	63941
2022	Response to Question 1: A is least invasive with fossil fuel guzzling motor boats. The non-motorized area on the Current River should extend to Two Rivers. Response to Question 2: A = Non-motorized Jack's Fork River Response to Question 3: "A" needs non-motorized on Current River from source to Two Rivers Response to Question 4: The upper Current and upper Jacks Fork are national treasures for canoe & kayaks . . . and occasional rafts. Response to Question 5: The access points need better signage visible from the rivers.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2023	Response to Question 1: A. - Gravel bar camping has been a huge part of our vacation time. We are a clean-up family, wishing others would do the same. Pack out your garbage should be law. Including personal hygiene. Either go the prescribed distance & bury your treasures or take them with you. Response to Question 2: No motorized boats. We have countless stories of Close-calls, due to drunken, or under age operators. It would be nice if they would also clean-up after themselves. Protection of flora & fauna. Response to Question 4: Too numerous to mention. And they may be a particular gravel bar or a rock formation, but to have these areas preserved is so necessary. Bottom line - courtesy & consideration to others on the river. Courtesy & consideration to this wonderful asset. Unfortunately hi powered motor boats are not kind to the environment. Response to Question 5: Visible presence of the Park Rangers. It would somehow be great to be able to fine visitors who leave their trash, beer cans, etc. We all have to be held accountable to keep this river as it was given.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2024	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is the closest to my ideal for management of the rivers. One of my main concerns is the availability of overnight group bar camping. As far as I can tell (& been told) there are no restrictions to gravel bar camping w/A. I think it is important to allow people to camp on gravel bars. It has played such a major part of my life - I think as long as people are good stewards - gravel bar camping should NOT be restricted. Response to Question 2: I feel we should return the rivers to a more family & canoe friendly area, while at the same time preserving the wilderness that makes this area so special & important to so many people. Also, I think it is important to close the roads that lead to almost every gravel bar. Response to Question 3: I feel that we should minimize the presence of motor boats on the river. We have had many negative encounters w/motor boats over the years & although this may not be true for all, they seem to lack respect for others on the water. In today's society w/ so many environmental concerns (& health concerns - obesity) I don't see why we should allow this in our natural areas. Response to Question 4: The upper stretches of the Current River is such a nice area. My family has floated here for years & we want to make sure it stays nice & natural Response to Question 5: I have seen an increased presence of park rangers, etc on the river, & I think that is essential for the management. Upping the presence on the river & talking to the visitors, being more approachable - is important (i.e. not flying by on motor boats, maybe in canoes, or on gravel bars being friendly w/ visitors & keeping crazy behavior in check)	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2025	Response to Question 1: NO Action!!! I Live 11 miles from Akers Ferry. Its a shame that I have to drive 65 miles one way to go trout fishing because we are not allowed to use our boat w/ 25hp motor above Akers. We cant go down stream because the river stays so low and the trout fishing is best above Akers and below Cedar Grove. Response to Question 2: Quit trying to keep the local people off of the rivers. Open the roads back up that lead to the river so the elderly can get it to fish. Not everyone likes to float in a canoe and fish. Keep the roads open and keep them maintained so we can have access to the river, to get to our favorite fishing spots. Response to Question 3: By letting us use our 25hp motors on the upper part of the river year round. We use this part of the river for fishing not "Partying." Most of the "Drunks" and those that display "Lewd Behavior" are the tourist, Not the Locals. I am not saying that the tourist shouldn't have the right to use the river. EVERYONE should have that right. We, the locals, do NOT want to be shut out. Response to Question 4: Between Cedar Grove & Akers Ferry need "No Action." We use this area to Trout Fish & Gig. I grew up on this stretch of the river, as did my Dad and his Dad before him. I have raised my children here as well. Response to Question 5: Keep the rivers open for everybody to "Freely" use, in all areas. Keep access Roads opened & maintained.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65479
2026	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Access & Usage Response to Question 3: Restrict Usage of Access Response to Question 4: I would like to continue boat riding & recreation with 40 hp. Response to Question 5: More picnic tables, rest facilities, recreational area's, restrooms and more trash receptacles for cleaner more enjoyable environments.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65542
2027	Response to Question 1: No-action/Even Reverse action. How about giving Back the Stretch above Aker's Ferry to the 25 HP John Boats. During the summer months, so we can have opportunity to Trout Fish. We have enough sense not to up River with a 1000 Canoes in the way. But we could go in evening or early in the mornings. They Don't stock the River Below Akers with Trout. Response to Question 2; I think the NPS Needs to stop catering to certain groups & trying to take River away From other. Leave us alone and let everyone enjoy the Rivers. Response to Question 3: I think you need to Forget Changing and Leave people alone Response to Question 4: We use the area from Akers to Cedar Grove For giggling and Trout Fishing. I own a 25 HP John Boat. Some of the Best memories I have are of Time spent on the Rivers with my Family & Friends. I was Born Raised on these Rivers & this is my heritage, what give you the Right to Take this away From me & my Kids Response to Question 5: I think you Need to Live up to your original agreed to Keep the Rivers open For everyone to use & enjoy.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65479
2028	Response to Question 1: No action. Open the river between Cedar Grove and Akers Ferry back up thru the summer months for boats with 25 HP motors for trout fishing. Response to Question 2: Keep access roads open and maintained. Response to Question 3: By letting us keep using the upper part of the river for our 25 hp motors. Response to Question 4: Cedar Grove to Akers Ferry. I have giggered and fished this stretch all my life with family & friends. "No Action" Response to Question 5: Keep the riverways open for all to use. Keep and maintain the access roads open to the rivers.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65479

2029	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 3: motorized boats should be limited as much as possible. Horse trails should not cross the river & should be extremely limited. Response to Question 4: Covered in Alternative A	7/10/2009	No			MO	65109
2030	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A IS MY PREFERENCE FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE O.N.S.R. Response to Question 2: 1) CLOSING OF THE MANY ROAD & ATV TRAILS THAT HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED WITHIN THE O.N.S.R. MOST OF THESE ROADS/TRAILS SEEM TO BE UNAUTHORIZED; AND THEY GREATLY REDUCE THE PRIMITIVE CHARACTER OF THE RIVERWAY THRU NOISE & VEHICULAR ACCESS TO MOST GRAVEL BARS 2) CURTAIL THE AMOUNT OF HORSEBACK RIDING ON O.N.S.R. THE LARGE NUMBER OF HORSES ARE NOT GOOD FOR WATER QUALITY & LEAD TO SEVERE EROSION OF TRAILS 3) PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TOILET FACILITIES ALONG THE RIVER. THESE COULD BE TEMPORARY THRU THE SUMMER MONTHS 4) REDUCE THE NUMBER OF CANOES/BOATS THAT CAN BE ON THE RIVER AT ANY ONE TIME Response to Question 5: DEVELOP A CAMPGROUND AT AKERS FERRY. A CAMPGROUND WAS THERE ORIGINALLY, BUT IT HAS BEEN CLOSED FOR MANY YEARS. AKERS FERRY IS THE CLOSEST PUT IN POINT FOR MANY PEOPLE & A CAMPGROUND THERE WOULD BE MUCH USED.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65063
2031	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles No action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2032	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Aciton Response to Question 3: Things should be left as-is Response to Question 4: the entire 134 miles is special to me. I grew up on the river, raised my son on the river. I want my grandchildren raised on the river as things are. Response to Question 5: I spend time on the river each night & every weekend. I want to say that I personally have witnessed over a dozen tourists on tubes & in canoes saved by boaters when their inexperience got them in trouble.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2033	Response to Question 1: No Action should be taken. Response to Question 2: None of the alternatives A, B or C. Response to Question 3: All of A, B or C should not be. Response to Question 4: All locations Are important to me. And None of the Alternatives address them. Response to Question 5: Better, cleaner bathroom faciltys. More, Better boat ramps.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63873
2034	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: All the River Response to Question 5: More law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			TN	38128
2035	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action Big Spring Park to Gooseneck Response to Question 5: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2036	Response to Question 1: No action is The Best way Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: No action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2037	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the horse power on the Boats & motors Response to Question 4: The four mile gap is a mess on the weekends Response to Question 5: need more law enforcement during high traffic weekends	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2038	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No more limits on horsepower. More boat ramp access & restrooms. Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles, no Response to Question 5: Leave boaters alone, more boating access & more restrooms	7/31/2009	No			MO	63937
2039	Response to Question 1: No action - motors remain 40 hp @ jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No. None Response to Question 5: Take no action on horsepower restrictions. Open 40 hp restrictions to no hp restrictions between bridge & big springs.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63830
2040	Response to Question 1: No action - motors remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: no Response to Question 5: take no action on horsepower restrictions open 40 hp restriction to no Hp restriction between Bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2041	Response to Question 1: No Action - motors to remain 40 hp @ jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No-None Response to Question 5: Take NO ACTION on restricting horspower. Outboard motor HP should remain 40 HP @ jet - open restriction on HP Between Bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2042	Response to Question 1: I am in support of Alternative A. I would like to see more game fish (trout, ect.) on the northern current. Stocking of these fish would be ideal Response to Question 2: Alt-A Response to Question 3: Alt-C Response to Question 4: I am concerned about big canoe floats. The noise and intoxicated people can ruin a trip over to the river Response to Question 5: I am a fly fisherman and would like to see more to accomidate that.	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown

2043	Response to Question 1: A or B. The rivers are way too crowded near towns (Current River) Response to Question 2: I like the idea of controlling motorized boating. Also 'B' allows limited amounts of guided services to increase knowledge of the Ozark resources Response to Question 3: 'C' will make the rivers too developed Response to Question 4: Preserve the pristine character of the Jack's Fork. Response to Question 5: Permits would help control access - give permits to outfitters with best green practices.	6/26/2009	No			MO	Unknown
2044	Response to Question 1: I believe the No-Action alternative is the best way to manage the ONSR w/no modifications needed. Response to Question 2: Keeping the horsepower limits the same as they are now Response to Question 3: Any part that is more restrictive than it is now Response to Question 4: The Log Yard area has been visited by my family for many years. The No-action alternative will be the best for this & all areas.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63638
2045	Response to Question 1: Yes - A Response to Question 2: non motorized on the Current R. Response to Question 3: C Response to Question 4: BAPTIST TO AKERS - YES	6/26/2009	No			MO	63122
2046	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE "A" IS THE CLOSEST TO WHAT I THINK SHOULD HAPPEN. THE MORE RESTRICTIVE & CONSERVATIVE THE BETTER! Response to Question 2: INCLUDE ANYTHING THAT COMPLETELY ELIMINATES OUTBOARD MOTORS, HORSES, ATV'S, AND ANY DEVELOPEMENT OF ANY KIND Response to Question 3: NO FUTURE DEVELOPEMENT OF ANY KIND!! Response to Question 4: MY GRANDFATHER & GRANDMOTHER BOUGHT 255 ACRES ON THE CURRENT IN 1951 ON "EE" GOING TO PULLTITE. WHEN THEY TOOK 95 ACRES OF THEIRS TO CREAT THE NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS IN THE 60'S, THEY SAID IT WOULD ALWAYS BE PRESERVED & PROTECTED IN ITS NATURAL STATE. WE WANT IT PRESERVED IN THAT WAY - NO OUTBOARDS, ATV'S OR HORSES!	6/26/2009	No			MO	63069
2047	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE B ELIMINATE HORSEBACK RIDING. Response to Question 2: BIG SPRING SHOULD BE PROPOSED FOR WILDERNESS DESIGNATION IN ALL ALTERNATIVES AND MUST BE IN PREFERED/FINAL ALTERNATIVE. Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: EXCEPT FOR BIG SPRING NOT BEING WILDERNESS, IN ALTERNATIVE C. BIG SPRING SHOULD HAVE WILDERNESS DESIGNATION IN ALL ALTERNATIVES Response to Question 5: I THINK SEASONAL MIXED USE MAKES ALOT OF SENSE FOR ANY FINAL RIVER MANAGEMENT. PEOPLE ARE GOING TO COME, MOSTLY DURING THE SUMMER, NO MATTER WHAT YOU DO, SO IT'S HARDLY "PRIMITIVE" THAT TIME OF YEAR. BUT A LATE FALL DAY SHOULD BE SERENE AND PRISTINE.	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2048	Response to Question 1: A is ideal because it bans motorized vehicles from Jack's Fork and limits them along the Current River. B is ideal because more naturalists in the area would allow citizens to fall in love with nature in an accessible way. Response to Question 2: -The banning of motorized vehicles along Jacks Fork -Keep things primitive, don't commercialize, limited cave commercialization, limit horse use!!! Response to Question 3: Don't allow horses near the riverways! Response to Question 4: *Ideally there should be a healthy balance between management Plan A & management Plan B. Response to Question 5: As a limiting/control factor, reduce the amount of people @ once by making smaller parking lots.	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2049	Response to Question 1: Alternative A most closely resembles what I would wish to see for the ONSR. Perhaps more natural & resource-based rec areas OK, but Alt. B goes too far. Response to Question 2: *Make Big Spring area a wilderness area!!!* Limit ALL parts of river to motorized vehicles w/ HP of 25 or less; but keep much of river non-motorized. Limit horseback rider usage. Response to Question 3: No more access points on the river! Response to Question 4: Again, propose Big Spring as a designated wilderness. Response to Question 5: Education! - Leave No Trace - You can love this areas to death Nip problems in the bud, be firm in enforcement. Limit parking and access, you automatically limit potential problems.	6/26/2009	No		The Open Space Council	MO	63116
2050	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is most appealing to me and my friends. Some aspects of Alternative B probably will occur due to pressure from those wanting more comfots of home. Response to Question 2: It's all about carrying capacity! You must limit the use to numbers that will sustain the resources. If this doesn't happen - the beautiful ecosystem will deteriorate. Response to Question 3: There should be a clear limit of 25 HP on all motors used by any boats in the entire riverways. Response to Question 4: The area around Round Spring & Alley Springs. Upstream from Alley Springs the Horses & ATV's have done a lot of harm to the river bed and the once pleasant environment. Response to Question 5: Limit the capacity of the number of canoes on the river at one time. Limit the number of trails for Horses. Don't allow any ATVs. Limit parking to reduce number of users	6/26/2009	No			MO	63011
2051	Commentary: A plan for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers Thousands of folks from St. Louis take float trips on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers – designated in 1964 by the US Congress as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (NSR). Congress also gave a mandate to the Department of the Interior to "preserve and protect" the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways became a national park, administered by the National Park Service (NPS). This was done with the approval of the Missouri General Assembly and Governor. Unfortunately, the NPS has, over the years between 1964 and now – 45 years later – let things slip a bit and has shown itself to be a poor steward of what Governor Nixon has referred to as the "prime jewels of the Ozarks". Consider: There are miles and miles of illegal Off-Road Vehicle trails. The lands adjacent to the Jacks Fork and Current are part of the ONSR and motorized access to these lands is supposed to be restricted to existing roads, but the NPS has failed enforce such restrictions and the ONSR lands are quite literally riddled with such illegal ORV trails. There are horsepower limits on boats – but due to local opposition, allegedly assisted by a US Congressperson, large, loud, and fast boats are common on both te Jacks Fork and the Current. Both rivers are narrow, and low-impact recreationists – canoeists, tubers, rafters and kayakers - are in constant danger of being run over or swamped. The Jacks Fork is on the "impaired" waterbody list. At times, it is so filled with bacteria that it is unhealthy to come in contact with the water. Those times that it is unhealthy coincide with large – thousands and thousands of horses – horse	6/1/2009	No		Sierra Club	UN	N/A

	<p>rides. The horse ride trails cross the Jacks Fork many times, and horse dung is the primary source of contamination. Much of the lands along the rivers was acquired by the NPS to create the national park, but some of the lands are still in private ownership and the NPS has easements. The NPS can grant what is known as "scenic easements" on public and private lands. Unfortunately, those "scenic easements" have led to much abuse allowing landowners to clear vegetation (and any wildlife that might depend on such trees and brush) and build on these lands. Some unscrupulous landowners have then sold what they have constructed and the hills along the ONSR have become little more than suburbs. Due to an "anything goes" attitude, the ONSR and in particular the Current River has a reputation for lewd, drunken, nude and rude behaviors. While the NPS has now taken steps to curtail such behavior, it is too little, too late. Prevention of such rowdiness, not reaction to it, would have been much more effective, and would have ensured that family float trips would have continued to be enjoyable affairs, rather than miserable voyages accompanied by those who view the OSNR as a place to let loose. While some of these things should never have been allowed, it is not too late to turn things back to those peaceful days of 1964. The NPS has developed a new and preliminary General Management Plan. Alternative A is a low-impact alternative and much preferable to the others, although there is no mention of horses. Alternative C is particularly objectionable, because it would allow more horses, more motors, more accesses, more roads and trails, and more development. Alternative C seems to fly in the face of the federal mandate to "protect and preserve". ----- I am for alternative C. More horses, more motors more accesses, more roads and trails and development means more people having fun and SPENDING MONEY! The more people having fun and enjoying these parts of Missouri the more likely they will return. There is nothing you can build that can not be torn down and removed in the future if it is found to hurt the environment. There is no trail or road that can not be blocked in the future if it is found to hurt the environment. The horses and the river problem is a short lived problem and then it all goes down the river. This is nothing that has not been going on for years. A little tolerance for people having fun can go along way. It's not like they get to have fun during the week. - I disagree Dave. If you can't use the area the way nature made it, then go find what you are looking for elsewhere. MoDNR does a good job in a lot of what they do, but even they can't handle the overwhelming abuse that many of the Ozark National Scenic rivers are enduring. It doesn't take much intelligence to imagine that powerboats, large herds of horses, and all-terrain vehicles damage the ecosystem a great deal. We don't need any more Option Cs. - There aren't many areas in Mo. and the Ozarks where man's impact has not been devastating. The Current and the Jack's Fork are gems that should be maintained as natural areas. Motor sports fans (ATV's and powerboats) have taken over most of Mo.'s thousands of miles of rivers. Some natural experience should be allowed to remain. Same for horse pollution. There are plenty of trails elsewhere without making it unhealthy in what has historically been one of the cleanest rivers in the state. Option A is the right path for the Conservation Commission, DNR, the USFS, and especially the National Park Service to take. To ..., AmerenUE spent 103 million to clean up the Taum Sauk disaster and that was with a flood of relatively CLEAN water. All told they spent more than 170 million. Better to prevent the damage than pay to clean it up later. - Is this a new policy running commentaries in the platform? If so, we hope to see equal time. - jjk, get your own newspaper, yapper! Maybe if your views aren't getting out, start a blog! We did it in March 2006, and now at http://www.dangerousintersection.org get 192,210 viewers a month. - wild horses were a big contributor, i remember. ride somewhere else and get rid of the wild ones. as for the yay-hoos, it's part of the reason i don't float much. when i do, i burn vacation days and go during the week, when the hoosiers aren't there.</p>						
2052	<p>Park users weigh in on Ozark riverways ... enjoys camping, boating, canoeing and exploring the historic buildings along the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. And she wants to keep enjoying those activities. That's why she wants the National Park Service to adopt a long-range plan that strikes a balance between protecting natural resources and keeping the park available for a variety of activities. The park service is considering three management plan options for the Current and Jacks Fork riverways in southern Missouri and the 80,700 acres of park land that surrounds them. Alternatives range from returning the park to its primitive state to allowing more development of trails, boat ramps and facilities. "We want to find the best solution for the most," park spokeswoman Elisa Kunz said. "We're going to have to compromise. So many people love this river. We want to make sure there's a place for everybody." About 125 people showed up for an open house in Columbia yesterday to weigh in on the plans. Attendees had a chance to review maps, talk to park service officials and submit written comments. Roughly 670 people attended three similar meetings earlier this week across the state. ..., who lives in Fulton, is a former resident of Eminence, the neighboring town to the west of the park. She's aware of conflicts that go on between boaters and those canoeing in the river, some of which have turned dangerous. Enforcement is tough, she said, because the locals who use the park don't respect park rangers who aren't from the area. ...thinks problems could be resolved if the park service hired more local park rangers. "We hillbillies don't like others telling us what to do," she joked. Mainly, ...wants the park service to keep roads open, even though they were built illegally. Those roads give visitors access to the historic cabins, she said. Environmental groups, such as the Ozark Group Sierra Club, are urging the park to close those roads and allow natural vegetation to grow back, as proposed in the most conservative plan. But it's likely too late for the park to return to the state it was in when it was established in 1964, said Onawa Lacewell, a graduate student at the University of Missouri who is from Eminence. "Idealistically, yes, I would prefer that plan," she said. "Realistically, it's never going to happen." Still, she said, park officials have an obligation to reject any plan that would further damage the natural resources. "My hope is that any change will be in line with the preservation of the park," Lacewell said. "It would be strange if they chose a plan that did not meet the overall goal of preserving the park for future generations." People have until July 31 to comment on the plans. Park administrators will then review that input, looking for themes, Kunz said. They will then draft a preferred plan, which will go back to the public for review late next year. Kunz said the park service hopes to begin implementing a new management plan by 2012. ----- The opinions expressed below are those of the readers who submitted them and not those of the Tribune's reporters or editors. Readers are solely responsible for the content of their comments. chas says... What about the horses that are churning up the bottom of the streams muddying them, crushing invertebrates and small fish and amphibians, suffocating the eggs with silt same as 4 wheel drives and ATVs? Horses are actually much worse as the manure makes the water unsafe and unappealing to swim in. - Tirebiter says... Chas is spot-on here. Horse traffic should be</p>	6/26/2009	No		Columbia Daily Tribune	UN	N/A

	<p>regulated/permitted much in the same way that canoe traffic is -- only so many at a time. Actually, however, the damage done to the riparian ecology by unlimited horse traffic is probably 20 times that of a canoe. As for ATVs, the sooner they vanish from the river bottom the better. - Xena says... Ditto, both to chas and Tirebiter.Well said! - baldknobber says... I agree with the most conservation-minded yet reasonable alternative in the plans - though, returning it to its "natural state" could possibly mean not having hundreds of canoes floating down it every day. Regulating the trail rides, and banning the motorboats and ATVs seems reasonable to me. Question: is there still a "wild-horse herd" roaming the ONSR park land? I seem to remember KY3 out of Springfield doing a story on them back about 1990 or so. - columbianative says... so true you cant swim in a river that is polluttred and you should regulate the horseback riding trails. Also the park rangers are there to protect everyone and the park. If you cant respect them then you need to stay away or get tazzed mayby? I would enjoy a nice swim or a quite canoee ride enjoying the natural beauty. ATV and the other things should be kept out of the park period, All they do is destroy. - settingitstraight says... Does anyone really have any true data that suggests that currently fish are dying from the horse riders? - settingitstraight says... Humm no data. Funny how that works out.</p>						
2053	<p>Protect and preserve' lost downstream In 1964, Congress designated the Current and Jacks Fork rivers as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Missouri's governor and the Missouri General Assembly supported this move. The federal legislation directed the National Park Service to "protect and preserve" the rivers, surrounding lands and, in particular, the springs and caves of the area. Fast forward to 45 years later ' now. The Jacks Fork River is on the "impaired water body" list for horse excrement causing high levels of bacteria. It is quite literally harmful to human health to touch the water. The state and federal agencies ' including the National Park Service ' have done testing, know what is causing the problem and also know the major source. There is a business entity in Eminence ' Cross County Trail Rides ' that invites thousands of horse riders to "come on down" (for a fee, of course). The trail ride path crosses the Jacks Fork many times, and horses do what horses do. It is no accident that the impaired stretch begins in Eminence and continues for eight miles downstream. One of the proposals now is to create more horse trails, even though that seems to violate the "protect" part of federal law. Protection? Preservation? Likewise, where once it was possible to take a relaxing float trip and camp on quiet sand and gravel bars, the area is riddled with unofficial off-road vehicle trails. Those who camp on sand and gravel bars are apt to be awakened or, worse, run over by an ATV or a four-wheel-drive vehicle. Preservation? Protection? The Shannon County Commission has, without any required permit and by entering on private lands without permission, conducted sand and gravel dredging operations in Big Creek, a major tributary of the Current River. That issue has been referred for action to our attorney general's office. The Army Corps of Engineers, which grants permits for stream operations, has said it never would have given Shannon County a permit to do what it did. When Shannon County conducted its illegal operation in Big Creek, the water quality of the Current River was heavily affected. Protection? Preservation? In addition, the Shannon County Commission has created and constructed several illegal crossings of the Current River, in clear violation of federal law. So far, the National Park Service has not done anything to enforce the "preserve and protect" portion of federal law. Float trips by gaggles of intoxicated young men and women have led to an "anything goes" attitude on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. Nudity, drunkenness, loud music and profanity have rendered family float trips untenable. After years of such rowdiness, tentative steps have been taken to outlaw such "R-rated" behavior, but akin to most things, reaction and enforcement are most difficult. "Protect and preserve" means that such should never have been permitted. Then there are all those motorboats ' and the motors seem to get larger and louder. The boats, with larger motors, go faster and faster. Since both the Current and Jacks Fork are fairly narrow rivers, canoeists are in constant danger of being run into by a motorboat or swamped by their wakes. I was at the open meeting in Eminence a couple of nights ago, and motorboat enthusiasts were out in droves. They espoused "no limits." Protect and preserve? The National Park Service has also acquiesced in the creation of "scenic easements," allowing speculators to clear the land of trees (and wildlife), build homes with expansive views and then sell them. Protect and preserve? The spokesperson for the National Park Service speaks of the need for "balance." But that word is nowhere to be found in federal law. To "protect and preserve" means just that. The Current and Jacks Fork rivers are to be maintained as they were in 1964, but that hasn't happened. Instead we have more of everything: more horses, bigger outboard motors on bigger, faster boats and more access points to accommodate them, more scenic easements, more makeshift and constructed roads and trails for those off-road vehicles. Protect and preserve? It might be a bit late to turn back the clock. It will be difficult to create the type of unspoiled water and lands that existed in 1964 so that our children and their children can enjoy the rivers. Alternative A in the Preliminary General Management Plan that the National Park Service has developed for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways proposes to do exactly that. After several public meetings in Van Buren, Eminence, Salem, Columbia and Clayton ' all held earlier this week ' written comments will be accepted. ----- The opinions expressed below are those of the readers who submitted them and not those of the Tribune's reporters or editors. Readers are solely responsible for the content of their comments. Xena says... Thank you ...for informing the public on the issues facing the quality of water and life along the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers. With citizen input hopefully the right thing will be done to preserve this jewel of Missouri natural resources. - baldknobber says... As I said in the comments on the story linked above, I rarely agree with ..., but I do here. The root of "conservative" is "conserve". I think it is consistent philosophically to be a strict constructionist of both the Constitution and the ONSR Act. - Robert_1 says... As a floater on those rivers since 1969, the area has turned into an absolute mess. It is hard to believe that it is managed by the National Park Service. I can understand the need for the local folks to utilize the river in ways that address their economic and recreational needs, and I can also understand the generational resentments that are deeply imbedded in the local culture (Big Brother: US Government coming in the early 60's and taking over a local resource via eminent domain). But what's done is done! Either manage it appropriately within the rules and guidelines under which it was established as an national scenic waterway, or pull the park service out and turn it back over to local governance. You can't have it both ways, and the current way consists of public officials being out of integrity with their legal roles and responsibilities. - Xena says... I think much of the problem was that Shannon County acted way beyond their jurisdiction in many areas (and trespassed!) and did what they wanted to do regardless of how the area was managed as a national scenic waterway, didn't notify anyone of what they were doing, and did it</p>	6/26/2009	No		Columbia Daily Tribune	MO	N/A

	quickly. And then the gov't agencies had to come in to do damage control...if Shannon county had understood their boundaries maybe a great deal of this damage would not have happened in the first place. Sadly the NPS has been in the background and not acted as they should have through all of this. JMO. - chas says... I'll bet most of those who go on these trailrides know the saying "don't drink downstream from the herd" so I am sure they would be willing to keep their horses out of the streams and pick up their horse's poop at the end of the day so as to make the streams enjoyable and safe for the rest of us. But you would probably disagree due to only having met nice people who once they mount their horse become the center of the universe thinking that private land becomes open range and motor vehicle have no right to be on the road. The whole world revolves around the horses a55 on horseback. - ghoti says... Ken, Best one I've seen from your pen in awhile. Well done. - Tailgunnerjoe says... Ken, stop by Wal-Mart and pick up a small shovel and clean up those horse apples!!!						
2054	Public discusses fate of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways COLUMBIA ' ... of Columbia has frequented the Current River, in Ozark National Scenic Riverways, for 20 years and wants the riverway to be left alone with no signs of development. "I love to go fishing in silence. When you are floating in a canoe, all you can hear is the water and the wildlife. I don't know why anyone would want to change that," ... said. ...attended an open house Thursday night held by the National Park Service to discuss four possible options for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, laid out in a 21-page document provided by the National Park Service. The event attracted 127 people, all interested in the future of the park. The Park Service has already held three similar meetings in different locations, with one still to come. All have been well-attended, said Eliza Kunz, public information officer for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and the National Park Service. Two of the meetings saw about 300 attendees each. ..., assistant commissioner for Shannon County, supported taking no action at Thursday's meeting. He said he has concerns for the economic well-being of the area. "If you limit the use of canoes, boats and horses, that's a source of income in our county," ...said. Like many of the members at the meeting, the Osage Group Sierra Club strongly supports Alternative A, the more primitive approach to managing the park. "This is a unique resource, a crown jewel of natural areas in Missouri, and it is being degraded," said ..., Sierra Club political chair. ... of Columbia said she is also a supporter of Alternative A and thinks that measures should be taken to make the Ozark National Scenic Riverways more family friendly; she said she's been to other parks where prohibiting alcohol and regulating river traffic enhanced her experience. Other attendants stressed that there was a need for responsible use from all parties involved. ..., of Rocheport and a member of the Missouri Equine Council, said she came to the meeting to gather information and plans to send comments to the National Park Service. ...said she is "pro-horse" and enjoys using various trails in the area. She said she used to frequent the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, but doesn't anymore because of the increased amount of horse traffic at the Cross Country Trail Ride in Eminence. "Responsible use from all the interests involved is the most important thing," ... said. "We need to learn to live together and all enjoy the beauty." "Public concerns run the gamut," Kunz said. "We don't want to have conflicts with locals and non-locals. Everyone must show tolerance and get along. We will have to find a balance, and it's that balance that will be hard." A variety of opinions were presented at the other open houses. There is a lot of concern for horsepower use in Van Buren. At the Eminence open house there were similar concerns, but they were more focused on land use. At the meeting in Salem, the concern was somewhat focused on the use of ATVs, horsesand motorboat horsepower, Kunz said. The plan must go through many more steps before a final decision is made, according to the National Park Service document. The open houses are a part of the development and evaluative stages. Other stages include preparing another draft of the plan and then submitting it to the public. After public dispersal, the revised plan will be followed by the final document. The final plan will not be implemented until the winter of 2012 or beyond, after the National Park Service director, the secretary of the interior, congress and the president approve the plan.	6/26/2009	No		Missourian	UN	N/A
2055	Response to Question 1: No Action & motors to Remain 40 HP at the jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take no Action and open 40 hp limit area to no HP Restriction in the Gap Between Bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2056	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: A, B, or C no changes Response to Question 4: I love the river and I don't think it should change! Keep it the way it is. Response to Question 5: More supervision!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2057	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of it. Response to Question 5: More law Enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2058	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: More law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2059	Response to Question 1: No-Action: If the ONSR wants to change anything it should be ticketing the people that break the law. Put more rangers out to keep the people from littering our rivers & bringing illegal drugs to our area. Do Not put any limitations to people with motorized boats that enjoy the rivers. We are the people that take care of our rivers. Response to Question 2: Open current closed roads to the rivers, take any motor limitations off the rivers. (No-Action Plan Response to Question 3: No limitations for public access to our rivers & roads to rivers. No Horse Power limitations for Motorized Boats Response to Question 4: The Current & Jack's Fork Rivers have been apart of my whole life living in Carter & Shannon Counties. I enjoy & go to the rivers camping & boating. Do not remove or take away our right to go to the rivers. Response to Question 5: If people are doing illegal things on our rivers whether locals or tourist they should be punished. I believe the ONRS should not ever take away the public to enjoy going or using the Current & Jack's fork Rivers.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438

2060	Response to Question 1: no action - motors to remain 40 HP at the jet Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: no Response to Question 5: take no action - open 40 HP limit area to No HP restriction in the Gap between the Bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2061	Response to Question 1: no action - motors to remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: no Response to Question 5: Take no action - do not restrict hp on motors below 40 hp at the jet	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2062	Response to Question 1: no action - motors to remain 40 HP @ jet Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: no Response to Question 5: take no action - motors should remain 40 HP at jet	7/31/2009	No			MO	63830
2063	Response to Question 1: No action - outboard motors to remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No action - Do not restrict Horsepower below 40 hp at jet on the river	7/31/2009	No			MO	63830
2064	Response to Question 1: I'm leaning toward alternative A, as it keeps the park the same & I enjoy it the way it's currently managed Response to Question 2: Alternative A Response to Question 3: Alternative C Response to Question 4: I am particularly concerned with Big Spring & Alley Mill & the festivals (Heritage Days & Haunting) that each hosts. Keep the Ozart heritage alive. Response to Question 5: Prohibit motor boats, limit hunting & promote more traditional music festivals in the park.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63141
2065	Response to Question 1: COMMENT: Whatever concessions are made now to development, motors, horses, will be the starting point when more concessions are requested next time. Response to Question 2: More primitive areas Response to Question 3: No further development - No more improved highways leading to river No engines on the water - certainly no more then now No ATVs No horses or at most on limited trails Response to Question 5: Enforce current statutes	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2066	Response to Question 1: Alternative A - I feel the river quality should be improved so it's better in 25 years than it is now. Some camping facilities eg permanent camp fire sites would be nice - even to Alt A. Pit toilets might help with sanitary abuse of river. A & B w strong leanings twd A. Response to Question 2: Limit ATV's & horses severely - if not eliminate completely Limit all motorized use - best case - totally non -motorized trail rides have gotten out of control & are inflicting terrible damage. Response to Question 3: No limits placed on commercial use. eg Commercial boat renters should be limited as to how many boats they can launch in a single day. Response to Question 4: Upper Jack's Fork - I like the way you are handling this area in all alternatives tho actually natural restrictions do it for you. Response to Question 5: Keep as primitive as possible with group "tours" to give access to those who need help - ie use "groups" to provide easier access w supervision at only certain times. Hope that makes sense!	6/26/2009	No			MO	65548
2067	Response to Question 1: I like A for the Jack's Fork as that is the river I am most familiar with having floated it for about 50 years. Please leave it as natural as possible as it is a unique and beautiful rive. I have seen it degraded in some ways (aquatic life and water quality) over this time span. The park service has eliminated a lot of the trash and made it safer for floating (-root wads, moved aside-etc.) Response to Question 3: Alternative C To allow private ownership along the Jack's Fork within the park itself would be horrible and destroy the unique character of the area. Response to Question 4: Yes, A is good for the Jacks Fork. It there were some way to limit the number of floaters on the weekend that would be good.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63130
2068	Response to Question 1: I PREFER ALTERNATIVE A WE SHOULD HAVE SOME PLACES (i.e. NATIONAL PARKS) WHERE YOU CAN GET PEACE AND QUIET Response to Question 2: NO MOTORBOATS Response to Question 3: THEY CAN USE MOTORBOATS ON LAKE OF THE OZARKS Response to Question 5: LETS KEEP THEM AS NATURAL AS POSSIBLE	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2069	Response to Question 1: Much prefer Alt. A, which helps to mitigate some of the damage that overuse of the riverways has experienced in the last 3 decades. I do like the small learning centers proposed for Alt. B. I'm a canoeist, with my own canoes that I don't generally take down to the Current on most weekends in the summer, too crowded. I would like to see a lot of the illegal accesses closed, horsepower be limited and horse (and their waste) managed a lot better Response to Question 2: See above - Horses should be controlled better. Horse power should not be considered at all above Round Spring at any time of year. Big Spring wilderness designation is a good idea, about time. Limit # of canoeist and tubers on summer weekends - no alternative addresses that. Response to Question 3: Don't consider Alt. C - please. Too much overdevelopment already. Don't just go with "No Action" either, we need less development & less conjection. Response to Question 4: More action on the horse management and waste control. More action items on closing illegal accesses, none of the alternatives address them adequately Response to Question 5: Need to rethink the overall strategy - we are overusing this resource to death. Spread out and limit camps near developed areas, reduce congestion, reduce large (drunken) party groups.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63146
2070	Response to Question 1: No. Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Log Yard, UPPER & Lower	6/26/2009	No			MO	63638
2071	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: No hp restrictions on jon boats Response to Question 4: Log Yard/Cardareva/Blue Springs/Paint Rock Areas	6/26/2009	No			MO	63638

2072	Response to Question 1: A - I feel strongly that we have Lake of the Ozarks for people who want motorized vehicles & recreational sports & bars for drinking. For those of us who want a more natural experience, we should preserve the experience of the Scenic Riverways Park. Younger people (I'm 58) don't have the opportunity to experience nature like I did. I believe that not experiencing old mature trees & the wonder of skies full of stars allows the kind of misuse of natural resources that has led to the environmental degradation we have today & the consequence of global warming. If you don't experience nature, you have no desire to protect it. You can't experience nature at 45 mph in a boat or in an ATV or with a cooler full of beer. A more primitive park experience might remind people that there is a plan better than man's and something greater than our own habits.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63105
2073	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. Need to restrict access to river - may need a permit system. Response to Question 2: Non-motorized transportation. Include Big Spring wilderness tract as wilderness. Restrict horses/equestrian uses on upper sections - at least down to Two River Natural zones should predominate Response to Question 3: Motorized boats should be restricted to lower section, of the Current River Response to Question 4: I was on the Jacks Fork recently and was struck by all the beautiful bluffs. Maybe it would be possible to develop some trails to get to the tops of these bluffs Response to Question 5: Really there should be a better visitors center maybe at Eminence or Two River. I have not been down to Van Buren but should probably go. Need more educational activities that would be off the river (natural history, geology, plants & animals)	6/26/2009	No			MO	63122
2074	Response to Question 1: YES. ALTERNATIVE A. I WOULD MODIFY IT BY ADDING SOME INTERPRETIVE & SOME LEARNING CENTERS FROM B. CREATION OF BIG SPRING AS A DESIGNATED WILDERNESS AREA IS VERY IMPORTANT TO ME. Response to Question 2: 1) RESTRICTING ACTIVITIES (HORSES, HORSEPOWER, LIQUOR, ETC) IN ORDER TO PRESERVE THIS NATIONAL TREASURE. 2) WILDERNESS DISTINCTION FOR BIG SPRING 3) INCREASING PRIMITIVE & NATURAL MANAGEMENT ZONES 4) ADDING SOME STRATEGIC INTERPRETIVE OPPORTUNITIES. 5) PRESERVING THIS PRISTINE PARK. Response to Question 3: ALMOST EVERYTHING IN "C" & "NO ACTION" Response to Question 4: WILDERNESS DISTINCTION FOR BIG SPRING AREA MAINTAIN & RETAIN INTEGRITY OF ROUND SPRINGS Response to Question 5: EDUCATE PEOPLE AS TO WHY RESTRICTIONS ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED AND COMMIT TO ENFORCEMENT. ADD MORE RANGERS.	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2075	Response to Question 1: I am most interested Alternative A. I am interested in their being more rangers in the park. Response to Question 2: I am most interested in the protection and use planning for Round Spring. Round Spring is the part of the park I am most interested in Response to Question 3: I like all parts of the preliminary alternatives in the future management of the natural riverways. Response to Question 4: I am most concerned about Round Spring. I think the alternatives address my concerns adequately Response to Question 5: I am most interested in always having in the future campfire talks.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63122
2076	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Just enforce current laws Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: Boat HP Restrictions Response to Question 4: Place emphasis on enforcing current restrictions!	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2077	Response to Question 1: No Action - we have way too much development, access to these areas should be limited for the sake of the planet, future generations. Educational activities would be good, but also controlled. Response to Question 2: Boats should be restricted in hp. Winter access should be controlled and limited. Response to Question 3: Horses should not be allowed too close to the water Response to Question 4: I've never been there, but I know it is beautiful, natural. Key word is natural and anothers is natural ecosystem. Response to Question 5: Thank You!	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2078	Response to Question 1: I think Alt. B is the best right now. There needs to be a balance btw. A & C, and I don't think No-Action is it. There needs to be limits on both ends. The park & rivers are not just for our recreation. Wild life must enjoy it too. We need to be able to enjoy it, but only to a certain extent. People are known for over indulging, so they must be regulated. Response to Question 2: Alt. B Response to Question 3: Alt. C Response to Question 4: No Alt. do not address my special place. I live on the Meramac River. If they limit your rivers, more will come to Meramac River & there are already enough. Response to Question 5: Supply trash bags & tell people not to liter. Threaten big fines!	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2079	Response to Question 1: No Action. No modifications, just enforce current laws! Response to Question 2: No-Action. Emphasis should be placed on enforcing current restrictions. Response to Question 3: Boat restrictions Response to Question 4: The current river is special from head waters to end. Emphasis should be placed on enforcing current restrictions in lieu of the alternatives.	6/29/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2080	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 2: -lower (lowest possible) horse power restrictions --making Big Springs a Wilderness designated area Response to Question 3: permitting horsepower on rivers allowing development of land Response to Question 4: Yes. Alt. A. does. Response to Question 5: I noticed a lack of bear proof trash cans in some campsites. It's possible these were national forest sites. If there are not all bear cans in the Riverways, there should be. Thx.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63143
2081	Response to Question 1: The closest alternative is A. I could see a change of some of the primitive to natural if it opens access to special sites: historic bldgs, caves, special water features. Response to Question 2: Limitations on motorized boats & the banning of motors on parts of the river in high use time. I feel that we should not have motorized boating on the Jack's Fork nor on the upper reaches of the Current, down to Round Springs. Response to Question 3: The movement to a large amount of Resource-Based Recreation as typified in Alternative C. There should be no more Development beyond what is present now. Response to Question 5: An emphasis on nature & the natural resources. An emphasis on the river as an example of what the river was historically, not an emphasis on trying to be all things to all people.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63121

2082	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. Further limit motor boats - certainly none above the Current - Jacks Fork confluence Response to Question 2: No off road vehicles in the park. Limit vehicle access to the river to every 6-8 miles. Response to Question 4: Upper Current (above Jacks Fork) and entire Jacks Fork should be free of motorized transport (except rangers).	6/26/2009	No			MO	63119
2083	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: NONE - No Action Response to Question 3: We should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limit on pump or motors. Response to Question 4: All of it is special - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river. Response to Question 5: Park Rangers should be seen on the River Get tougher on peopl trashing the River	7/31/2009	No			MS	38801
2084	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: NONE - No Action Response to Question 3: we should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limit on the pump on motors Response to Question 4: All of it is special - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river Response to Question 5: Park Ranger should be Seen on the river Get tougher on people trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			AL	36461
2085	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Should NOT be used. Response to Question 4: Use ALL of PARK	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2086	Response to Question 1: no action. Response to Question 2: none - no action. Response to Question 3: we should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limit on the pump on motors. Response to Question 4: All of it is special - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river Response to Question 5: Park rangers should be seen on the river Get tougher on people trashing the river	7/31/2009	No			AL	36445
2087	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: We should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No Limit on the pump on motors. Response to Question 4: All Nature is special. Leave it the way it is so everyone can enjoy all the land and river Response to Question 5: Park Rangers should be seen on the River. Get tougher on people trashing the river	7/31/2009	No			AL	36067
2088	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	61847
2089	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hrs power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63303
2090	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	61849
2091	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 H.P. at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63379
2092	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63379
2093	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horse Power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63379
2094	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 HP at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63379
2095	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the out put shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
2096	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 HP at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	63362
2097	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 HP at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	63362

2098	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the output shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
2099	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	62567
2100	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	62221
2101	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	62226
2102	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the output shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
2103	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
2104	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63629
2105	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: 40 HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
2106	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2107	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2108	Response to Question 1: No horse power Limit Response to Question 2: No horsepower Limit Response to Question 3: No horsepower Limit Response to Question 4: No horsepower Limit Response to Question 5: No horsepower Limit	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
2109	Response to Question 1: No Horsepower Limit Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Limit Response to Question 3: No Horsepower Limit Response to Question 4: No Horsepower Limit Response to Question 5: No Horsepower Limit	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
2110	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			NY	11758
2111	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			NY	11758
2112	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65401
2113	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the output shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560

2114	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65401
2115	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the Output Shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	63629
2116	Response to Question 1: No - Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: Van Buren, MO	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
2117	Response to Question 1: No - Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: Van Buren, MO	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
2118	Response to Question 1: No - Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: Van Buren, MO	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
2119	Response to Question 1: No action, Leave as is Leave 40 HP rating at the pump, (Not at the power head) Response to Question 4: More water patrol. More checks for drugs and alcohol and reckless and/or lewd behavior for boaters and canoeists.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63640
2120	Response to Question 1: No action, Leave as is Leave 40 H.P. rating at the pump (Not at the power head) Response to Question 4: More water patrol. More checks for drugs and alcohol and reckless and/or lewd behavior for boaters and canoeists.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63640
2121	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: alternatives a-b-c Response to Question 5: southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no-limit.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63841
2122	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern Edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit.	8/5/2009	No			FL	33913
2123	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern Edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit.	8/5/2009	No			FL	33913
2124	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63825
2125	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternative a-b-c. Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63825
2126	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no-limit.	8/5/2009	No			FL	33991
2127	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: NA Response to Question 3: NA Response to Question 4: NA Response to Question 5: Employ Local Residents to help manage & Keep them Full Time Evironment Clean & Safe.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63629
2128	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: NA Response to Question 3: NA Response to Question 4: NA Response to Question 5: Employ Local Residents to help manage & Keep them Full Time Evironment Clean & Safe.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65479
2129	Response to Question 1: 'Thank you.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63943

2130	Response to Question 1: Alt A Response to Question 2: No ATV's, horseback RIDING, motorboats	7/6/2009	No			MO	63129
2131	Response to Question 1: Alt A Response to Question 2: No ATVs, horseback Riding motorboats	7/6/2009	No			IL	62234
2132	Response to Question 1: Alt A Response to Question 2: No ATV's, horseback RIDING, or motorboats	7/6/2009	No			MO	63123
2133	Response to Question 1: No Change No-Action Response to Question 2: No Change No Action The trash on the river comes from the tubers not the boaters. If you don't believe this when the water is clean go out in a boat at the point where the spring enters the river and you can find All the trash that the floaters lose. You won't find this Anywhere else. Response to Question 3: No. Change No Action Regulation on horsepower is not a option that should even be considered. And Anyone that is not living in the Current River Area should not have a opinion of how the river is being used. Response to Question 4: from Big Springs to Clay Band should not be regulated on boat motors. As It is now this is the only place's for motors that are bigger than 40 hp and smaller than a shoal runner can enjoy being on the river. Response to Question 5: If you want to control the way people are conducting themselves on the river perhaps you could put out more water patrol. Not to harrass people but just to be seen would help.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63937
2134	Response to Question 1: No/Action Response to Question 2: no/action Response to Question 3: No/action Response to Question 4: No/action Response to Question 5: 40 hp at OUTPUT Shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62269
2135	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: ALL	7/31/2009	No			MO	64083
2136	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL	7/31/2009	No			MO	64053
2137	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2138	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2139	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/14/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2140	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: no-Action Response to Question 5: no-Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63937
2141	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63937
2142	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/14/2009	No			MO	63951
2143	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	6/30/2009	No			CA	94952
2144	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: No action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965

2145	Response to Question 1: No Action or unlimited Horse power	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
2146	Response to Question 1: No Action or unlimited Horse Power.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63601
2147	Response to Question 1: No action or unlimited horse power	8/5/2009	No			MO	63601
2148	Response to Question 1: No Action @ this time.	6/27/2009	No			FL	33967
2149	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free usage to the riverways for recreational purpose. Response to Question 3: restricted usage should NOT be made on the riverways. Response to Question 4: Use motors on the river like can be done now. Response to Question 5: horse trails away from people camping or picnicing. Not crossing the river on horseback.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2150	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: FREE Acess and Recretational Use Response to Question 3: Restrict Acess and Usage Response to Question 4: Our friends have 40 hp motors, and I feel they should be able to continue using that size motor. Response to Question 5: Restrooms and Trash Cans are two important items	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2151	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict Usage & Access Response to Question 4: I want to continue using my motor which is 40 Hp at the pump. Response to Question 5: A few more trash cans and restroom facilities.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2152	Response to Question 1: No action - rate horsepower at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: We need more road access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2153	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: Personal Comment Response to Question 5: More Recreationale Usage Facellities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2154	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Acess Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: Personal Comment Response to Question 5: More Recreational Usage Facilties	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2155	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: Personal Comment Response to Question 5: More Recreationl Usage Facilities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2156	Did not give responses to any of the questions,	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2157	Response to Question 1: TAKE-NO-ACTION	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2158	Response to Question 1: Take No Action	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2159	Response to Question 1: Take no action	8/12/2009	No			MO	63967
2160	Response to Question 1: Take no Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33904

2161	Response to Question 1: Take No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33904
2162	Response to Question 1: Take No Action.	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2163	Response to Question 1: Take No Action!	6/27/2009	No			FL	33913
2164	Response to Question 1: Take No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
2165	Response to Question 1: Take No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33919
2166	Response to Question 1: No Changes.	7/13/2009	No			MO	64064
2167	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE	8/4/2009	No			MO	63122
2168	Response to Question 1: No Change!	8/4/2009	No			MO	63122
2169	Response to Question 1: No Change	6/27/2009	No			FL	33919
2170	Response to Question 1: No Change	6/27/2009	No			MO	63960
2171	Response to Question 1: No Change	6/27/2009	No			MO	63960
2172	Response to Question 1: No Change.	6/27/2009	No			MI	48816
2173	Response to Question 1: no change	6/27/2009	No			MO	63960
2174	Response to Question 1: No Change	7/31/2009	No			MO	65466
2175	Response to Question 1: No Change.	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2176	Response to Question 1: No Change	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown

2177	Response to Question 1: No Change	8/5/2009	No			IL	62034
2178	Response to Question 1: No Change	8/4/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2179	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
2180	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs No limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63825
2181	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
2182	Response to Question 1: WITHOUT QUESTION I WOULD SUPPORT THE "NO-ACTION" ALTERNATIVE. I AM A TAX PAYER AND I ENJOY BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER. REDUCING HORSEPOWER AND ELIMINATING BOATING WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF VAN BUREN AND SURROUNDING AREAS. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: REDUCEDTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING. Response to Question 4: POWDER MILL (HWY 106) TO GOOSENECK. TWO OF THESE ALTERNATIVES (A & B) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH MY 40 HP MOTOR. ALSO I USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT I SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACCOMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS DURING THE SUMMER. Response to Question 5: 1. ELIMINATE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 2. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			IL	62298
2183	Response to Question 1: WITHOUT QUESTION I WOULD SUPPORT THE "NO-ACTION" ALTERNATIVE. I AM A TAX PAYER AND I ENJOY FISHING AND BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER. REDUCING HORSEPOWER AND ELIMINATING BOATING WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF VAN BUREN AND SURROUNDING AREAS, AS DISCOURAGED BOATERS WOULD NOT BE PURCHASING FUEL, GROCERIES, LODGING, BOATS, MOTORS, FISHING TACKLE OR EVEN PROPERTY. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: REDUCTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING Response to Question 4: POWDER MILL (HWY 106) TO GOOSNECK. TWO OF THESE ALTERNATIVES (A & B) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH MY CURRENT BOAT AND 40 H.P. MOTOR. ALSO I USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT I SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACOMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS DURING THE SUMMER. Response to Question 5: 1. ELIMINATE HORSPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAT TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 2. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP. 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			IL	62298
2184	Response to Question 1: WITHOUT QUESTION I WOULD SUPPORT THE "NO-ACTION" ALTERNATIVE AS I BELIEVE THE PRESENT USE IS NOT ONLY ADEQUATE, BUT THE WAY I PREFER IT. REDUCING BOAT HORSEPOWER AND OR ELIMINATING BOATING WOULD DISCOURAGE MANY PEOPLE WHO CURRENTLY USE THE RIVER AND WOULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON OUR SMALL TOWN'S ECONOMY WHEN CONSIDERING FUEL, GROCERIES, LODGING AND PURCHASING BOATS, MOTORS, PROPERTY ETC. ALSO I USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT I SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACCOMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS DURING THE SUMMER. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Responsse to Question 3: REDUCTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING. Response to Question 4: POWDER MILL TO GOOSENECK. TWO OF THE ALTERNATIVES (A & B) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH MY CURRENT BOAT AND 40 H.P. MOTOR. I HAVE BEEN USING A 40 H.P. JET MOTOR ON CURRENT RIVER FOR APPROXIMATELY 33 YEARS AND HAVE BEEN BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER FOR 48 YEARS. I ENJOY THIS RECREATION AND DO NOT WISH TO CHANGE IT NOW. Response to Question 5: 1. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP. 2. ELIMINATE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE VERY SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63965

2185	Response to Question 1: WITHOUT QUESTION I WOULD SUPPORT THE "NO-ACTION" ALTERNATIVE. I AM A TAX PAYER AND I ENJOY BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER. REDUCING HORSEPOWER AND ELIMINATING BOATING WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF VAN BUREN AND SURROUNDING AREAS. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: REDUCTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING. Response to Question 4: POWDER MILL (HWY 106) TO GOOSENECK. TWO OF THESE ALTERNATIVES (A & B) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH MY CURRENT BOAT AND 40 H.P. MOTOR. ALSO I USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT I SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACCOMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS DURING THE SUMMER. Response to Question 5: 1. ELIMINATE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 2. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP. 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63042
2186	Response to Question 1: I SUPPORT THE "NO-ACTION" ALTERNATIVE. I ENJOY BOATING AND FISHING ON CURRENT RIVER. REDUCING HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF VAN BUREN AND SURROUNDING AREAS. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: REDUCTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING. Response to Question 4: POWDERMILL (HWY 106) TO GOOSNECK. TWO OF THESE ALTERNATIVES (A & B) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH MY 40 H.P. MOTOR. WE ALSO USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACCOMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS A YEAR. Response to Question 5: 1. ELIMINATE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 2. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OOUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP. 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			IL	62298
2187	Response to Question 1: No action & motors remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: take No action & open 40 hp. limit area to No hp restriction in the gap between bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2188	Response to Question 1: No action & motors remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: take No action & open 40 hp. limit area to No hp restriction in the gap between bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2189	Response to Question 1: No action and motors remain 40 hp at Jet Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take no action and open 40 hp limit area to No hp restrictions in the gap between bridge & bridge Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63857
2190	Response to Question 1: No Action & motors remain 40 hp at Jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No action and open 40 hp linit area to No hp restrictions in th gap between bridge & bridge springs.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63857
2191	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION - Motors stay 40 HP at Jet Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: NO ACTION - open 40 Hp limit to NO Restriction in the Gap Between the Bridge and Big Springs.	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2192	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - Motors Remain 40 HP At Jet. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: None Response to Question 5: Take No Action - Open 40 HP limit from the Bridge to Big Springs to no Restrictins.	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2193	Response to Question 1: No Action - Motors Remain 40 HP At Jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: No Action - open the Gap from the Bridge to Big Springs to No HP Restrictions.	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2194	Response to Question 1: No Action Motors stay at 40 Hp At the Jet Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: No Action - Open the 40 Hp limit in the Gap between the Bridge on Big Springs to No restrictions	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2195	Response to Question 1: No Action - Motors stay at 40 HP at the Jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: No Action - open the 40 Hp restriction between the Bridge & Big Springs to No HP Restrictions.	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2196	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62550

2197	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: No Action. Response to Question 4: No. Response to Question 5: 40 hr. power at the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	61761
2198	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61761
2199	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the oup pt shaft	8/4/2009	No			IN	46235
2200	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61764
2201	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp @ the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62550
2202	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: 40 hp at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			KS	66062
2203	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp output at the shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62034
2204	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	65202
2205	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			AR	72761
2206	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			AR	72761
2207	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			AR	72761
2208	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	63385
2209	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	62401
2210	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	65560
2211	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	65560
2212	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62521

2213	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: 40 hp	8/4/2009	No			IL	62401
2214	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	63103
2215	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr. Power at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	64133
2216	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	60625
2217	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power @ the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	60625
2218	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61764
2219	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IN	46148
2220	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hour power @ the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IN	46235
2221	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62257
2222	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	61364
2223	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62255
2224	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: 40 HR POWER AT THE OUT PUT SHAFT	8/5/2009	No			IL	61607
2225	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			KS	66205
2226	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: 40 hr. power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	62260
2227	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62223
2228	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62034

2229	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower @ the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62257
2230	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: 40 hr. power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61364
2231	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr Power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61764
2232	Response to Question 1: No aAction Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	62243
2233	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			KS	66220
2234	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put	8/4/2009	No			KS	66061
2235	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61911
2236	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	62269
2237	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: 40 HR POWER AT the output SHAFT	8/12/2009	No			IL	61534
2238	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/12/2009	No			IL	61534
2239	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft	8/12/2009	No			IL	61534
2240	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: 40 HR POWER AT THE OUT PUT SHAFT	8/5/2009	No			IL	61747
2241	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hrs. power at the out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			IL	61747
2242	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the output shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	63459
2243	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: 40 hr. power at the output shaft.	8/5/2009	No			IL	61604
2244	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr power at the out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			IL	61611

2245	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr. power at the out put shaft.	8/4/2009	No			IL	61611
2246	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	63044
2247	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	65560
2248	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61733
2249	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: No action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
2250	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63071
2251	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/8/2009	No			MO	63011
2252	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: NO ACTION	7/31/2009	No			MO	65711
2253	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: No action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
2254	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: No action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
2255	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
2256	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
2257	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63664
2258	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63630
2259	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63630
2260	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2309	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/24/2009	No			MO	63881
2310	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/24/2009	No			MO	63845
2311	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/24/2009	No			MO	63630
2312	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65548
2313	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65479
2314	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: no action Response to Question 5: no action	7/16/2009	No			MO	63965
2315	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2316	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2317	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
2318	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MS	63638
2319	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MS	63901
2320	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63944
2321	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MS	63940
2322	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			TX	76036
2323	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2324	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	64011

2325	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			TX	76036
2326	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2327	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			TX	79070
2328	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
2329	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438
2330	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			TX	79070
2331	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MS	65588
2332	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	64831
2333	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65588
2334	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
2335	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
2336	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
2337	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
2338	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65588
2339	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438
2340	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			AR	71742

2341	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2342	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
2343	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2344	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
2345	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MS	63633
2346	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2347	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/20/2009	No			MT	63633
2348	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63633
2349	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
2350	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
2351	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
2352	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
2353	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
2354	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	63943
2355	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65619
2356	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65809

2357	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63965
2358	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/7/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2359	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63937
2360	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65658
2361	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63629
2362	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63654
2363	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/16/2009	No			MO	65466
2364	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/7/2009	No			NV	63965
2365	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63620
2366	Response to Question 1: No Action!!	7/7/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2367	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63620
2368	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2369	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2370	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63640
2371	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63640
2372	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63640

2373	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63965
2374	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	63128
2375	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	63128
2376	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65738
2377	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	63633
2378	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2379	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2380	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2381	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2382	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2383	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/24/2009	No			MO	65775
2384	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/24/2009	No			MO	65775
2385	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	Unknown
2386	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65742
2387	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	63960
2388	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65807

2389	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65617
2390	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65612
2391	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			WY	82327
2392	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2393	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63629
2394	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63849
2395	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65802
2396	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			IA	50315
2397	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65803
2398	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			AR	71964
2399	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63935
2400	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			AR	71601
2401	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			IL	62849
2402	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2403	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965
2404	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965

2405	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2406	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2407	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2408	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2409	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63654
2410	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			KY	42086
2411	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2412	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33908
2413	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2414	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MS	63940
2415	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
2416	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			AR	71742
2417	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65802
2418	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65644
2419	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65479
2420	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			MO	65438

2421	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
2422	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			MO	65438
2423	Response to Question 1: No Action!	6/25/2009	No			MO	65438
2424	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/25/2009	No			MO	65438
2425	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65438
2426	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65438
2427	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65804
2428	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65438
2429	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65775
2430	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2431	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63957
2432	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			WY	82327
2433	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65613
2434	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/28/2009	No			MO	63965
2435	Response to Question 1: No Action!	8/12/2009	No			MO	65065
2436	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65438

2437	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65438
2438	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/12/2009	No			MO	65438
2439	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65548
2440	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
2441	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/8/2009	No			MO	63638
2442	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MS	65742
2443	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65742
2444	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65802
2445	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65753
2446	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
2447	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63665
2448	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2449	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2450	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
2451	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
2452	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65806

2453	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65803
2454	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65806
2455	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2456	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
2457	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
2458	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63801
2459	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63834
2460	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63834
2461	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63801
2462	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63801
2463	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63353
2464	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63353
2465	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63459
2466	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	65738
2467	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33050
2468	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	Unknown

2469	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2470	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2471	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2472	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63801
2473	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2474	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2475	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63953
2476	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
2477	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810
2478	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	Unknown
2479	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65807
2480	Response to Question 1: No Action!!!	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810
2481	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810
2482	Response to Question 1: No Action!!!	7/31/2009	No			MO	65616
2483	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810
2484	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810

2485	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/13/2009	No			MO	63965
2486	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/24/2009	No			MO	63629
2487	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
2488	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
2489	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
2490	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
2491	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
2492	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63960
2493	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33908
2494	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33990
2495	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33876
2496	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841
2497	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			AR	72404
2498	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2499	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2500	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63841

2501	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			AR	72404
2502	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65202
2503	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65202
2504	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65807
2505	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65349
2506	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63965
2507	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63825
2508	Response to Question 1: No Actions	6/22/2009	No			MO	65588
2509	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2510	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
2511	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
2512	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
2513	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2514	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2515	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
2516	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084

2517	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2518	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	64012
2519	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2520	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2521	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65360
2522	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65037
2523	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2524	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2525	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65725
2526	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65725
2527	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65802
2528	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65588
2529	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			OH	45243
2530	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65804
2531	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65738
2532	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638

2533	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/8/2009	No			MO	63638
2534	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63943
2535	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63957
2536	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2537	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2538	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2539	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2540	Response to Question 1: No Action!	8/4/2009	No			MO	65725
2541	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63640
2542	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2543	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65588
2544	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			IL	62859
2545	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			IL	60437
2546	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63869
2547	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
2548	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638

2549	Response to Question 1: No Action!	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2550	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2551	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2552	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63353
2553	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2554	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
2555	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
2556	<p>Sir, Please consider the following as the comments of the Missouri Clean Water Campaign on the Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Missouri Clean Water Campaign of the National Sierra Club is primarily concerned with clean and uncontaminated water in our state's rivers, streams, and lakes, therefore our comments will focus on Water Quality, however, we do have several general concerns, and wish to enumerate those: -Off-road Vehicles (ORVs) and in particular, four-wheel and three-wheel All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should not be allowed in the lands or water of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Violators should be subjected to heavy fines and penalties. Second offenses should result of confiscation of the offender's vehicle. ORVs and ATVs are damaging to the landscape and to solitude. -Illegal roads and trails should be closed and obliterated. Preserve and Protect were the key words in the enabling legislation - illegal roads and trails violate that edict. -Gasoline-powered engines (outboard motors, jet pumps, etc.) should be prohibited in the waters of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. The engines are polluting, noisy and dangerous. While the enabling legislation allows for the use of outboard engines, the National Park Service is also authorized to limit or prohibit such use for good cause. The type of outboard motors on current boats was not envisioned in 1964. In general, we prefer Alternative A, as the "low-impact" alternative. However, there is one serious omission in Alternative A that calls out for redress: the Jacks Fork River is impaired for Whole Body Contact Recreation (WBCR) or as phrased by the federal Clean Water Act for "recreation in and on the water". The Jacks Fork River has been on the 303(d)Impaired Waterbody list since 1998. That is 11 years of contamination for a stream that is afforded the very highest Water Quality Standards. The Code of State Regulations (CSR10-20.7) designates the Jacks Fork as an Outstanding National Resource Waters. The Jacks Fork is impaired for WBCR within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is an embarrassment and a national disgrace that this is allowed to continue. The United State Geological Survey (USGS) has identified several causes of impairment the sole remaining one is HORSE MANURE, which was identified by the USGS as the primary cause of impairment. The National Park Service (NPS) has installed pit toilets, Circle B campground uses the waste-water treatment facility of Eminence, state matching funds have been afforded to upgrade failing on-site septic systems, the ONLY remaining source of E. Coli bacteria is horses and horse manure. It is high time that the National Park Service addressed this issue head on. There are several solutions that should be tried on an escalating basis: 1) Move horse trails away from the Jacks Fork and limit the number of crossings, 2) Limit the number of horses that can be stabled and ridden, and 3) Failing all else, prohibit horse use within the watershed of the Jacks Fork River. It is intolerable - and likely illegal - to allow the problem of contamination by harmful bacteria to continue. The NPS is responsible for managing the Jacks Fork River and steps must be taken to ensure clean water and public health.</p>	8/1/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65203
2557	<p>Sir, Please consider the following as the comments of the Missouri Clean Water Campaign on the Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Missouri Clean Water Campaign of the National Sierra Club is primarily concerned with clean and uncontaminated water in our state's rivers, streams, and lakes, therefore our comments will focus on Water Quality, however, we do have several general concerns, and wish to enumerate those: -Off-road Vehicles (ORVs) and in particular, four-wheel and three-wheel All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should not be allowed in the lands or water of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Violators should be subjected to heavy fines and penalties. Second offenses should result of confiscation of the offender's vehicle. ORVs and ATVs are damaging to the landscape and to solitude. -Illegal roads and trails should be closed and obliterated. Preserve and Protect were the key words in the enabling legislation - illegal roads and trails violate that edict. -Gasoline-powered engines (outboard motors, jet pumps, etc.) should be prohibited in the waters of the Jacks Fork and</p>	8/1/2009	No		Sierra Club	MO	65203

	<p>Current Rivers. The engines are polluting, noisy and dangerous. While the enabling legislation allows for the use of outboard engines, the National Park Service is also authorized to limit or prohibit such use for good cause. The type of outboard motors on current boats was not envisioned in 1964. In general, we prefer Alternative A, as the "low-impact" alternative. However, there is one serious omission in Alternative A that calls out for redress: the Jacks Fork River is impaired for Whole Body Contact Recreation (WBCR) or as phrased by the federal Clean Water Act for "recreation in and on the water". The Jacks Fork River has been on the 303(d)Impaired Waterbody list since 1998. That is 11 years of contamination for a stream that is afforded the very highest Water Quality Standards. The Code of State Regulations (CSR10-20.7) designates the Jacks Fork as an Outstanding National Resource Waters. The Jacks Fork is impaired for WBCR within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is an embarrassment and a national disgrace that this is allowed to continue. The United State Geological Survey (USGS) has identified several causes of impairment the sole remaining one is HORSE MANURE, which was identified by the USGS as the primary cause of impairment. The National Park Service (NPS) has installed pit toilets, Circle B campground uses the waste-water treatment facility of Eminence, state matching funds have been afforded to upgrade failing on-site septic systems, the ONLY remaining source of E. Coli bacteria is horses and horse manure. It is high time that the National Park Service addressed this issue head on. There are several solutions that should be tried on an escalating basis: 1) Move horse trails away from the Jacks Fork and limit the number of crossings, 2) Limit the number of horses that can be stabled and ridden, and 3) Failing all else, prohibit horse use within the watershed of the Jacks Fork River. It is intolerable - and likely illegal - to allow the problem of contamination by harmful bacteria to continue. The NPS is responsible for managing the Jacks Fork River and steps must be taken to ensure clean water and public health.</p>					
2558	<p>1. The no action is close to my idea of the best action. I am in favor of leaving the current horsepower limitations as they stand which includes the 60/40 output regulation. My ideal plan would not put further restrictions on the use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. 2. Educational opportunity including demonstrations that used to take place, but not limited to just demonstrations. Any additional demonstrations showing our Ozark culture such as john boat building, quilting, sorghum mills should be added as a continual summer activity. One festival a year is admirable but misses a large percentage of visitors thereby, in large part, missing the goal giving visitors the opportunity to learn about our culture and history. 3. I strongly oppose any further restrictions on uses of the OSNR through designation as a "wilderness" area or by single limitations such as horse power limitations. Has thought been given to where people with motorboats would go to enjoy the river? Would they not start using areas like the Van Buren gap? This would only create crowding whereas these particular populations of people now go to locations to avoid congested areas. It seems as though a natural selection, if you will, has occurred to areas of the river being used with the common sense of those using the river on a regular basis. 4. The Lower Current River area is the place I frequent the most including the Big Spring Park. I strongly disagree with any further limitations, specifically horsepower limits. The No Action plan is the only current option that would not diminish the use in this area in some way. I could not see any reason in the General Management Plan document that would indicate any reason for making changes from the use of the river. 5. I feel that the NPS should strive to make certain that everyone they come in contact with come away with the feeling they were treated as a guest and they had a great experience here and want to come back. This includes locals and visitors. This can be accomplished through education and prevention before people are on the river. One positive activity that I have witnessed is having a Park Service employee at put in points. Floaters were given last minute instructions concerning what they should prevent and this was also the first line of defense for someone that had consumed too much alcohol to be on the river. This is a great approach. Other thoughts: In the past several years, many people have purchased property for the sole purpose of retiring and enjoying the river. Many of the properties are in the Van Buren area and along the river. This has been a much needed boost to our economy. Any change in the current regulations that would diminish the use of the Current River would be a detriment to property sales of this kind and therefore the economy. Please consider the fact that many boaters help floaters during the summer by taking them back to their designated take out point, rescue them from obstacles, or simply give information and take part in conversations about our area. In addition, boaters are continually picking up trash while on the river and especially after the summer season is over. Since the boat concessions were closed at Big Spring Park several years ago many visitors have lost the opportunity to experience boating on this beautiful river. Every year a handful of people might get this chance when a boater offers a ride just so folks can enjoy the river through boating. What would it take to put the boat concession back into operation? One of the most memorable events in my life was being able to form a friendship with someone from Czechoslovakia. The couple floated and camped and we struck up a conversation while on the river bank. The next morning we drove them back to Alley Spring so the gentleman didn't have to hitch hike from Big Spring. Letters were exchanged for several years after that river experience. If some of the proposed limitations had been in place, that friendship and cultural exchange would never have taken place. A possible suggestion for park and river users might be a short informative workshop on floating the current and even information about motorized boats. Better understanding of how these boats work and maybe some pointers on floating would make the trip more enjoyable for all. Thank you for your time.</p>	6/22/2009	No		MO	63965
2559	<p>Dear Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I grew up on the Jack's Fork River from the time I was seven years old. I lived next to it in the woods and my family visited almost every day for the summer every year. The river was my life, I played with friends there and I have countless memories of canoeing down the Jack's Fork and enjoying an area of the river that we reached from our private road, which was supposed to be completely inaccessible to others. Our favorite spot on the river was right across from Jam Up Cave, where you could constantly feel cool breezes flowing from even in the heat of the summer. There is a beautiful bluff upriver from the cave, and at night when the sky is a dark blue and there aren't many stars, you can see thousands of fireflies that dot the bluff, which rises up like a pitch black curtain with jagged edges at the top, reaching to the sky. It is absolutely one of the most beautiful things I have ever seen, and I will treasure it forever. The ages 7-13 for a child are very important and influential years, and living next to the Jacks Fork River is the best place I can imagine to spend those years. I wouldn't have had it any other way. Unfortunately, there were eventually people that discovered our private road and accessed it from Hwy 0, and would drive their big trucks and</p>	7/17/2009	No	First United Methodist Church of Webster Groves	MO	63119

	ATV's down it to the river. People left trash on our road and all along the riverbanks. There was especially a lot of solid human waste and toilet paper absolutely EVERYWHERE. People would build fires and leave their beer cans in the burned debris. Piercing out the peaceful natural quiet of the river would be an occasional ATV driving around across the river just behind the trees. They would disturb wildlife and create bad erosion that would fall into the river and cause unnatural damage. I'm sure many people can agree that there is almost nothing worse than canoeing with your family and having a wonderful time until a bottle or can floats by, or you come across a riverbank that you can't even stop at to enjoy a break because it is so heavily littered. There are so many things that can so easily disrupt the incredible beauty of the Jack's Fork river, or any river. And the things I have described here don't only happen near Jam Up cave, or where I used to live, it happens everywhere, and many people who live in this area or who have even ever enjoyed the Jack's Fork have similar concerns that I do. I urge you to take action and make stricter regulations on A'TV's, dirt bikes and other vehicles that disturb the rivers natural beauty and annoy families enjoying it. I have written this letter with the hope that many others write ones like it, and if they don't, you should be sure that even if people aren't writing you about it, there are hundreds of people out there who feel the exact same way I do. Thank you for taking care of our magnificent river and I hope you will continue to for many more years.						
2560	<p>Dear Sir: I would like to take this opportunity to express my comments regarding possible changes to the public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My comments primarily pertain to the Cedar Grove-Akers Ferry (and up the river towards Baptist Camp) area and the Eminence...Shawnee area. I am a member of the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, and the Natural Resources Defense Council. I have been a member of a Stream Team and have assisted in measuring water quality in both the Jack's Fork and the Current. I have followed and continue to follow the efforts to address the decline in the Ozark Hellbender, I am greatly concerned about the overall decline in frogs and bats, and I recognize that the Current River is home to many endangered and threatened species. I am also an avid trail rider. I do most of my trail riding in the Cedar Grove area and on the trails so nicely maintained at the Shawnee staging area in Eminence. I can hardly describe what the privilege of riding in the Cedar Grove area has meant to me. I have been blessed to ride there through all the seasons and to enjoy the renewing energy I get every spring watching the dogwoods, red buds and new flowers bloom and enjoying the progression of the flowers blooming throughout the Spring.... I have had the privilege of seeing wildlife from the mighty to the small and so many in between... I have had my appreciation for the vulture renewed..... I have been able to watch the circle of life, And I've seen the damage that nature can do.. (I also hear that as an excuse for riders doing whatever they want...that horses will never do as much damage as Mother nature. .you need to get out more info that shows that often damage by man with or without horses, is different than Mother Nature) Watching the eagles has been particularly moving for me as I grew up in a time when they were about to become extinct. I marvel each time I see one because without efforts of many people there would not be any for me to see today except maybe in a zoo or Alaska. I would hate to think that the Ozark Hellbender will become extinct....even though I've never seen one in the wild, and doubt that I ever will (which of course makes it much harder to get people excited about saving it). So I have a great appreciation for the efforts of environmentalists, but I also want to be able to enjoy the fruits of their (and my) efforts. The only way I am able to do this is by horse back. I am physically unable to canoe and to get to my favorite places (particularly at Cedar Grove) you have to cross the water and that makes hiking quite difficult. And I do get to see and enjoy things by horse back I would not by floating or hiking. Being able to ride along the trails truly renews my soul. I have been unable to get any specifics regarding what is being proposed for horse back riding in these areas. Rumors run rampant that "you" are going to close all the trails, or that "you" are going to charge a \$10.00 per day user fee. Due to previous obligations I was unable to attend the public meetings. People that I spoke with that did attend were unable to give me any clear proposals, so I can't say if I favor no changes, plan A, plan B or whatever, so I will just submit my comments and you can fit them into whichever proposal they fall into. I probably spend more time riding at Cedar Grove than most other riders. I am there often two or three times per week except during the hot months. So I feel that I have a lot invested in what happens to the trails and I have a good feel for what the riders do. Sometimes on a weekend there will be several trailers there...the most I've ever seen is 8. Over the course of a year, it is most common for me to be riding by myself or with one or two other people. So the damage that is done by the "locals" that trail ride is somewhat minimal. It is not uncommon for me to see considerably more damage done by floaters who leave cans, fire crackers, trash whatever, in their campsites along the river. I make an effort to do a trash pick up at least once every 10 rides. I'll only pick up cans or plastic bottles (not the toilet paper left by floaters). I've never heard people talk about wanting new trails...the ones there are fine (well, we'd all like a trail that goes past Akers to Eminence! Or from Alley up to Bay Creek!). The riders that come to Big Creek and Whispering Pines that I have encountered have all been very respectful of the land. I have encountered some riders at Eminence while Cross Country is having trail rides that show some disregard for rules about staying on trails etc, but because of the sheer number of riders at Cross County there are bound to be ones there that tend to do as they please. And the ones I've encountered may not even be with the trail rides. Most of them I've encountered have been very respectful. I don't think it's fair that all riders get banned from riding in this area because of what a few riders do. So I would very much like to see things remain the same at Cedar Grove, that is keeping the trails along the river open (and clear so riders don't make new trails around downed trees etc), and I hope that the tails at Shawnee can be kept open as well (it would be nice if there could be some kind of limit on where such large numbers of people ride...like if they could just ride on the roads, but that makes it hard to get to the best trails...I don't want to see everything turned into the type of riding now available at Angeline...that's wonderful, but a nice trail in the woods is also wonderful). The organized rides at Eminence and Big Creek provide a wonderful opportunity for people of limited means to enjoy the river...other self contained rides such as Panther Creek or Golden Hills don't offer the public the same opportunity to enjoy the beautiful rivers, or to understand and appreciate what our National Park system is all about. If we don't allow people to see and appreciate the beauty of the rivers, eventually there will be no support for anything to help maintain the environments there. Perhaps, if worse came to worse, you could make people buy an America the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands annual pass. I am on a very limited income but I would be willing to do that. It would be helpful if you could continue to post fliers about the Ozark Hellbender and other endangered to threatened species (print lots..I know people just seem to tear them down). It is critical that our national lands be as accessible as possible and unless the horse back</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	65464

	riding at the Cedar Grove area was to increase dramatically, there is no reason to put limits on it now) If there are trails or logging roads that may damage the breeding/living areas of these animals or other endangered or threatened, make new trails and put information out about why the old trail should not be used. I think it would be fairly easy to get a list of horse back riders and maybe hike who would be willing to work on such trails (or help clear trails after storms like the one we had in May). I do think any motor boats on the Jacks Fork or from Montauk down to at least Akers are not good for the river. As a floater or a rider, I really find them distracting and annoying, and especially when the river is low, they can't be good for the flora and fauna. I do want to commend the Park Service for all they have done in the past couple of years to make being on or near the rivers much more enjoyable...the drinking, profanity, nudity and noise is way down, and I almost feel comfortable bringing my family for a float trip and not fearing it would be ruined by those things. All of the Park Service staff I encounter have been very polite, professional, friendly and helpful. They have a very difficult job and they do it well. So, in short, just leave things the way they are except get floaters to NOT leave toilet paper arou					
2561	Subject : Ozark National Scenic Riverways/NPS Plan Input Dear ONSR/National Park Service I was a Park Aid at Van Buren in 1976, for a summer, and learned much and had a lot of fun. I have lived outside Willow Springs on the land my husband was born on for the past 40 years. I have spent a number of years working to prevent the lead industry from moving further south into the Eleven Point watershed, among other things. I love the Park Service and the park system, but I am very sad about what has happened to ONSR. I am well aware of the history of agency/local folk interaction regarding 1government lands. The unfortunate situation that evolved when the Eleven Point lands were-acquired by the US Forest Service has left a legacy that 1lives on with new generations of residents, native born and those migrating in. My first involvement with agencies as a landowner surrounded on 3 sides by the Forest Service centered around a proposed Willow Springs Unit Plan management document USFS released in the early 170's, and a visitor from Oregon county Mo., was present a the first citizen gathering who made sure to give us first hand accounts of much of the rancorous doin's at the time of 11 Point acquisitions in 11 Point counties. Nonetheless, despite the attitudes that linger, it is extremely important that at this critical point NPS fulfills its essential role as protector of the resource. It is just nuts to do otherwise. Early on with the advent of trail rides citizens knew that without limits on the numbers, the rivers were possibly doomed. It was disheartening when the trail rides situation was ignored early on despite feedback/efforts from concerned citizens to call attention to the potential problems til it has become extremely difficult to do anything about it. It was NOT rocket science, and now we all know without doubt that protecting water and habitat is a Big Deal, and a bigger deal than the profits of persons will have a gold mine going, granted....but they need to take it to the bank and back off. I am with atv issues as per Willow Springs unit of the Mark Twain National Forest, having endured much illegal trespass on our land, and in eastern Missouri when landowners succeeded in curtailing expansion of the Potosi District ATV trails. The fact that often the only pro expansion persons at the meetings were the atv dealers from St. Louis etc., bespoke one reason for the positive conclusion of that situation. Atvs are an incompatible use with many, many settings, and should be kept elsewhere, away from waters, out of the woods. Always. Certainly they need a designated place and for sure, law enforcement willing to spend time ticketing. It can be a very effective deterrent if the agency is determined to implement it consistently over time. I know that things change with the political world and agencies. I have been happy with the response of the ONSR, and the National Park Service at the national level when we were dealing with lead industry proposals to move into protected watersheds....hopefully the opportunity now exists once more when you will be able to take the situation at hand and live up to your mandates and restore the rivers and protect them the way most of us in the state have envisioned for years. Please be forthright and brave. Close down the illegal entries, regulate numbers, require identification of users, absolutely, (horses, atv's canoes) and prosecute the transgressors, re-train the users. If hiding on the banks with binocs worked to get rid of dopers on the rivers, so be it....but add friendly patrols. There MUST be lower limits on jet boats....tho of course some of us will never get over any noise being tolerated on the river at all....sigh. (Just an aside) Educate the politicians. (Another big fat sigh...but science is on your side. Reality is on the side of river/water first, humans next in line after..well...on and on) Other places here and abroad must make reservations/take a number etc on public land, and we can learn to do it as well should it become necessary. But tearing stuff up has just gotta be history. I hope you will consider wilderness proposal for Big Spring. I know your mandate is (or was) essentially no managemet to speak of, but an official designation would seem to be. PLEASE enforce easements! What a shock that you have not! What on earth will happen to this essential tool for citizens to protect lands that deserve it, the conserVation easement, if agencies openly disregard them? It is no skin off the agency nose to train citizens in a sense...by following their own demands/rules, constraints/laws in this case vs training them to disregard regulations/laws. I think the alternatives are a little nebulous, not enough detail, and not enough difference to warrant alternativeness....looks to me like a and b are more or less the same, and in any event should be combined, and executed as one action. Which I favor. Both. Seems to me also that the large color mailing is great but in terms of ease of using as a potential respondent/participator, difficult...tho there may never be a perfect document. Etc. Hoping for a gutsy NPS re-do of our beloved Riverways....toward the wilderness end vs playground...we have so many playgrounds, and so little unspoiled natural land left. The Current and Jack's Fork are terribly special, and must have the BEST stewardship ever. The recent past years can be remedied, if NPS has the will. I suspect that the huge campaigns to keep the rivers undammed (Eleven Point as well) is lost to memory til someone goes down to U of Arkansas and digs out the papers given to the University at Fayetteville by the citizen group that spearheaded the effort. Perhaps that pile of paper can be added, to by those who determine to continue that effort at this time. National Park Service, you are about to get a big PR boost on public television these weks of August, 2009. Use it. Come out strong for ONSR, and live up to your calling/mandate, gut up and put energy into the Ozarks!	8/3/2009	No		MO	65793
2562	Subject: General Management Plan / Wilderness Study Ozark National Scenic Riverways Dear folks, Thanks for allowing us to comment on this important management process. On behalf of the Ozark Society, we would like to support Alternative A with additions below. The Ozark Society was the main driving force in protecting the Buffalo River in Arkansas from being dammed. It continues to partner with the National Park Service (NPS) on management and care of the resource. We feel the NPS values the Ozark Society's input. While the management is not perfect, the NPS does a good job of balancing recreation with preserving the resource for future generations. I think the Ozark National Scenic Riverways could	8/5/2009	No		Conservation Chair Ozark Society	AR 72118

	<p>learn from the management practices used on the BNR. The main point the Ozark Society would like to get across is that management and protection of the resource should come first. Users groups should put aside their agenda and focus on the long term health of the rivers and watersheds. Management of the rivers is not just about public opinion and recreation. Recommended modifications to Alternative A: Determine and set the carrying capacity of the river and backcountry o Start monitoring to back it up o Set zones of recreation use Declare a limited number of access points o Close the rest at park boundaries and rehab the roads o Stop all car camping on the gravel bars Limit the number of canoes on the river Rental and Private o Implement a permit system when needed Limit the size of parking areas Limit the size of campgrounds Limit the number of miles and usage of trails Provide more education on park rules Provide more enforcement of park rules o Rangers need to be on the river and in backcountry Designate more areas as wilderness, roadless and primitive Recreational motorized boats no longer have a place on a National Scenic River o Use boats for enforcement and rescue only The Buffalo National River is starting revision of their management plan. The ONSR should partner with the BNR for the best management of the whole Ozark region. Please keep us informed on the progress of the management plan and anything we can do to help. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.</p>						
2563	<p>SAVE & PROTECT THE CURRENT & JACKS FORK The National Park Service's Alternative "A" is the most promising of their proposals. However the following criteria for safeguarding the Rivers must be included: Restore the degraded natural conditions on the riverways by closing the excess of river access points and restore the banks of the rivers to their native vegetative cover Redesign the horse trails so they are set back from rivers, creeks and sink holes to alleviate the pollution problems Reduce the number of equestrian river crossings Bann the operation of ATV's, dirt bikes and similar recreational vehicles from the Park Restrict mobile camper units to official appropriate park campgrounds Designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park, a 3,400 acre primitive area, as a National Wilderness Area Implement a float permit system during heavy periods of River usage to avoid overcrowding Enforce effective noise control measures Prohibit the use of power boats throughout the Park I wish to thank the Park Service personnel responsible for the well-being of these Rivers, the Governor in charge of safeguarding Missouri's treasures, and the Senators and Congressmen who not only represent the people of our state but also who must be responsible for maintaining the natural beauty encompassing Missouri's waterways and surrounding land.</p>	7/24/2009	No			MO	63122
2564	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The ONSR is a valued natural treasure which provides many management challenges. We hope our comments will help in the preparation of a management plan that rises to those challenges. We are providing input on behalf of the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club is a national conservation organization founded in 1892 and dedicated to the preservation, protection and enjoyment of our natural resources. The Sierra Club has a membership of nearly 650,000 with approximately 8000 in Missouri. We value the OSNR for the resource it provides to all citizens, including of course Missourians for which it holds special significance. As the NPS works with public input to develop a management plan, we hope that the primary purposes of the National Park System and the OSNR in particular are kept foremost in mind as stated in the 1916 Organic Act: The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. (U.S.C., title 16, sec. 1.) And as stated specifically in the 1964 act creating the ONSR: For the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources.... We know that the NPS is dedicated to these principles. But many of the current conditions in the ONSR reflect a failure to apply them rigorously to on the ground day to day management. Cumulatively those shortcomings have taken a toll. At the same time we note that the NPS has taken meaningful steps to address some contemporary issues, such as the Park's efforts to deal with rowdy behavior on the river. We hope that through the development of a new management plan the NPS and the public reaffirm that the future of the ONSR will be managed in accordance with its original principles. Through that effort the best options for protection of the natural resource and best opportunities for enjoyment of those resources will emerge. It is in that spirit that we offer our observations and recommendations in the following areas. WATER QUALITY The Current and Jacks Fork rivers are also listed as Outstanding National Resource Waters. That status along with designation as part of the country's Natural Scenic Riverways system should insure that high water quality in these waters is maintained and protected. Families who swim, inner tube, canoe or boat in these rivers deserve to know that the waters are clean enough for recreation. Unfortunately that has not always been the case. In fact a portion of the Jacks Fork has been classified as an "impaired waterbody" through a mechanism of the Clean Water Act. The ONSR management plan needs to include aggressive steps to restore and protect water quality. This should be acknowledged as a fundamental and critical goal. Management cannot be considered a success unless water quality standards are met. At the same time not all factors impacting water quality are under direct control of the NPS. But significant sources of poor quality are. Studies have indicated that horses contribute significantly to river contamination. The new management plan should take steps to provide for the following options: 1. Move riding trails further from the river and minimize stream crossings. 2. Limit the number of horses on the river. Even with limited stream crossings and trail adjustments, large trails rides may be more than the system can handle. 3. Include a commitment to water quality testing to measure outcomes of policy changes In summary, the new management plan needs to include a clear commitment to greatly reducing the impact on water quality from equestrian use. The plan needs to clearly give the NPS authority to take measures as outlined above to achieve that goal. Equestrian recreation is appropriate on the ONSR, but it must be conducted in a manner that does not harm the stream environment or create a health hazard for other recreationists As with all management activities, the NPS should include input from the public on details regarding achievement of this goal, so that the ONSR can boast of both high water quality and opportunities for equestrian recreation. Equestrian recreation is not the only activity on the</p>	8/6/2009	No		MO Chapter of the Sierra Club	MO	63143

	<p>ONSR that impacts water quality, but it is the most significant source within the NPS jurisdiction. Other activities such as controlling off road vehicle use, motor boating and sheer numbers of canoeists also have an impact. We encourage the NPS to keep water quality objectives in mind when managing any facet of the ONSR. ROADS, TRAILS AND ACCESS POINTS A well managed system of roads, trails and river access points is important to providing safe and satisfying recreation opportunities along the river. Originally the ONSR was envisioned to include 18- 20 access points. It now holds 25 official access points but up to as many as 100 if unauthorized access points are included. Those unauthorized access points are many times linked with an unauthorized road or trail. Unauthorized access points contribute to stream bank erosion, and impair stream habitats. In addition they provide a point of entry for off road vehicle use. It is important that these unauthorized access points be closed. The access point system should be evaluated for spacing (longer and shorter runs) and for safety. Some current unauthorized access points, where linked with an authorized road, may be candidates for inclusion in the system of legitimated points. But inclusion should be considered only after careful evaluation of the need, placement, ecological impacts and maintenance requirements. The present, out of control, situation must change and the number of access points be significantly reduced. The same evaluation needs to be applied to unauthorized roads and trails. Trail expansion or relocation needs to develop through a process of environmental evaluation and public input. So called "user designated" trails or roads should have no place in the ONSR. The new management plan should directly address the issue of unauthorized access points, roads and trails and include a commitment and schedule to achieve the above objectives. The original vision for the ONSR of natural flowing streams, with a largely uninterrupted natural riverbank should guide the plan. OFF ROAD VEHICLES The use of off road vehicles of all types unfortunately mars the visit of many recreationists along the ONSR. Their presence off road in campgrounds, on gravel bars, on river banks and in the river is all too often part of the ONSR experience. Off road vehicles also contribute to erosion, water pollution and disturbance of stream and riparian habitats. Off road vehicle use is a contributor to the problem of unauthorized roads, trails and access points. It is widespread and well known that the ONSR is an easy place for illegal off road riding. This is an unacceptable situation. Resolving it should be a priority in the management plan. The NPS needs to enforce its own current prohibition against off road riding in the ONSR. The management plan needs to outline how the NPS will to do this, what resources it needs to do so and what support it needs from the public for this critical objective. MOTORBOATS Developing a sound policy regarding the use of motorized watercraft</p>					
2565	<p>Response to Preliminary Alternatives ECM the 15 year GMP 1. The "No Action" plan is the alternative among i4osq: presented which in my Opinion, most conducive to meeting the needs of the public consistent with enabling legislation and my view of what the park should offer. I would modify it is follows: A. Add staff B. Enforce existing regulations and management goals C. Interpret the resources INCLUDING the cultural resources for a range of time D. Add facilities and services Existing staff include experienced and well trained staff as well as some who should never have been retained, staff who have neither the ability nor the understanding that they do not have the ability to perform the tasks for which they were hired. You have lost several of the best and most skilled to retirement and will be losing more. You (meaning park management) have not taken advantage of that resource and trained others. By failing to do so, you have made no provision for the future. This park was established to protect the natural, historical and cultural resources of this area. The Powder Mill area was slated to become a living farm. Steps toward that goal, including a blacksmith shop and sorghum making were implemented and abandoned. The buildings have been allowed to deteriorate, no effort has been made to do any hiring except keep potential visitors away. All the focus has been to Alley, and Big Spring when most of your visitors are on Upper Current. By further limiting access and development you are essentially limited use a great deal more and each of the management alternatives being discussed would require a great deal more man hours if the suggestions are implemented. For example, Alternative A suggests re-creating earlier days for "traditional" activities that are less crowded. That would mean more staff scattered throughout the area in significant numbers for visitors who live in the computer age and have little interest of a sustained nature for such activities. The Alternative continues by suggesting the closure of roads and trails that have been "illegally developed". 'How did these road and trails become developed if staff are sufficient in number and allowed to enforce existing rules? Who decides whether these roads and trails were "illegally" developed. If you review the history of this area, you will find that many of these roads and trails in use have been in use sporadically for more years than any of us have been alive. The same Alternative and most of the others seem to be geared toward giving a livery service the opportunity to operate even those "lower horsepower motor boats like the traditional johnboats of years past." What era are you considering? The enabling legislation speaks of preserving the culture. Does that set a timeline? I suggest that it does not. Reference is made to visits to isolated farmsteads, and cemeteries. Are you planning to maintain those cemeteries and farmstead or will people be visiting with grass and brush head high among the voracious ticks and chiggers? 2. I strongly believe the park should have MAINTAINED areas for camping, picnicking, canoe traffic, motorboat use, and that includes REGULAR trash pick up and removal and maintenance of toilets. I am a park visitor and neighbor. I regularly clean up after visitors who have not been provided toilets. The management plan should consider first the bare necessities such as TOILETS and the availability POTABLE WATER. Those are health concerns which are being regularly ignored by the NPS. When flood waters rise, the toilets should be capable of being valve protected so the human waste does not enter the flood water. But most important there should be toilets where they are needed and where visitors are using the resource. Furthermore, the park should have clearly posted numbers and staff available to deal with the visitors who leave there manners at home. If a particular areas becomes a problem, don't shut it down, stop the inappropriate conduct. 3. ZONING. One thing a civilized society must be able to do is respect each other. Every last one of us has a right to enjoy this park. It was established for every one of use to use and enjoy. We should not have to travel from one end of the park to another to find that little segment set aside to protect our special interest. Not only does that foreclose the recreational opportunities of a large segment of the users of their particular special interest, it forecloses their opportunity to enjoy the various unique features the park was established to showcase and protect. The people who complain about the motorboats are the same people who are mighty grateful to take a ride in that motorboat if there is an injury, an allergic reaction, or a flood and they are out there in a canoe. WE ALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO ENJOY ALL OF THE PARK. It is your obligation to</p>	8/3/2009	No		UN	N/A

	<p>accomplish that by your management. Likewise, those same visitors who are hiking and object to four wheelers or motorized vehicles are sure singing another tune when they have an emergency. Your management is the key to promote co-operation by reaching out to all users not isolating only one group. 4. N/A 5. We have property near the trail ride. We regularly see horses grazing on Park property, and the owner of the horses does not seem to be required to keep his animals in. This year it was a herd of goats as well as horses. We should see consequences for that type of repeated behavior. We should see consequence for any type of repeated illegal behavior without regard for who the offender is. The ideal situation would be for this Park to have unlimited funds to develop and maintain the park in a pristine fashion, to have sufficient staff to maintain aid interpret and protect the resource and visitors without limit. Realistically that does not happen. Most of the alternatives would require a large outlay of money for those purposes. Implementing most of those changes without sufficient guaranteed continuing staff support would essentially open the door to no management and we would all lose. ' I realize this comment did not make the timeline. Personal obligations made it impossible for me to submit a timely response. Having been down this road several times in the past, I think it is important for each person to voice opinions and to be optimistic that each person's comments will be given care fill consideration. It is easy to criticize those who make decisions. It is not so easy to make those decisions. As a local person it is easy for me to feel that I don't matter. I suspect that is a common situation for park neighbors. However, I will end by saying again what I started with in #1. The park needs additional staff. The park management should take, advantage of the knowledgeable staff still around and use their abilities to train for the future. Enforce the rules and regulations in existence. Don't turn a blind eye to a violation. Stop it at the outset. Everytime. Follow through and prosecute. Make it clear by actions, not rhetoric, that OZARK is not party central. Broaden the interpretive activities beyond Alley and Big Spring. Use the resources you have. Don't limit the interpretive activities to one type, one or two locations, one time frame, one activity. Use some imagination. You are playing to a sophisticated crowd. Clean the place up: ADD facilities, trash pick up, and water. Finally; this should not be local vs. tourist, canoeist vs. motorboatist horses vs. campers. We all have a stake in every inch of this park and every inch should be available for our use. Thank you.</p>						
2566	<p>Sir: On behalf of the Osage Group of the Sierra Club, with over 1000 members, responsible for an area from Shannon County to the Iowa Border, and inchieling the towns of Rolla, Columbia, and Kirksville, these comments are submitted on the Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Rivervvays. While it is recognized that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are of considerable interest to the residents of Shannon County, it should also be taken into consideration that the Current and Jacks Fork and surrounding lands are owned by citizens throughout the United States. These rivers "belong" to the citizens of Bellingham, Washington, and Key West, Florida, just as much as the citizens of Eminence, Missouri. Please review our comments carefully. These represent the consensus of caring citizens of central Missouri. CC: US Senator Claire McCaskill US Senator Christopher Bond US Representative Joann Emerson US Representative Blaine Leuticemeyer Governor Jay Nixon Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson Missouri Department of Natural Resources Director Mark Templeton ----- Osage Group Sierra Club Comments on the National Park Service:8ra% Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Local emphasis on rivers of national importance The United States Congress passed a bill designating the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) in 1964 and then-President Lyndon Johnson signed the enabling legislation into law. The designation specifically mandated that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers (the ONSR) be preserved and protected. The Missouri congressional delegation (US Senators and US Representatives), the Missouri General Assembly and the Governor of Missouri approved of the federal action. After some discussion between agencies (primarily NPS and USFS) and influential individuals, it was determined that the ONSR would be a National Park, operated and managed by the National Park Service. Both the Jacks Fork and the Current Rivers are also listed as Outstanding National Resource Waters (as is the Eleven Point, as a National Wild and Scenic River), and, as such, are afforded the highest levels of water quality standards and the highest levels of protection. It is somewhat ironic that the Jacks Fork River, downstream from the Route 19 Bridge (the Danny Staples Bridge) at Emminence to the confluence with the Current River is on the "impaired waterbody" list (sometimes called the "303(d) list" in reference to Section 303, paragraph (d) of the federal Clean Water Act). The Jacks Fork does not meet Water Quality Standards specifically what is referred to in Missouri rules (CSR 10-20.7) as Whole Body Contact, and in the goals of the federal Clean Water Act (Section 101) as "recreation in and on the water". A national scenic river and one that has the highest level of protection is impaired!! The Current and Jacks Fork rivers, composing the ONSR, as national rivers, are owned in common by all citizens of the United States by residents of Portland, Maine, to San Diego, California and everywhere in between. Therefore, it is troubling that the NPS/ONSR* gives much credence to local, self-serving interests in Shannon, Carter, and Dent counties of Missouri. Apparently, the NPS feels that the few hundred residents of south-central Missouri who attended the "Open Houses" outweigh the interests of millions of Americans. This is contrary to national interests. While a relative few citizens - representing local self-serving interests - claim that ORV usage, horse rides, and large motorboats are economy boosters, facts and data are not supportive of these assertions. Much more revenue flows into Shannon County coffers from low-impact, non-motorized users (primarily those taking float trips) than from the high-impact uses. More and more low-impact users have become disenchanted with the management of the ONSR, which seems to cater to high-impact users, even though such use is highly detrimental to the local economy. High-impact users assert economic benefits only as a way to promote their interests and the NPS/ONSR would do well to ignore such false claims. When it is considered that Open Meetings held by the National Park Service to solicit comments were held in Van Buren, Eminence, and Salem to the exclusion of Springfield, Joplin, St. Joseph, and Kansas City, this over-emphasis on local, self-serving interests becomes even more troubling. Again, the ONSR is a National Park, belonging to all citizens of the United States. Interestingly, the westernmost open meeting was held in Columbia, Missouri. The entire western portion of the State of Missouri was apparently deemed to be unimportant. It is likely that citizens of the western half of Missouri are not even aware that a Preliminary General Management Plan is being considered, and, worse, that their comments, while welcome, are NOT being sought . It is sad that the National Park Service seems to be catering to the wishes of elected officials in the US Congress, the Missouri General Assembly and in the counties of Carter, Shannon and Dent, who have, in turn,</p>	7/17/2009	No		SIERRA Osage Group	MO	65203

<p>responded to the wishes of the local high- impact users.. However, given the heavy emphasis placed on local, self-serving interests and the abject failures of the National Park Service to take action against clear violations of federal law, that conclusion is inescapable. The primary directives of 1964's enabling legislation were to "protect and preserve" these national rivers and the lands, caves and springs of the area. That has not occurred, primarily to acquiescence by the NPS/ONSR to local self-serving interests. This document will detail failures of the National Park Service to "protect and preserve", will detail ways for the NPS/ONSR to correct a negative image and to restore the Rivers to their 1964 condition. Horses Of all the problems that are currently present on the ONSR, none are more pressing than horse use. This includes the numbers of horses, horse trails and the contamination of the Jacks Fork River. However, akin to other problems, all of the subcategories are linked. It is a matter of public record that the Jacks Fork River, below the Danny Staples Bridge in Eminence to Two Rivers, is on the Impaired Waterbody list, unhealthy at many times for human contact State and federal agencies have documented the contamination. Essentially, the Jacks Fork has a high bacterial level and the harmful bacteria E Coli 0157:H7 can cause a variety of human illnesses, from quite minor infections of wounds to bloody diarrhea to death. Minor infections and minor flu-like illnesses are generally not reported, mostly because no doctor is seen. The state and federal Water Quality Standards establish a level for a healthy, adult male as no more than 126 Colony Forming Units per 100 milliliters of water (stated scientifically as 126CFU/100 ml). Any amount above this level is deemed to be unsafe for "recreation in and on the water". While the impairment is well-documented, so is the source. Various studies by state and federal agencies (including DNA testing) have established that horse dung is the major source of impairment It is a embarrassment to the State of Missouri, the Environmental Protection Agency and the NPS/ONSR to allow a major national river, and one that is afforded the highest water quality standards, to be so contaminated that it does not meet one of its designated and beneficial uses. To allow horses to continue to foul the water is abhorrent; to allow more horse dung to enter the water is abhorrently paradoxical. Solutions have been proposed ranging from drastic (prohibition of horses on ONSR lands and water) to relatively benign (move trails away from the Jacks Fork and disallow crossings). Other solutions are to limit the number of horses (similar to the limitquot; dictates of the NPS/ONSR. While some of the activity has garnered some public attention such as the Shannon County Commissioners claiming the existence of a road through the newly created and under development Current River State Park, much of the illegal construction activity has flown under the radar. To the credit of the NPS/ONSR attempts were made to enforce prohibitions on constructing roads within ONSR lands and, in particular, roads that cross the Current River (the Jacks Fork valley walls are steep and in many places sheer cliffs, so the issues of illegal roads and trails apply primarily to the Current River, which is more amenable to road and trail construction). These attempts to enforce existing laws and regulations were thwarted by a US District Attorney, who has since resigned. Unfortunately, however, the NPS/ONSR seems to have given up and has become an apologist for those creating illegal roads and trails. Roads and trails through the ONSR lands and waters are very destructive of the environment of the area. Trash and litter are seldom a problem with hikers and backpackers, simply because not much can be carried and therefore not much can be discarded in the woods. Not so with motorized vehicles. Illegal roads and trails are strewn with trash. Vehicular traffic is disruptive of wildlife birds and terrestrial animals flee at the sight, sound, and smell of vehicles with gasoline engines. In addition, illegal roads create openings where other illegal uses take place. At Flying W, for example, there are ORV tracks through old fields with resultant destruction of native vegetation, even though signs are posted that vehicles are restricted to designated roads". Many such roads to and across the Current River have been constructed where no roads or crossings ever existed. Such is the case at what is called Flying W and at Lewis Hollow. Flying W is particularly egregious as the NPS/ONSR had plans to create a campground at that site but due to actions by the Shannon County Commission, such plans were abandoned. There was an old road and a low water river crossing at Lewis Hollow, but the site of the original crossing (so long ago that it is lost in time) was approximately 300 yards upstream from the current constructed crossing and due to shifts of the river is now about 6 feet deep. The present river crossing at Lewis Hollow consists of removal of trees and brush, cutting a road through the river bank, and building up the river bed with loads of gravel. The road is on private lands, ONSR lands and the crossing is through the Current River. There are other equally illegal roads and trails on ONSR lands and through the Current River. Many of these have been created simply by repeated usage by ORVs. Others have been deliberately constructed. While the Enabling Act of 1964 did envision allowing landowners and farmers to access their lands and crops by crossing the Current River, that private use has been asserted as a public use by the Shannon County Commission. The NPS/ONSR needs to recognize these claims for what they are: bogus. All roads and trails that did not exist in 1964 should be closed, re-vegetated, and violators prosecuted. Easements So-called Scenic Easements have been issued by the NPS/ONSR in lieu of outright acquisition of the lands in question. Each of these easements has generic language, and each has unique characteristics. These unique terms and conditions were negotiated between the landowner and the NPS/ONSR. However, the NPS/ONSR has in some situations enforced the negotiated conditions when landowners violated the terms. In other situations, the NPS/ONSR ignored egregious and blatant violations. The NPS/ONSR must vigorously and consistently enforce the terms and conditions of each Scenic Easement. Water Quality With the exception of motorboats with polluting emissions and the impairment of the Jacks Fork by horses, the water quality of the ONSR remains fairly good. There are problem, however, in major tributary streams. These problems may be traced to illegal sand and gravel mining and to illegal road building. There are two major tributaries with the name "Big Creek" that enter the Current River. One Big Creek comes in from the West, originates in, and flows through, Texas County. Approximately 5 miles from its confluence with the Current, just above Akers Ferry, a massive sand and gravel operation has decimated Big Creek, and it is probable that loosened sand and gravel and loosened sediments entered the Current River, impacting water quality. The other Big Creek, originating in Dent County, but the bulk of which is in Shannon County, enters the Current River from the East, downstream of Round Springs. In attempts to prevent flooding on a county road, the Shannon County Commission conducted an immense and unpermitted channelization and manipulation of Big Creek, and loosening sand and gravel from what was the creek channel, entering and impacting private lands without permission. That sand and gravel with concomitant sediments entered the Current River, causing at least temporary degradation of water quality. Upstream of the "Prongs" where the North and South forks or "prongs" of the Jacks Fork join at a low-water bridge known as Dixon Crossing, in</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>2004 the Peirce Township of Texas County channelized and manipulated the South Prong of the Jacks Fork. The loosened sand and gravel with sediments - from the old river channel washed downstream and entered the waters of the Jacks Fork River within the ONSR, resulting in a degradation of water quality. It is likely that this sand, gravel, and sediments covered and smothered aquatic macro- invertebrates and the spawning areas of the fishes that inhabit the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. In order to protect the water quality of the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, it is necessary for the NPS/ONSR to become involved in activities that have an impact on water quality and to prohibit such activities that have a likelihood of lowering or degrading water quality. The enabling legislation authorizes the NPS/ONSR to do exactly that. Party behavior We wish to commend the NPS/ONSR for its recent steps to prohibit drunkenness, nudity, profanity and other "R-Rated" behavior. While it is realized that young adults like to shed inhibitions, and a remote waterway seems to be a good place for such lewd behavior, it must also be realized that many folks, including families, seek out quiet and solitude. In addition, children should not be subjected to such behavior. The NPS/ONSR must upgrade its attempts to quell unruly rowdiness. Of course, such should never have been allowed to occur and prevention would have been easiest to enforce. However, the NPS/ONSR must now take steps to ensure that the ONSR remains family-friendly and such rowdy behavior should be prohibited. Wilderness The Osage Group of the Sierra Club is part of the Missouri Wilderness Coalition and, as such, supports more federal wilderness designations in the State of Missouri. The reasons for creating more wilderness areas are stated succinctly in the statement of the Missouri Wilderness Coalition and we see no need to duplicate that statement. Suffice it to say: We adamantly support the creation of the Big Springs Wilderness and support this being done via an act of the US Congress (as in Alternatives A and B) rather than administratively (Alternative C), since it is very difficult to repeal or rescind Congressional actions, but administrative ones can be undone with ease. Low-impact usage The ONSR is much loved and therein lies a problem. If large portions of Alternative A are adopted by the NPS/ONSR, low-impact (daytrippers, float and camping, tubing, rafting) use will increase, since many low-impact users avoid the ONSR because of ORVs, water-quality problems, large jet-pump outboard motorboats, rowdiness, and contamination from horse rides. But, an increase in low-impact users has potential to damage the very reasons that cause such users to flock to the ONSR a classic example of being "loved to death". Fortunately, however, the NPS has much experience with such overuse and has taken steps in several national parks to limit such damage. In national parks such as the Great Smokies, Grand Canyon, Canyonlands, and Yellowstone, registration is required and the numbers of visitors are, in many cases, limited. Therefore, we must reluctantly endorse that such a system of visitor limitation be established on the ONSR This would be relatively easy to implement and enforce, since the places that low-impact users enter the water are easily identified and a limit could be easily imposed. We, however, do not know and consequently do not advocate any specific number, but the NPS/ONSR should closely monitor existing and increasing low-impact uses, and take preventive action BEFORE damage occurs. Overall Recommendations The Enabling Legislation, passed into law in 1964, mandated that the ONSR be preserved and protected. Special mention was made of the caves and springs of the area. But the area bears little resemblance to what it was in 1964. Yet that is exactly what was to be preserved. Therefore, we support Alternative A, with the additions and reasons stated above. The "No Action" alternative essentially locks in existing situations, and is unacceptable. Many aspects of the current situations violate the mandates of the enabling legislation. Alternative B is a weakened version of Alternative A and is generally unacceptable although certain portions which mimic Alternative A, such as the federal designation of the Big Springs Wilderness, are acceptable. Alternative C supports high-impact recreation, much development and is unacceptable. Given that it does NOT "protect and preserve" the ONSR, portions are not only unacceptable, but likely violate the mandate of the enabling legislation.</p>						
2567	<p>Dear Superintendent Detring: The Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen (SNLMBCH) wish to offer these comments concerning the development of the new general management plan (GM?) and the alternatives created for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. SMMBCH will address the alternatives as they pertain to equestrian use only in keeping with our organization's purpose and mission statement. It is our belief horseback riding is a historical and traditional activity within the Park and should remain so. This area of the Missouri Ozarks and its culture cannot be defined or represented without horses/mules playing an integral role. The Land-based Management Zones, as referenced on page seven (p.7), confine horse use to resource-based recreation and natural zones only. It is understandable and reasonable for horses not to be in high levels of development; however, to deny horseback riders the more wild and natural character of the primitive zone is questionable and troubling. A primitive packing or riding experience denied to equestrians reflects favoritism. SMMBCH supports and continues to support multi-user facilities. Any conflict or perceived conflicts should be accounted to all parties and all parties should be held equally accountable without exclusion of any one group. The Recreational Activities by Management Zone chart (p.7) reflect horseback riding being restricted to "designated trails." Designated trails throughout the Park are inevitable. SMMBCH does not object to a designated trail system if well designed, managed, and adequately meets the needs of the equestrian users. SMMBCH has traditionally been of the understanding that Federal lands have been administered under a policy of "Open unless declared closed". We are somewhat naturally concerned that the new GMP may somewhat indicate a subtle change in that policy. This may not be the case but we are concerned that some of the areas may contain traditionally used country roads that might be closed but which could be left open to equestrian use without creating harmful environmental impact. The plan should address staging areas of adequate size for today's trucks and trailers throughout the Park. The number of trails available is critical. With too few trails, the likelihood of overuse is high. With overuse comes degradation and loss of resources. A good trail system will take this into account and provide adequate number of trails and crossover links. Any designated trail system that does not plan for this is a designed plan for failure. No where is this more evident than the overuse of trails that had no design, planning, oversight, or management than in the Eminence area. ALTERNATIVES: In reviewing the three alternative choices, Alternative B in general seems to be the most reasonable for most users and visitors. The traditionalist will see "B" as too open to visitors and intrusion; the more "social" user will view "B" as too restrictive. SMMBCH in addressing only the equestrian experience would support an alternative that blends itself to identify degraded biological communities through sound scientific data and to restore and protect by reasonable and common sense methods. SMMBCH promotes the protection of resources and feels this can be done while not denying access for</p>	7/16/2009	No		Show-me Missouri Back Country Horsemen	MO	63060

	<p>horse use. Most equestrians are conservationists, own and manage acreage, and understand the cycle of caring for land and what it grows. Carrying for and enjoying land and nature is very personal and a way of life with most equestrians. SMMBCH would also support an alternative blend that recognizes the historical and cultural significance of horses/mules in this part of the Missouri Ozarks. Horses and mules belong to the fabric of the Park in the same way as john boats, springs, caves, and old settlements. SMMBCH would support and promote an alternative that would allow working with the Park interpretive opportunities programs promoting educational experiences that include horses/mules through our Leave No Trace Master Stock Educator's trainer or awareness classes. SMMBCH would support the Camp Current facility. SMMBCH has no opinion on the proposed wilderness designation for the Big Springs tract. As stated in the newsletter material, this would be managed under the primitive zone that at this time does not allow horses. The Wilderness Act acknowledges and protects horse/stock use within the Wilderness areas; however, the Big Spring tract has already acknowledged there would be additional special management restrictions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the GMP for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Respectfully,</p>						
2568	<p>I grew up on these Rivers swimming, fishing, gigging, and going to the river just to boat ride, meet friends and sit on the gravel bars visiting. I have three brothers and a sister who did the same. Like a lot of other young people, after graduating from High School, I went to St. Louis to work. My wife and I both left well paying jobs to move back to Eminence so our son could grow up as we did. He too, loves the river and still comes home from Springfield at every opportunity to take his son and wife boat riding, camping, hunting and fishing. I've hunted and fished up and down both rivers my entire life, even while living and working in the city. I would also come in every chance I would get. I tried many things and never found anything that I enjoyed as much. Like most all the people in this area, I was strongly against the making of a Nat'l Park in this area as I felt we would have to give up our rights to the river. After learning that it was to be a Nat'l Recreation Area and hunting and fishing would be allowed, knowing that a lot of job opportunities would be available, I somewhat had a change of heart. Being one who was able to get a good job, with good pay, I consider myself very lucky to have been able to work and live here and get to raise my family in this type of environment. I believe the Park Service has done many good things, protecting the rivers from developers, pollution, providing protection from drug users and mostly by providing people like myself good paying jobs. I also think they have constantly tried to add more regulations at every opportunity, most of which was not even close to necessary. During my career, which was thirty two years, I was always against closing roads, banning trapping, gigging, doing away with the wild horses, making people case or break down firearms in vehicles even if only moving a short distance from one hunting area to another, not allowing reasonable use of ATV's, and other off road vehicles for recreational use. I know that the government way is to chip away a little at a time until eventually they have complete control of an area, but this was supposed to be different than what is traditionally thought of as a National Park, such as Yellowstone or other parks where everything is protected from the visitor. As the years went by, I noticed each time we got new superintendents, chief rangers and other top managers that had came from Parks that were highly regulated, they were soon trying to do same here. Since the beginning it is my belief that the Park Management had constantly tried to impose more regulations on many people, local and otherwise that want to use this park to hunt, fish, motorboat ride or ride horses and ATV's. I also believe the Rivers should be enjoyed by everyone, not only the local people. I have nothing against canoes as I feel they also have contributed a lot to the local economy by providing summer jobs to many young people and to the local business's as well. It has been my experience while boating and fishing on the rivers, that the majority of canoeist are friendly and considerate people when treated the same. They appreciate you slowing down when meeting them even though we know that it makes a bigger wake than keeping your boat on plane. There are times when on shallow shoals that it's impossible to slow completely down without hitting bottom and doing damage to your boat. It seems to me that this could be explained to each one as they rent their canoe which I believe would eliminate many hard feelings. There will always be a few bad apples that have no concern for other people. This happens on both sides of the canoes vs. boats. Some people in canoes use very vulgar language, show nudity with no respect for women and children. Some boaters run much to close to canoes and do many of things mentioned above. This is why we have Law Enforcement Rangers. As far as going back to the old ways this can never be and we all know it. The old way was people respecting each others rights and doing what we thought was right without any regulations from the government. I would like to go on record as voting for NO CHANGE.</p>	6/14/2009	No			UN	N/A
2569	<p>Dear Mr. Detring, I would like to take this opportunity to express my concern about the proposed General Management Plan that has been outlined by the National Park Service for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In particular, the preliminary alternatives concerning the Current River. Being the Mayor of any community has many rewards. I take my position as a servant to the people quite seriously and with great pride. When situations such as this arise, my approach is to be open minded in the decision making process. During this process, I ask myself one question! "What is the best possible solution for the community as a whole?" I take my own personal interest completely out of the equation. Therefore, when it comes to the City of Van Buren, I strive to make rational decisions that will benefit the community and not any one person or any one particular group of persons. In the past weeks, I have received numerous phone calls and had several face to face conversations with individuals in the community concerning your General Management Plan. I do not have to tell you that any decision made by the National Park Service has a tremendous impact on this community. Please understand I have the utmost respect for the National Park Service. I feel that without the guidelines, programs, and the enforcement of rules and regulations, the Current River and surrounding area would not be the treasure it currently is. Also, I commend all of your staff for their professionalism and courtesy. The National Park Service is a tremendous asset to our community and Carter County. Having said these things, I feel compelled to address an issue of importance and deep concern. Having lived in Van Buren for only 10 years, I have served as Mayor for 7 of those years. It did not take me long to realize the extreme importance of tourism and the economic effect it places on this community. We rely heavily on sales tax in order for our city to function. We project each year, in our annual budget, how to best appropriate monies for necessary maintenance and improvements that help keep our community moving in a forward direction. The present economic crisis across our nation is being felt right here in our community. The timber industry is virtually non existent. We have been informed that our local Chevrolet dealership will soon be closing. The unemployment rate continues to increase. Our community can ill</p>	7/30/2009	No		City Of Van Buren	MO	63965

	<p>afford any further losses in revenue. I would like to point out how your alternative plans A, B, and C will negatively affect our city revenues. The General Fund is comprised of a 1 cent sales tax, a gasoline tax, a motor vehicle tax, and other sources. In 2008 we brought in \$275,213.00. Of this amount \$192,278.00 was collected through tax monies. That calculates to roughly 70%. Our Capital Improvement Fund is comprised of a 1/2 cent sales tax and other funding. Our total revenue for 2008 was \$93,172.00 of which \$73,894 was from the V2 cent sales tax. This calculates to roughly 80%. On Monday, June 8th, 2009, the Van Buren City Council met in regular session. A great deal of time was spent discussing your preliminary General Management Plan. We decided unanimously that alternative plans A, B, and C, as proposed, would have an extremely negative impact on the community as well as Carter County. Therefore, we are in full support of the "no action" alternative. We firmly believe that boating on the Current River is an important facet of our economy. Most of the boats are built in Ellington, MO (Blazer Boats). The majority of the boat trailers are manufactured in the Eastwood area (Rivercraft). Most of the motors are sold by 4 dealers, Red's Super Service (Van Buren), Buckshot Marine (Van Buren), Ernie's Sales and Service (Webb Creek) and West Boat Shop (Winona). These businesses will either be forced to close or make drastic cut backs in order to stay in business. The sales of boats, boating equipment, and fishing equipment would seriously decline, if any of the three proposals are enacted. I would like to give you personal testimony about the economic impact Current River and boating has on the City of Van Buren. The weekend of June 5-7, my daughter, son-in-law, my brother, sister-in-law and two friends of my daughter came to Van Buren. The number one reason they came was to spend time at the river. The number two reason was to spend time with my wife Tammy and me. I filled our boat with gas on Friday, went to Big Spring Food to place an order for meat, my wife went to Dollar General Store to purchase snack items. After dinner on Friday, some of our guests walked to the Jolly Cone for dessert. Saturday morning, the men in our group went to the river. The women went to Big Springs Food and bought lunch items. After a full day of enjoyment on the river, we came home, got cleaned up and went to Stray Dog Barbeque for our evening meal. Once again, some members of our group went to the Jolly Cone for dessert. On Sunday, before returning to their respective communities, two of the vehicles purchased gas at a local convenience store on their way out of town. On the 4th of July weekend, my wife and I had 10 guests in our home. Once again, the same scenario took place. My wife and I added on to our home in 2007 for one reason; to entertain guests. From Memorial Day to Labor Day we have guests in our home nearly every weekend. They all come to Van Buren for one reason----Current River. If we did not own a boat these individuals would not come to visit. Our enjoyment in life is the recreational opportunities we have because we own a boat and due to the fact we live near the Current River. I would also like to point out a potential problem I see with alternative plans A, B, and C. I feel they discriminate against elderly and disabled persons. My mother is 78 years old. The only opportunity she has to enjoy the river is by boat. Due to arthritis and diminished swimming skills, she is unable to canoe or tube the river. My brother-in-law has Muscular Dystrophy. He is unable to tube or canoe, as well. I sincerely hope this subject was and is being given considerable consideration. Please understand I am not trying to make this an issue of boating versus floating. I feel we all have the right to spend time utilizing Current River in any manner we so desire. I want to see every business and every community prosper. The Current River is a valuable asset and we need to guarantee that not only ourselves, but future generations will be able to enjoy this National treasure. Also, think for a moment about how many people have invested in property in the Van Buren and Carter County. Each year we have families coming here from other communities who are buying homes and/or property. Why are they doing this? Because of Current River! Many of these families purchase boats as well. They also purchase groceries, gasoline, clothing, building supplies, and they eat in our restaurants. They also entertain guests. Simply stated, these families contribute heavily to our economy. I have heard that there is concern about congestion on the river. I feel, at times, this statement is true. But, in reality, the congestion exists for approximately 25 days a year, on weekends between Memorial Day and Labor Day. The other 340 days a year the river is not congested. Should we allow 25 days a year to dictate the usage of the river for the entire year? Absolutely not! There is no doubt that your office will receive complaints about boats on the Current River. This will never cease to happen. But, are these complaints coming from people who live and work in Van Buren and Carter County? The answer would be no! Also, based on the number of people who utilize the Ozark National Scenic Riverways on an annual basis---are you receiving enough complaints to warrant any changes? Again, this answer would be no! As I stated earlier, during the decision making process, I personally strive to make decisions that benefit our community as a whole,</p>						
2570	<p>1) The closest alternative is No-Action. To "go back" to the 1950's way of the river would be detrimental to the current way of life for local business owners, local recreationists and many others relocating to the area. My 71 year old mother loves going to the river. She likes the boat ride up and floating back down. She enjoys being in the natural setting. She enjoys the watching her children, grand children and great grandchildren enjoy the river. She isn't physically able to canoe, kayak or tube. A boat ride is her only option. Our family, like most local families, enjoys the river, many times a year, for an hour or two or for several days at a time. We respect the river and its natural beauty. We leave it cleaner then we find it. We teach our children to respect the river, to help keep it clean and natural and to assist others, including ungrateful tourists, when needed. We cannot "go back" to pristine conditions or substantially reduced usage due to the negative impact it would have on the local economy(s). To keep an area undeveloped is one thing, to take it back and make it undeveloped is a completely different thing. The local people are just as important to the river as the river is to the people. ONSR manages the park. We take care of the river. Think about it. 2) Future management should be a living evolving process taking in the needs of locals (recreation and business), tourists and natural needs. Long term management plans with short term adjustments as necessary. 3) Same as #2 4) The special part of ONSR to me is all 134 miles of it. It is a beautiful living thing. 5) One of the most controversial parts of management concerns motor boats. As I stated in #1, my mother, along with my other elderly friends and relatives, including those that are disabled access much of the river by boat. It is rather difficult to take 6, plus coolers for food and drink, up the river in a canoe, boat with a 25 hp motor, or even with a 40. Do we need 115, 150 and 200+hp motors??? I don't. I think a good compromise that would fill the need and better benefit the environment is the 60\40 boat motors. Not too big, not too small. Less fuel. One thing I have not read in any of the literature or anywhere else is how much and how often local boaters help people on the river, tourists and locals alike. Apparently, only "the bad" interactions are reported. Many, many times, I have helped tourists on the river. After they turn over or get stuck in a root wad or on a log. Maybe they lose</p>	8/3/2009	No			MO	63965

	<p>something or their young child is freezing or it is starting to get dark and they have no idea how far it is to their take out point. A more visible presence of Park Rangers and the Water Patrol would reduce unwanted behavior. We have laws concerning our behavior in public. Don't make new limitations and rules. Enforce the ones we already have. Especially, littering. ONSR should work actively with local and regional chambers of commerce, along with other groups and publications to educate the public to what we have and how to use it while protecting it. I think the suggestion of a new quality boat ramp and adequate parking area at Wehmeyer Landing would benefit everyone. It would help reduce boat traffic in the most heavily used section of the river, in the Van Buren area. My home and business location is in Van Buren, along with my primary use of the river. I would appreciate any information on planning information\projects in the future. I prefer electronic information rather than paper.</p>						
2571	<p>To Whom It May Concern: I write to you today on behalf of many constituents who have contacted me regarding the preliminary alternatives suggested by the National Park Service-Ozark National Scenic Riverways Planning Team that would establish the management direction for the ONSR for the next 20 years. Over the course of the last several weeks, the greatest concern conveyed to me is in regard to your three preliminary plans (A,B&C) that propose to limit or reduce horsepower on motor boats. It seems that most local folks agree that further regulation restricting horsepower is unfounded and unnecessary. In fact such an unfounded policy direction would lead to unnecessary public safety and public health consequences as today's boaters are the number one providers of life saving rescue and transportation for those who become sick or injured on the waters and shorelines of the ONSR. For example, on June 13th of this year ... and another boater save three tubers from drowning on the Current River upstream from Van Buren. In addition, it has been correctly pointed out that horsepower restrictions would also limit access for many of our elderly and disabled citizens. As you may know, many of our elderly and disabled family members require motorized transportation to be able to enjoy the river and be safe. My constituents have also voiced their concerns regarding further regulations and user limits proposed by preliminary alternatives (A,B&C) including Wilderness designation that would pick and choose the groups that can use the ONSR compared to the current management plan where a wide variety of recreational activities are available today. However, there is strong support for enforcing the laws and regulations on the books that are designed to limit irresponsible behavior that jeopardizes the safety and enjoyment of visitors in the ONSR. Equally important is the call from my constituents to dramatically increase the visibility and number of law enforcement personnel to reduce irresponsible and unlawful activities. There is also good support for helping limit user conflicts between boaters and floaters by increasing parking and providing an adequate boat ramp at Waymeyer. It seems that most folks agree that there should be room for every responsible citizen to enjoy the many visitor experiences and abundant recreational opportunities provide by this wonderful resource we call the ONSR. Hopefully, your ONSR planning team will carefully consider the impact of any management plan on the local economy and the many individuals and families who depend on the Current and Jacks Fork for all or part of their livelihood. With this in mind, the overwhelming letters and comments from my constituents supports the No-Action Alternative as the better course of management in the future. I also want to remind you that that the preliminary management alternatives you put forth are very important to all the people of my legislative district and our state. More importantly, your final proposal will have a great and lasting impact on the local people who raise their children, make their living and inherently enjoy the abundance of recreational opportunities provide by-the abundant resources of the Current and Jacks Fork River. I urge you to listen, consider and put in place the commonsense suggestions provided by the local people during your discussions and decision making over the next several months. Sincerely, cc: Reed Detring, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways</p>	8/3/2009	No		Missouri State Representative	MO	65101-6806
2572	<p>Dear Sir or Madam: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed alternative General Management Plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a jewel in our nation's Park System, providing unique benefits to the region and the thousands of visitors. I appreciate the National Park Service's continued dedication to effective management. As you are well aware, the Ozark National Riverways System was established by Congress to carry out several purposes, including "conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States..." As with many of our National Parks, a natural tension has risen between those who would prefer to the NPS to focus on "managing wildlife" (often in the most extreme manner) and those, like myself, who prefer the NPS to focus on ensuring access and enjoyment of these public parks by the taxpayers of Missouri and the nation. After reviewing the proposed alternative General Management Plans, I would urge the National Park Service to adopt the No-Action Alternative. The No-Action Alternative clearly allows for the greatest enjoyment of the National Riverway by my constituents and those who visit from outside the Eighth Congressional District. Maintaining a responsible level of access to activities, both on water and land, is an important goal that can be achieved under the No-Action Alternative. While valid concerns have been raised regarding the conduct of visitors along the river, I believe the National Park Service has the ability to address these concerns under the current General Management Plan; if additional resources are needed, I am prepared to work with NPS to respond to these needs. Alternatives which severely, even punitively, restrict motorized forms of recreation fail to take into account the changing public appetite for recreation. The ONSR should be allowed to expand recreation activities, in a safe and responsible manner, to provide individuals a broad selection of activities. Overly aggressive limits on horsepower may also pose safety and access concerns, especially when areas of the river subject to higher regulation isolate areas in which general use is allowed by these proposed plans. Responsible boating is the duty of all who enjoy the river; it is not necessarily determined by horsepower. The No-Action Alternative clearly best meets the access needs for individuals who use the river. Additionally, proposals A and B include a wilderness designation for the 8,048 acre Big Spring Tract which I have opposed as part of previous efforts. In addition, the Big Spring Tract surrounds, as in-holdings, some 2,600 private acres. Disruption of access to these private lands, as well as access to and from the riverways along areas in which the Tract borders the ONSR, would constitute a major issue for the constituents I represent. Finally, of particular concern to me and my constituents is the fact that none of the proposed alternatives address the impact on the local communities and counties along the ONSR. Vibrant and even thriving local partners are essential to fulfilling the goals of the National Scenic</p>	8/5/2009	No		MISSOURI CONGRESS 5TH DISTRICT	DC	20515

	<p>Riverways system, however, it is not clear to me that the National Park System is even allowed to consider the surrounding, local economic community in their decision-making process. Managing wildlife, preserving the environment and providing recreational activities do not stop at the Park Service's gates. The taxpayers who travel to and from the region will base their enjoyment and impression of the environment on more than just the river itself; a functioning local economy is important to achieving the shared goals of this interconnected community. I would hope the concerns of local government are heard and addressed during this process, so they do not have to be carried to Washington in another process.</p> <p>Sincerely CC: Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways</p>						
2573	<p>Dear Reader: My experience with the Ozark Riverways goes back to the early 1960's. I floated the Jacks Fork and rode the Powder Mill ferry before the park was created. In 1968 I took an overnight float trip (my first) from Powder Mill to Big Spring. In 1975 I began mapping caves in the park and surrounding areas. How things have changed since then! I have visited virtually the entire park in one way or the other and the entire park is of great importance to me personally. The NPS has identified reasons of significance for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Included in these are: -Significant river systems, spring systems, and cave systems. -Jacks Fork and Current are two of only three Outstanding National Resource Waters in the state. -The rich terrestrial and aquatic biological diversity. -The rich landscape of historic, archaeological, and Ozark cultural sites. -High quality recreational experiences of the type that was identified in the enabling legislation. I would argue that most of these items of significance are in danger. Following are just a few of the most important issues that are apparent.</p> <p>Horsepower Limits When I floated from Powder Mill to Big Spring we saw one motorboat until we got to Big Spring. This was on a weekend. The boat had a 3 1/2 horsepower Mercury on it I can remember it well and it was motivating upstream with no problem. It wouldn't go 40 knots but that wasn't the point. The person using it was fishing, a traditional use. We saw a couple of other motors on jonboats that were tied up near Van Buren, none of which had big motors. The tour boats at Big Spring had 25 horse motors and we marveled at their size. The point is: for the traditional values that the park was created to preserve, small motors are all that is necessary. The Ozark Riverways was not created in order to provide high-speed motorized boating. Nearby lakes are more than adequate for that purpose. The upper rivers should have no motors at all on them; the stretch below Big Spring could support 25 horsepower boats; sections in between could have 10 horse limits. Reducing horsepower limits is absolutely necessary.</p> <p>Canoe and Tube Crowding Limits to use must be established. Permits could be required. This should have been done long ago. It is easy to establish numbers of boats that can be put in on a stretch at a time. Previous documents have indicated that this could be done, but these have never been implemented.</p> <p>Roads There are far more access roads now than there were thirty years ago. This has happened because old traces that were reverting to nature in 1975 have since been used by ATV's or have been widened and "improved" by either NPS or local governments or, in some cases, individuals. Numerous of these "roads" cross the river, causing erosion and stream pollution. Many of these "roads" should be closed to traffic or converted to horse and hiking trails, and virtually all river crossings should be eliminated. This was done at Buffalo National River with great success. Trail use at Buffalo is much greater as a result and many other problems have been prevented.</p> <p>Access Areas and Primitive Camps Streamside access has greatly increased and must be addressed. Aesthetic qualities of the rivers are under attack. Today, one can hardly float from one place to another without seeing numerous access points with attendant vehicle traffic, noise, trash, and degradation of the stream bank. The difference today is readily clear: the values of the park have degraded greatly. Many of the so-called "primitive" camps are nothing more than vehicle access points while there are fewer and fewer good locations left for family float camping. The 11 Point National River has converted some of these areas to float camps, primarily accessible by water, but the roads have been left in place -gated and locked- so that maintenance can be easily done.</p> <p>Horses While horses are a traditional use, 500 horses do not constitute traditional use. The present system of trails (which was established initially by private individuals, not the park) is poorly designed, crosses drainages too many times, goes through riparian vegetative areas, and the trails are used by numbers of horses which cannot be supported. These trails should be rethought and redesigned and moved out of the riparian and stream areas. Pollution and degradation of the stream bank are only two of the problems. Recently we tried to camp at a favorite gravel bar and found it dug up by hooves, and decorated with horse feces and the strong smell of urine. Horses need to stay out of the riparian zone.</p> <p>Scenic Rivers In addition to road accesses and "primitive" camps there are other problems with the scenic vistas that used to be along every stretch of the rivers. Cabins on in-holdings have increased in numbers and size. Small, old cabins on scenic easements have been replaced by structures twice the size. Scenic easement land has been cleared of trees and brush; new structures have gone up in violation of scenic easement requirements. Trailers are present at numerous places - many times right at river level (guess where their holding tanks drain). The park needs to reestablish a riparian zone that does not allow trailers or vehicles to be in it. Scenic easements absolutely must be enforced and mitigation measures such as tree plantings need to be undertaken where violations have occurred. Other federal areas have prohibited the presence of vehicles and trailers in the riparian zones which should be at least 100 yards wide.</p> <p>Noise Currently the rivers are very noisy places to be during much of the best times of the year. Measures that should be taken include: -Reducing motorboat numbers and horsepower -Reducing canoe and tubing "jams". -Removal of inappropriate "primitive" camps. -Banning radios and stereos from the river and adjacent banks. -Removing roads and illegal ATV traffic.</p> <p>Wilderness I support the concept of a designated wilderness in the Big Spring area, noting that it does not include the developed areas themselves. Buffalo National River, for instance, has at least two wilderness areas in or along the river.</p> <p>Alternatives Alternative A is not perfect but it represents the best hope of restoring the values that Congress recognized in the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. With attention to the issues noted above, it can once again be a place where families can float and camp, where a fisherman with a small boat can cast a line in the water without a power boat running him over, where floaters can enjoy the sounds of nature without hearing motors and stereos, where a family can swim without worrying about e coli levels being too high, and where the traditional values of the Ozark culture can be expressed and interpreted and learned about all at one time.</p>	7/31/2009	No			MO	63701

2574	<p>SUBJECT: General Management Plan/Wilderness Study (GMP/WS), Preliminary Alternatives Dear Mr. Detring, Please accept my comments as a response to the GMP/WS. The preliminary alternatives as presented by the National Park Service (NSP) prompts the following observations and thoughts: 1.0 CONTEXT: "THE LAND ETHIC" The NPS has afforded itself the opportunity to rededicate to the enabling legislation that created ONSR in 1966. As NPS manages for competing attitudes and values as it goes forward, I petition the NPS to adopt the attitudes and values as expressed by Aldo Leopold in "Sandy County Almanac," 1948. Proportion and balance of use should be the controlling standard for judgment making. The sets of uses, existing and proposed, are either compatible or incompatible. The associative impacts either engender care or excuse abuse. While the republic we value is 233 years old, the prospects that it will continue to flourish for the next 233 years remain an open question. We, as a culture, have no prescriptive right to do as we please without consequences. Cahokia Mounds serves as a persuasive historical reference. Let "the land ethic" proposed by Aldo Leopold give context to this process. 2.0 ISSUES: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS 2.1 SCENIC AND CONSERVATION EASEMENTS 2.1a PROBLEM: There is a constituency of users who maintain that NSP has not met its enforcement and approval obligations under existing easements. I lack the authority to offer any judgment. However, whether this is fact or fiction, NPS has a perception problem. 2.1b SOLUTION: Perception notwithstanding, NPS should execute a full in depth review of all easements. A rededication to the proper enforcement and approval provisions should be made. Any facts on the ground that have changed should trigger amendments to be pursued with landowners. Furthermore, any opportunities for additional scenic and conservation easements should be pursued aggressively. The relative positive impacts of the existing easements at 9,000 acres will only continue to diminish with growing user and development pressures. 2.2 ACCESS 2.2a PROBLEM: The magnitude and direction of use, whether in, on or near the rivers' edge is going to increase. The corresponding uses by type and comparative impacts must not fall prey to shortsighted remedies. The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are priceless. 2.2b SOLUTION: With objective dispatch, the number and location of river accesses must be evaluated. The existing conditions of riverbanks, trails and roads complete this assessment. The number and location of river accesses should be reduced. Trails and roads can be improved and enhanced through reduction and/or elimination of certain park uses. 2.3 HORSES 2.3a PROBLEM: The presence of horses and riders has presented negative impacts. They include, but are not limited to, the following. Soil compaction promotes initial drainage along trails as sheet flow during storm events, and later degrades further into concentrated flow. This causes soil erosion, which discharges into the rivers, compromising water quality. The ingress and egress of too many horses, intersecting soft unconsolidation riverbanks has negative impacts as well on water quality and other passive park users. 2.3b SOLUTION: Management practices, dedicated and improved, should be implemented. Riders and commercial vendors should meet the cost of repair and recovery as end users and financial beneficiaries, respectively. 2.4 MOTORIZED VEHICLES 2.4a PROBLEM: There has been a material and substantial breakdown between legal use and illegal abuse of motorized vehicles. Off-road vehicles, motorcycles and ATV's have no place in ONSR. The negative impacts are far too many to catalog. What is certain is attitudes and values that engender care have lost to excused abuse. 2.4b SOLUTION: The NPS must find the will and financial means to enforce the law. Fines and penalties should cover the costs met initially by NPS for repair and recovery. A schedule of fines and penalties based upon past expenses should hopefully meet any legal challenge. Note, I am not a lawyer, only a man who aspires to be reasonable. 3.0 OTHER ISSUES: OPPORTUNITIES If we cherish our natural heritage and we know there is going to be continuing use and development pressures on public land, let us act on opportunities. NPS should adopt and commit to a congressional effort to designate Big Spring State Park as wilderness. Any collateral benefit would undoubtedly flow to ONSR. There is a host of civic and environmental NGO's that surely would support this effort. 4.0 PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVE: ALTERNATIVE "A" Alternative "A" presents a credible starting point. While it would be premature to offer a blanket endorsement of this alternative, NPS offers hope amid competing attitudes and values. Specifically, I would urge NPS to act upon these parameters: -Identify ONSR's capacity for use. Calibrate passive and active recreation within those natural limitations. Permit needs vs. capacity as a dynamic squared with a cost vs. benefit analysis to inform your judgment. -Any park use characterized as passive with benign impacts should be met by NPS and ultimately the U.S. taxpayers. Active recreation characterized as manageable, running on the margins of extreme to abusive should be met by the end user directly through fees, permits and/or licenses. -Minimize abusive activities absolutely; eliminate illegal uses emphatically. 5.0 SUMMARY NOTES I appeal to NPS to stay true north of common sense and reason. Set a straight bearing from principle through policy to practice. Far too often, obligations are readily met from principle through policy only to be rendered sterile in practice. Don't let this scenario materialize at this time, in this place, for this process. May the needs for stewardship trump the demands of brinkmanship. Thank you for your kind consideration in these matters. Submitted respectfully by, cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Representative Todd Akins Governor Jay Nixon</p>	8/8/2009	No		ASLA	MO	63126-1923
2575	<p>I. The "No Action Alternative" which describes what the park has to offer.; canoeing, kayaking, tubing, rafting, john boating, fishing, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, picnicking, camping, heritage events and specific other related programs with additional park ranger oversight would be my chosen preference. While I do not participate in all of these activities I respect the interest of those who do. I am aware that a federal budget in crisis does not allow for the hiring of additional rangers but I am of the opinion that visibility of the rangers available has a far greater impact on visitor behavior than the occasional ranger sighting. I do support the protection of the primitive character of the Big Spring area. 2. With 300 million plus visitors in the park last year I do support the need to maintain and protect the resources within the National Park Service boundaries. I do not see problems arising between visitors who are participating in park related activities such as; picnicking, hiking, fishing, etc. However it does appear that the major problems within the park are river related due to the heavy use and overlapping of boating, tubing and canoeing in a very congested area. I strongly support the need for additional river access in the form of boat ramps at points above or below the more congested areas between Waymeyer and Big Springs on the lower Current. I believe the vast majority of local residents who are boaters will regulate the congestion problems on their own if access to the river is more conveniently available. The only accessible boat ramp that is not in the heavy traffic area is located at Big Springs which on most weekends has an ever increasing overflow traffic problem. The ramps at the Bridge and Watercress are located in an area most heavily used by those who tube float, this appears to be a problem for boaters and floaters alike on most weekends.</p>	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466

	As a boater on the river I always chose to go beyond the congested areas of the river on those weekends when the influx of visitors is the highest, and as a floater I would choose to float within the areas more suited to that activity. I believe the willingness to respect each others form of recreational use by boaters and floaters alike would grow with a courteous understanding of each others river experience. 3. To set in place guidelines or regulations on motor boats appears to be singling out one group at the whim of another. I would strongly oppose this action and would hope that all newly formed regulations would allow visitors to the park and the activities they participate in to be met with a compromise by all recreational groups involved. I see no need to downsize the already existing horsepower limits that are in place on the river as I believe the general public will regulate themselves if appropriately placed boat ramps are available. 4. I boat from the upper Current to the lower Current depending on the time of year, water levels and visitor congestion so all sections of the river are important to me. No, I do not believe that the "Alternatives" adequately address the 134 miles of river which in fact has a shoreline of 268 miles with inadequate boat ramps. I also did not find the "Overview" specific enough in its wording on the management of this shoreline and the recreational activities on the waterways. 5. 1 would propose more enforcement of the already existing laws in place, increase the visibility of rangers throughout the park, strategically place boat ramps out of the heavily congested swimming areas of the park, place (some) additional rest rooms above and below the walk in areas to accommodate the boaters and canoe floaters who are more prone to be using those sections of the river.						
2576	Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways: Preliminary Alternatives, General Management Plan/ Wilderness Study The following comments are being submitted on behalf of the L-A-D Foundation Board regarding the National Park Service's continuing development of a draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In order to provide the most secure future for our unique, outstanding Ozark streams --- the Current and Jacks Fork rivers --- the Congressional mandate to protect them must be rigorously enforced. The L-A-D Foundation, which I established in 1962, has been active and involved in the Missouri Ozarks in grant making, natural areas protection, and, since 2004, the management of the 140,000-acre Pioneer Forest. I believe our foundation's forest lands adjacent to this national park contribute a substantial and stabilizing conservation buffer. We share miles of boundaries with the National Park Service and collaborate wherever possible in protecting the health and beauty of the rivers and their watersheds. As observers of the national park's history and recent management, we have seen firsthand the damaging influences that have increasingly affected the fragile quality of these streams. These assaults include the overdevelopment of the park, the spiraling number of access roads to the river, the jarring impacts of motor and jet boats, the uncontrolled use of the park by gigantic commercial horseback riding operations, and the destruction by motorized vehicles of the river corridors and adjacent lands. The result of these accumulated damages is that our first national river park now resembles a continuum of motorboat intersections, removed from everything natural. Visitors are exposed to an assault of human and mechanical noise; the sounds and silences of nature are hidden. The refreshing experience of nature's beauty is hidden, too. Private and well-kept places along the river that were purchased for the park have become overrun with roads, horse trails, and all types of motorized vehicles. The vision for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is at risk of being lost; the laws that govern most national parks are being broken at the Riverways. The language that the National Park Service itself chose to describe the original concept for an Ozark Rivers National Monument was crafted to preserve these free-flowing streams and the wild character of the river valleys. That basic sentiment survived as Congress further considered recommendations from many Missourians and from our state's elected officials. The legislation that was passed in 1964 Public Law 88-492 – was designed to protect the outstanding qualities of this river resource as our nation's first national river park. I believe the national park management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways can and must be re-aligned with the law and the Congressional intent that established this park. I support the comments prepared and submitted by the Friends of Ozark Riverways which are based on the Friends' thorough review of the issues and alternatives. Many positives remain within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; others can be revived. For the most part, the National Park Service has protected the wild character of its lands near Big Spring that had been the backcountry portion of the State of Missouri's Big Spring State Park. This area of the Ozark Riverways, as well as adjacent land of the Mark Twain National Forest, have been proposed as the Big Spring Wilderness. We urge that you recommend this area be added to the National Wilderness Preservation System. The L-A-D Foundation owns several pieces of land adjacent to this proposed wilderness and, as your neighbor, we support the proposal. Eventual designation of this area as wilderness is a long-standing goal of conservation, environmental, and outdoor recreation organizations around the state. I also hope you will include in the General Management Plan the development of the "Current River Trail," a multi-agency effort to develop an eleven-mile hiking route through the Current River valley, between Round Spring and the mouth of Brushy Creek. For almost 60 years I have been working to protect and preserve the Ozark streams and adjacent lands that the National Park Service is now privileged to control. The management plan that you design for the future of these rivers must be a strong departure from what is happening now. Today's generations of Ozark residents and visitors must rely on the National Park Service to protect our streams for future generations. Sincerely, Cc: Missouri Governor Jay Nixon Missouri Congressional Delegation Mark Templeton, Director, Missouri Department of Natural Resources	8/3/2009	No		L-A-D FOUNDATION	MO	63101
2577	Dear Senator Bond: I am writing to express my concern over the National Parks Service's Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. The General Management Plan (GNP) identifies four preliminary alternative concepts; a No-Action Alternative, and three Alternatives (A,B,C). Alternative A and B effectively eliminate boating on the Upper Current-South Segment (from Waymeyer to Two Rivers) by reducing outboard motors from the current limit of 40 horsepower to 25 horsepower. On page 4 of the GNP it states, "The upper Current River (North Segment) is a high-density canoe use area due in part to the river's shallow depth and winding course." This section (above Two Rivers) currently has a 25 horsepower limit and little boat traffic. Approximately one-third of an outboard engine's horsepower is used to power a jet boat's pump. A jet pump allows running shallow water and avoids the cost of propeller replacement. A jet is less harmful to the fish and plant life than is a propeller. A 25 horsepower jet boat will have approximately the same speed and power as a 15 horsepower outboard propeller. You can not take a family, or group of four adults with gear; easily, enjoyably or safely up the river with a 25 horsepower jet. The entire Upper Current-North Segment has very little boating traffic. Alternatives A and B would drastically reduce boating on the South Segment of the Upper Current. This would	6/18/2009	No			MO	63965

	<p>effectively eliminate recreational boating on the entire Upper Current. Proposal C allows a 40 horsepower engine but changes the rating on the horsepower limit to be measured at the powerhead. The majority of boaters have an engine that is titled by the State of Missouri as a 40 horsepower engine. These engines come directly from the manufacture with a jet pump attached. They are rated 40 horsepower output. The GMP is now proposing to redefine the horsepower rating on engines to be at the powerhead, a change from previous policy. This seemingly innocuous change would in fact outlaw the vast majority of engines currently on the river. The proposal would cost thousands of dollars of monetary damages on each boater, if forced to sell their motors. Van Buren is a small community of less than 1,000 residents and relies on tourism to support its finances. The river has its highest density of usage by the tourists from Mid-June (when the river warms) to Labor Day. These 10 weekends are the lifeblood of survival for the gas stations, motels, restaurants, convenience stores and other businesses. Whatever the number of complaints received from the tourists on the 10 busy weekends (20 days out of the year), it does not justify the draconian step of reducing/eliminating boating throughout the year. While some boats are brought in for weekend use, the majority are owned by residents who use them for recreation, fishing, and gigging. There are NO problems on the river during the 345 days of "Non Tourist" season. With utmost respect, I believe some self inspection needs to be done by the National Park Service. The two primary facilities to put boats into the river are at the bridge and Watercrest Park. Both of these facilities require one to go through the heavy tubing/canoeing traffic to get up river. There are very few tubes or canoes above Waymeyer to Log Yard (approximately 10 miles). If the Park Service would provide parking and a usable boat ramp at Waymeyer or above, there would automatically be separation of users. The boaters would go up river from the tubers/canoeists that would go down the river. There are very few complaints from tourists concerning the river from Log Yard to Waymeyer. The community is extremely proud of its heritage and river. The town through its Operation Clean Stream prides itself in self policing the river. Trash and refuse is picked up from the river, restoring it to what the town expects. Our city realizes the importance of the river and wants to take care of it The only option left is to elect the No-Action option. Let's all respect everyone's right to use the river and not further curtail our enjoyment through another round of rules and regulations. I respectfully request your support on this action. Sincerely, Cc: U.S. Senator Claire McCaskill U.S. Representative JoAnn Emerson Missouri Senator Kevin Engler Missouri Representative Mike Dethrow Missouri Representative JC Kuessner Mr. Reed Detring, Superintendent</p>						
2578	<p>Dear Superintendent, Thank you for the chance to state our ideas and choices. The Current and Jack's Fork Rivers are treasures that need an updated and tough love approach at this time. What has always attracted people, and wildlife, to the area is the pristine beauty and a rare spot where nature can be witnessed and experienced as it might have been a long time ago. I fully support Alternative A for any changes you need to make at this time. I don't believe we need more education and slogans. Adults and children are crammed with this kind of thing. All of the education doesn't matter if children are being taught otherwise at home. Today there are very few resources financially for this approach, and it is time to get back to keeping it simple. What teaches volumes is the rivers themselves when they are protected. We hike in a parcel of virgin forest in Illinois, Beall Woods, on the Wabash River. Nature is the best teacher and so should it be so with the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. We are only the temporary caretakers of these beautiful rivers. Our choices to be made soon will truly reflect our values, and this too is the strongest and clearest teacher. If we preach ecology, but choose otherwise, then our integrity is gone and kids and adults know it. One solution I have for the trail riders is to greatly limit the number allowed each season just like they do on rivers out west. This limit even extends to those floating the rivers there, but I don't think we need that here. We could do as they do out west and have permits obtained by a lottery system. The number can be regulated according to the time of year so that there is never severe damage done in generally heavy use months. This is even true for hiking and lodging out west, and it seems to work. The limit would still provide income, but will also make it special when you "Win the Lottery". It is a good thing to limit. There is truly no excuse or place for ATV's to be in, crossing, or using the rivers for recreation. Missouri has many other places for that and that same holds true for motor boats. There are other places on this river, there are other rivers and lakes that want that kind of business and can handle these machines. I believe that until the rivers are reclaimed, security and patrolling is essential. People's use and behavior reflects how they value these rivers, and it's best they get the message as soon as possible, that other places best suit their actions. I am in my 50's and understand having "fun", but we always did it with reverence for the rivers. Maybe that is what's missing -reverence. If you protect it with that in mind, then people will again begin to think of it as such the rare gem that it is. When they see it as rare they will begin to treat it as rare. Today they feel that "anything goes." Please send them the message that this is no longer true. I know the business owners are worried, but I assure them when much of the problems are cleared out many people will return, or come for the first time. They too must see this more than just money. With some plans if they fail, we can just start a new plan. But with nature we are not given that option. Nature must be protected. If we don't then the business owners will still have to worry, but by then there is no turning back. Missouri is blessed with lots of land, rivers and lakes than can handle, and want to handle, trailriders, motor boats, ATV's, etc. We are talking about a small area. It is not an all or nothing choice- just a choice that says that stuff should be taken elsewhere. This is protecting the rivers. I also ask that you create and implement a plan that takes into consideration the next 7 generations. That is the philosophy of the Native American Indians, and it is an appropriate guideline in making the next changes needed. I have been floating the Current and Jack's Fork rivers since I was a teenager. Some of my fondest memories are from there. I have taken my children there, and would like to bring my grandchildren soon. They boat a lot at Lake Norfolk. There truly is no other place like these rivers anywhere else in the state of Missouri and I would like them to experience them as I did, and so many others before me. I ask you from the bottom of my heart to please do all you can to protect the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers with Alternative A. I believe you will feel like you will be doing something great for the world. Sincerely, If you use any part of my letter, you may identify me with my first name only and the name of my town. Thank you.</p>	7/8/2009	No			MO	63357

2579	<p>Dear Superintendent Detring, I am very concerned about the Ozark National Scenic River ways General Management Plan the National Park Service is proposing for the Current River. The GMP has put forth four preliminary concepts. In my opinion the "NO ACTION" alternative is the proper course of action, essentially leaving things as they are. Many of us have moved to the area because of the diverse activities in the wonderful and beautiful region. Would I have moved here if I thought there was a chance that I could not have a boat? No. To reduce the horsepower of the motor boats would be very detrimental to the enjoyment of the river for most of the local people and would have a tremendous economical impact on Van Buren and the area. The economic impact of forcing all the boaters to go from 40 hp to 25 hp would be catastrophic for the boat owners, the local economy and local property values. I doubt we would get a bailout. For one, I would move to a more friendly area. To reduce the horsepower to 25 hp would effectively prohibit the local residents from having family and friends from distant locations being able to enjoy the Current River. The aged and the handicapped would not have access to the river. My mother is 100 years old and has been to the river for the last four years. My sister who is in her seventies and is disabled brought Mother to the river. It required both myself and my wife to assist both to the river's edge and onto the boat. Once they arrived to a gravel bar they enjoyed the day and the river the way it was meant to be by the Congress when it established the Ozark National Scenic River ways in 1964. I and many others have elderly family that love to come visit and enjoy the river but are not capable of floating in a tube or canoe. To reduce the horsepower from the present 40 hp to 25 hp would make the river unavailable to the aged and disabled. The lower horsepower would make navigating the shallow shoals in late summer with four adults in the boat next to impossible and possibly increase their exposure to danger, being caught in a shallow shoal and swift water. In the years that I have been in Van Buren I have personally rescued many floaters and overturned canoes and helped retrieve their belongings. Twice and maybe three times I feel that I prevented a potential drowning. Multiply that by all the boaters on the river. Floaters and canoes create 99% of the trash on the river. Boaters pick up trash and retrieve trash lost or left by floaters and canoes. We always police any location we may be and always bring home the trash and garbage left on the gravel bars we visit. I have picked up as many as a pint water bottle of cigarette butts from a single gravel bar. The majority of the disruptive noise comes from floaters with loud boom boxes that can be heard for at least a mile (1/2 mile coming and 1/2 mile going). The boat noise is short lived for the most part. The four stroke engines are so quiet you can hear the water splashing before you hear the motor. Floaters and canoeers bring a large percentage of their supplies, food and drinks from home and just leave their trash. The boaters are mostly locals and support the local economy. The NPS reported 371 complaints in 2006. I understand the Park Service solicited these at the bridge. At any rate, with 1.8 million people utilizing the river in 2007 that amounts to .02 % of the overall visitor population having a complaint. I dare say that any businessman, legislator, bureaucrat, or governmental agency would be thrilled with those results. Further, I am sure no drastic policy changes or business practice changes would be instituted with such positive results. Let the Sierra Club "types" use the millions of acres already set aside as "wilderness areas". Take the NO ACTION plan and leave things as they are. The present plan has the highest approval rating of anything I know of, based on the above numbers. Most of the boaters live in Missouri and pay taxes and vote in Missouri. A high percentage of the floaters and canoeers come from Illinois, Tennessee, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, and other states and do not pay taxes or vote in Missouri. I urge you to use all your influence to cause the NPS to take the NO ACTION PLAN. Thanking you in advance for taking the time to read this, I remain, Respectfully your</p>	7/7/2009	No		National Skeet Shooting Association	MO	63965
2580	<p>Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverway General Management Plan The "federally-protected" National Scenic Rivers known as the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers, sadly are not. The soil, gravel and vegetation that were loosened on the South Prong of the Jacks Fork five years ago by the Pierce Township (Texas County) road crew, the Shannon County Commission on Big Creek on the Current River earlier this year and currently by the Roberts Sawmill of Mountain View in Flat Rock Creek (major tributary of the Jacks Fork are all well on their way downstream to the Gulf of Mexico. Delayed response to emergency situations is no response at all. Regretably, ONSR and NPS do not adequately address behaviors like this, in their proposed Management Plan for the next 20 years, or the rise of destructive activities like AN use and abuse by existing horse trail rides and future abuse by more trail ride businesses. All these activities are horrendously destructive to the water quality of the ONSR and the quality of the low-impact experiences of floating, fishing, hiking these rivers. What part of "preserving and protecting" these rivers are allowing the loss of riparian soil and water quality? The ONSR and National Park Service have failed miserably in their attempt to protect the Current and Jacks Fork. The proof of that failure is the fact that the Jacks Fork appeared on Missouri's Impaired Waters List. It is an embarrassment! What's more, it has taken citizen lawsuits, in many instances to force ONSR to do its job. Congress and the Interior Department also can take credit for failures at ONSR by treating these premier National Scenic Rivers like they are the last stop on the bus, They are perennially underfunded and understaffed. All too often, the superintendents appointed here are a year or two from retirement and don't want to make waves or their subordinates are allowed to run roughshod over the law and spirit of why these rivers were singled out by Congress for protection, in 1964. The latest faux pas by ONSR was the limiting of public meetings on the ONSR GMP to five sites in Missouri. Three of those sites were local. Only two included the urban centers of St. Louis and Columbia. Springfield and Kansas City were totally ignored. These rivers belong to ALL Americans, not just the people in Dent, Shannon and Carter Counties. Yet the ONSR allowed themselves to be bullied by local citizens and skewed the process. Perhaps if the people in the Interior Department and the National Park Service (six months into an Obama administration, the NPS still doesn't have a director!) took this park seriously, their laxity would not contribute to the lawlessness in the park. What would happen if the ONSR were fully funded for education, management and enforcement? What would happen if the Watershed Partnership, set up by former ONSR superintendent, Art Sullivan, was more than just a debating club and feel good society? What has ONSR and NPS done to further the education of the local children as to the water quality and karst topography of the watershed? What has the ONSR and NPS done to help local people protect water quality rather than ignorantly destroy it? ONSR has deferred these issues to a handful of environmental and conservation groups rather than demonstrate leadership. A true partnership would enlist other state and federal agencies to help accomplish true protection of these rivers. Federal and state protections for these rivers should work in tandem inside and outside the park to protect water quality.</p>	8/10/2009	No		Ozark Riverkeepers Network	MO	65548

	<p>Good points in Alternative A: -Closing of roads and trails that have been illegally developed -The emphasis on traditional non-mechanized experiences. -Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks -Restoring the river corridor and protecting the ENTIRE WATERSHED! If further legislation is needed to accomplish this, then that should happen. -The proposal for wilderness designation for the Big spring tract is a no brainer and should happen. -The motorboat use needs to be restricted to below Two Rivers -Horsepower limits should be strictly enforced. Motorboat etiquette should be strictly enforced. Non-motorized boats should always be given deference. Two recent deaths of motor boaters on the Current River punctuate this need.' Good points in Alternative B: -Enhancing the awareness and understanding of the historical culture of the Ozarks -The network of small learning centers with facilities would include classrooms. New trails should be limited and anti ATV devices should be installed -Restoring the river corridor and having a focused program for research, monitoring and preservation -The proposal for wilderness designation for the Big spring tract. Concerns -the increase in motorboat horsepower and range should be strictly limited and enforced. -primitive camping experience should be increased Good points-Not many in Alternative C: -This Alternative is very vague. The public needs more specific information on how you plan to accomplish the goals. -It doesn't deal with the ATV problems. Federal law supercedes state law! ATV's shouldn't be allowed in a National park... let alone one that is statutorily required to preserve and protect the watersheds of the Jacks Fork and Current River. If further legislation is needed to accomplish preservation and protection, so much the better. ATV's did not exist when ONSR was created! -It doesn't define the expanding problem of horse trail ride businesses along the Current and Jacks Fork. Increasing the trails for horses proposed in Alternative C just adds to the problem. The trail rides need to be controlled better than the canoe concessionaires are. There needs to be strictly enforced limited river crossings and a method devised to identify the horse and rider. -Easement land needs to be better enforced. Too many landowners with easements restrictions have violated the legal requirements and no enforcement has been done. "Do what you want because the Park never enforces the restrictions" mentality is what predominates in the absence of strong management, enforcement and education. This needs to stop!!! -Immediate and swift enforcement of counties/cities that violate the clean water act and who decide they can do as they please on Park Service land. Preservation of the river channels, stream bank and riparian zones ought to take precedent over recreational enterprises. Private individuals and representatives of cities and counties who destroy the integrity of the nature of these rivers ought to spend the successive months restoring that integrity or paying for proper restoration and remediation of their offenses. Confiscation of all equipment involved in such activities should be immediate and permanent. Re-arranging the channels of these rivers and their tributaries should never be acceptable! Sincerely,</p>						
2581	<p>On behalf of our 65,000 members and supporters nationwide and particularly our active members in State of Missouri thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan and Wilderness Study. We appreciate the thorough effort the National Park Service (NPS) has undertaken to solicit public input in this process through public hearings, via mailings and on the NPS website. American Rivers has deep concerns about the potential for degradation of the free-flowing Current and Jacks Rivers if proper care is not taken by the NPS to protect the outstanding values for which these rivers have been recognized. The stated the statutory purposes of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are to: 1) "preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins; (and) 2) provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the natural riverways resources." The ecological, recreation, and geological values of the 134 miles of free-flowing rivers in the Ozark National Riverways are exceptional and abundant. According to the NPS: "The ... karst landscape supports an amazing variety of natural features, including a world-class spring system that is unparalleled in North America. The national riverways features the largest spring in the national park system, six first-magnitude springs and spring complexes, and more than 350 other springs. The cave system is equally impressive with more than 338 recorded caves one of the highest densities of any national park system unit." "The ancient Ozark Highlands is an important center of biodiversity in North America, including more than 100 endemic species. The large variety of species found within Ozark National Scenic Riverways is due to the rich array of aquatic, terrestrial, and subterranean habitats concentrated within its river corridors." These two rivers have also been designated as Outstanding National Resource Waters, two of only three such waters in Missouri. This designation legally protects the nation's high quality waters under the authority of the Clean Water Act. The designation protects "waters of National and State parks and wildlife refuges and waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance," in which no permanent degradation is allowed. Unfortunately the Jacks and Current Rivers have been subjected to overuse that threatens the values that deemed the rivers nationally significant and worthy of protection. Soil erosion, water quality impacts and habitat fragmentation caused by unregulated overuse, particularly the creation of unauthorized roads and river access points and equine and floater use which threaten water quality, are among the greatest concerns to our organization. American Rivers supports proposed Alternative A provided that the Park Service adopts improved management policies that address the current threats to this national treasure. American Rivers urges the Park Service to improve management and focus on restoring the degraded natural conditions on the rivers. Specifically, we encourage the NPS to implement a plan for use that retires and restores unauthorized access points, limits motorized, equine and other recreational use within limits that do not degrade habitat connectivity and water quality. We oppose adoption of the proposed Alternatives B and C because we believe they would exacerbate existing pressures which would undermine the values of the area, the purpose of the National Scenic Riverways designation and violate the ONRW designation. Finally, we encourage the NPS to recommend the 3,400 acre primitive area portion of the old Big Spring State Park as a federal wilderness area. This area is representative of the pristine hills and forests that once dominated this part of the Ozarks and is worthy of further protection as a compliment to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please keep me informed of future actions relating to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I look forward to working with you on these issues in the future and feel to contact me if you have any questions,... Sincerely,</p>	8/17/2009	No		River Protection Program American Rivers	DC	20005

2582	<p>I feel like the government should be for the people. Anytime we have tax payer money involved in parks and lands it should be for everybody to use as chosen. We should not have a permit system for tax payer land (that should be our permit). I am a lifetime resident of Carter County with no plans of ever having to leave. I have always used the river for recreation, hunting, fishing, trapping and just enjoying being on it. I have had a boat since I was 12 years old. All different horse power starting with 71/2 prop and now own a 60/40 jet, that I bought a month ago. I am confident that boats of any horse power have saved lives on Current River. Myself I have probably saved 10 to 20 people while operating a boat. The worst being this year on 6-13-2009. The river was flooded about 1 1/2 to 2 ft. and the concessionaire was putting tubes and rafts in the river, about 100 yards above a tree that was pulling them under. The river was extremely swift that day. If I had not been there in my boat I would not have been there at all. With the help of another boat we were able to save what I am sure was three lives. The park Ranger was within 1 mile down river writing tickets, nowhere near the access. The park rangers cannot watch the entire river. The local boats are the ones that are helping these people and have been always. (since tubing started) Very few canoes have difficulty. The boating families are not the people that are causing the heavy partying. Most boaters prefer to get away from the tourism and are able to with their boats. I do not believe Current River is polluted in any fashion. The river would already have been ruined if people, vehicles, horses and motorboats were polluting it, although people particularly floaters in our area are very disrespectful in their littering. Plastic and aluminum are commonly floating in tourist areas. Most boaters pick up floater trash. This is temporary trash and cleaned up by locals or the river itself. No matter what temporary erosion is thought to have been done by any boat and motor the river takes care of itself. And has done so since the beginning of time and will continue to do so. People do not affect the wildlife along the waterways. I've seen all types of wildlife and fish for years, and there is more aquatic wildlife and birds now than when I was young. I am not aware of any plants or animals that do not naturally belong here. The water quality outside the park is no reason to take action of this measure. It has nothing to do with the activities on the river. Current River is a gavel bottom river that has its own cleaning system. Current River is clear inside and outside park land, (Doniphan to gooseneck for instance) Anyone that has access to Current River can see its clean and clear. As a child our vacations were always camping on Current River. My family uses Current River year round. No person that comes to Current River once or twice a year is hardly qualified to make judgment of what is best for Current River. Current River is treated with respect by my family and all local families. It is our life. It is the reason we stay here. Hopefully my children and theirs will get the chance to enjoy Current River as I have. I wouldn't want to think all they had of Current River was stories of days gone. On the Big Spring Wilderness subject. I feel the park as a state park was for everyone and every citizen of Missouri. And as a federal park should remain as is. I feel that it is already a pristine wilderness without any help. I think that travel in the park is so small it would be irrelevant to designate more rules. Our school suffers because of all the federal land in the county that is tax exempt. These lands should pay the same amount as any landowner. Tax exempt land is hurting our children's education.</p>	6/22/2009	No			MO	53965
2583	<p>Dear Mr. Detring, Having been campers, boaters, and hikers in Missouri for many years, there was no part of the park system that our family enjoyed more than the Scenic Riverways under your jurisdiction. Our family grew up with a respect for and love of that land and those waters, and have passed their enthusiasms and protective visions regarding the natural world on to our grandchildren. Now in our late 70's, we have found, to our dismay, that the pristine areas we so enjoyed have been steadily abused for years, subjected to an onslaught of illegal motoring roads, ATVs, excessive numbers of commercial trail rides, high powered motor boats, jet boats, car washing and oil changing. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that such activity can only lead to massive degradation and the loss of everything that defines a national park experience. We also realize that policing a large area (where too many people feel their "rights" include using the land and water as they choose) is a difficult charge. But if the Park Service doesn't do it, who will? I truly beg you to make laws and stand firm on them against the above cited activities. Raise the camping fees slightly and hire more rangers, if that's what it takes. Create fewer access points. Go so far as limiting the kinds of boats allowed: canoes, kayaks, slow-moving electric- motor-powered craft, OK. Jet boats, ski boats and their lesser companions, not OK. Let the water cowboys find other playgrounds than the National Scenic Waterways. Close the wildcat trails and fine or jail those ATV trespassers. We fought once before to save the Current River, and now we must do it again. I guess the late David Brower, environmentalist extraordinaire, was right when he said, "There's no such thing as permanent victory. After we win a battle, the wilderness is still there, and still vulnerable. When a conservation group loses a battle, the wilderness is dead." How depressing. Sincerely,</p>	9/8/2009	No			MO	63119
2584	<p>Dear Mr. Detring: The Missouri Parks Association would like to offer our thoughts on Ozark National Scenic Riverways' Preliminary Alternatives for the General Management Plan/Wilderness Study which you issued earlier this summer. We are reminded of your participation last fall at our Annual Meeting at Montauk State Park where we as citizens discussed the variety of problems being encountered at the Riverways. Thank you again for your time on that weekend. This continues to be a very important issue for us. We appreciate the opportunity to provide these thoughts and will be anxious to review your Draft General Management Plan. As Missourians, we feel a sense of pride in the fact that the ideas behind the Ozark National Scenic Riverways began the thinking about national rivers, what they mean for our country, and how we work together to protect, preserve, and manage them well. At that time the threat to the river and its valley was from the flooding of dams and expectations for the national park were clear. Beginning in the 1950's Missouri officials including the governor and many citizens voiced support for the national park understanding that it would protect significant stretches of these rivers as free-flowing and undeveloped. The National Park Service itself produced "A Proposal - Ozark Rivers National Monument" in 1960. Many consider it to be the source document and the impetus for what are now the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and, a few years later, the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. A short time after the NPS document appeared there were two separate pieces of legislation addressing the establishment of the park, Senate Bill S.16 and House Bill H.R.1803. Differences between the two bills were worked out in a conference committee and their report is instructive. An excerpt from that report provides a clear sense of the overall direction Congress intended for Public Law 88-492, the law which established the Riverways. In short, enactment of H.R. 1803 will provide an answer, as far as the Current and Jacks Fork are concerned, to a question asked by Mr. Hall in his book which has already been quoted. "What future lies ahead for Current River, and for other American streams, that have managed to retain their original beauty and, more especially, some</p>	8/3/2009	No		MISSOURI Parks Association	MO	65205

	<p>of the quality of wilderness?" It will be a recognition by Congress of the importance of the values claimed by him for such areas as this their value "for science, to be used as a yardstick in measuring the health of tame-land"; their value "for the preservation of wildlife and for the recreation of our people, and their value as a "matter of esthetics- that renewal of the spirit which we know comes from association with unspoiled nature."...And..."that certain rivers of unusual scenic, esthetic, and recreational values...be allowed to remain in their free- flowing state and natural setting without manmade alterations." The park was established in 1964 and, as members of the Missouri Parks Association, we also know that several of this state's exceptional state parks, Alley Spring, Big Spring, and Round Spring, were given to the National Park Service to be the starting point for the lands of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The 50th anniversary of Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be in 2014, just a few years away. There are many visitors to and observers of this park who recognize that the early vision for this special place has not been met. The problems are increasing along with damages to park resources. Many of our members and even local people write and talk about the rowdy, party-like behavior of large groups of floaters. This should be easy to fix but understanding and then fixing other core problems demands that the National Park Service be firmly determined to do so. We make note of several: -Rather than a dozen or so access points envisioned early on, this number has rocketed to probably more than 100. There may be so many today that we do not know their actual number. -The network of roads linking access points has resulted in an attack on the river valley from all sorts of motorized vehicles. This comes day and night, year-round. The sad commentary from many is that there may no longer be a riverside spot guaranteed to provide a peaceful camp at night. -The open access, even to otherwise remote areas, has stimulated an escalating development of river resources. Too often the Park Service response to small areas of overuse has been to sanction the activity with official grills, trash cans, etc. rather than to fix the damage and restore the park. -Riding a horse is a tradition in the Ozarks. The shocking difference is that rather than hundreds there are now thousands using the Riverways. The number of horses and their riders has grown tremendously and unduly influences recreation in the park. A plan to control the number of horses within the park and the design of their trails must be part of this GMP. -There is much NPS experience in these matters from across the country-- it must be applied here. -There are other problems too, with assuring the protection of easements and the allowances that have been made for operating jet boats on narrow sections of the river. It is not our intention to make note of every problem. There are opportunities as well, for example, to continue to protect the Big Spring Wilderness as you have done and recommend it for wilderness designation. We do feel that many of these problems are serious and when taken together, are indicative of a national park in crisis. If we were to pick one of the preliminary alternatives, it would be 'A' which conforms best to the original intentions for this park. Several years before you joined us last November, the Missouri Parks Association was again gathered at Montauk State Park and became one of the first members of Friends of Ozark Riverways. We remain involved with this group and support their views and comments to you. We view this as a call for the agency to act. This national park must be helped and the adoption of a General Management Plan, one which is mindful of the public law, will serve to re-establish what Missourians had called for in the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and which we now call for once again. Sincerely,</p>						
2585	<p>Preliminary Alternatives Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan The Cave Research Foundation and other cave research groups have a long history of involvement with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Since the inception of the park, volunteers have worked with the NPS on cave and karst issues. A formal volunteer agreement with the Missouri Speleological Survey was initiated in 1980 and has continued to this day under the auspices of Cave Research Foundation. The enabling legislation for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) calls for "...conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values..., including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River..." One of the changes to the initial bill was to "make clear that recreation is a purpose". However, the primary purpose remains conservation and preservation. One of the insights of this time is to make it obvious that the rivers are not just to be preserved but used. By comparison, rivers in Yellowstone National Park are preserved but not to be used by visitors. However, it is difficult to imagine that anyone in 1964 envisioned the kind of use that the rivers are undergoing today or that such use would be deemed appropriate by the 1964 standards under which the park was established. What is necessary to determine is whether the ONSR will be managed as befits a unit of the National Park Service or if it will continue to decline to something approaching county park status. In what follows, we will discuss what we perceive as problems existing within ONSR, followed by a discussion of the alternatives offered. Finally, we are including a brief discussion of cave and karst management. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES Easement Issues Over the years scenic easement regulations have frequently been ignored or overruled. This has resulted in many great and lasting changes to the scenic qualities of the park. -Scenic easements were entered into voluntarily by landowners. -Scenic easement standards must be adhered to and enforced. Horsepower Limits The present limits on power boat use are described in the River Use Management Plan, written in 1989. This was a follow-up to the 1980 GMP which delayed river use guidelines until outstanding litigation had been settled. Comments on the draft GMP revealed that 80% of respondents favored limiting horsepower. At that time, power boat use was low, probably only 10% of present traffic, and yet many conflicts and complaints were noted. Since the 1989 horsepower limitations were established power boat use has increased exponentially. Virtually all of this use seems to be by local residents, i.e. people from adjoining counties utilizing the park as a day-use site. The 1989 study noted that "the potential for accidents resulting from increased speeds and size of motorboats presently being used... is a growing safety concern..." These problems have greatly increased in the past twenty years. Today it is difficult to take a summer canoe trip below Round Spring without encountering vast numbers of motorboats and their attendant safety problems. The greatest use of these powerboats is speed-boating, with few being used for camping or fishing, traditional uses of powerboats at the time of the enabling legislation. The problem of safety has been made obvious by recent incidents including the unfortunate deaths of boat passengers. -Powerboat use is increasing in regularity and in total days. -Average horsepower continues to climb. -Use of motorboats has changed from camping/fishing to pleasure speed-boating. -Boating courtesy has become a thing of the past. Rarely do boaters slow when meeting canoes. Near accidents and swampings are increasing. Canoeists report harassment by motorboats. -Large parties of motorboaters are taking over gravel bars and leaving trash behind, making it difficult for canoe campers to even use these gravel bars for camping. -Motorboats are noisy, frequently being able to be heard for more than a mile away.</p>	8/8/2009	No		Cave Research Foundation	MO	63620

	<p>-Exhaust and oil residue are polluting the air and water of the park; the visitor experience continues to decline in quality. -Excessive motorboat use has driven family canoe users away from such sections of the river as Powder Mill and Log Yard. -An annual boat permit for the park should be required. Canoe and Tube Use While excessive canoes detract from the visitor experience, they are not as disruptive as motorboats. Most of the complaints about canoe use are related to odious behavior by the occupants. We believe this can be addressed by law enforcement. -The practice of an outfitter bringing canoes from one area to another apparently continues and should not. Concession canoes should be limited to designated zones. -Such limitations on concession could lead to greater use on certain zones that are not currently undergoing much use such as Two Rivers, Powder Mill, and the Log Yard. Reestablishment of a canoe concession in the Powder Mill or Log Yard areas would enhance the use of the park. - An annual boat permit for the park should be required for all canoes and tubes. - The 1989 river use plan mentioned additional measures that could be used to mitigate problems but these were never implemented. Horse Use and Trails Horse use has greatly increased in recent years, largely as a consequence of increased commercial facilities. Viable policies that protect the park have not been developed. At the same time, hiking trails have not been increased and a long-term plan for doing so has not been developed. -Trails were laid out by horse users rather than the park. Normal compliance procedures and assessments do not seem to have occurred. -Due to location and use, trails are rutted and unusable by foot traffic. -Horse feces and urine continue to go into the rivers and tributary streams. -Some present trails should be closed and alternatives such as old roadbeds should be explored. -Day use limits should be established. -Horse permits should be required and commercial operators should be required to be concessionaires. -River crossings should be greatly reduced and eliminated anywhere possible. The issue is one of resource protection, not convenience for horse riders. -Day hiking and backpacking trails should be increased. Wherever possible, these should utilize old traces and road beds rather than making new impacts on the resource. Roads and ATV Use The past 25 years have seen many traces become well-used roads. The result has been to degrade the visitor experience. Traditional use was to utilize gravel bars for overnight river camping. Today it is harder and harder to find a campsite that is not accessible via motorized traffic. Campers have reported more and more intrusions during the night hours and conflicts keep increasing. ATV traffic continues to rise. -Many old traces and illegal roads need to be closed, some permanently and others by gate. -Old traces (historic roadbeds) could be used as hiking and horse trails, such as are done at Buffalo NR. -Illegal ATV/ORV traffic must be stopped. While this is a law enforcement issue, it has not been adequately addressed by management policy. River Accesses and Primitive Camping This is part of the road issue. Most of the new roads, illegal roads, or widened roads are utilized to access the rivers. As these roads have increased in use, so has maintenance of them, by the NPS, county, or even individuals acting on federal lands. This has resulted in severe degradation of the riparian vegetation cover, and it has resulted in visitor experiences that are far from what was envisioned in the enabling legislation. Trailers and other vehicles are now a common site along the rivers. Roads now go all the way to the water at hundreds of points within the park. Trailers are dumping human waste on gravel bars. Other trailers are camped on the river, unattended, for weeks on end. -Illegal roads and widened roads need to be closed. -River banks that have been degraded need to be cl</p>						
2586	<p>RE: Ozark National Scenic Riverways - No-Action Alternative To whom it may concern: I first came to Van Buren and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a guest of ... in 1984. ... owned a second home in Van Buren where ... parents had chosen to retire. ... and I worked together in St. Louis. The ... were excited about sharing the Current River experience with new friends. The group from St. Louis would participate in the 2-man scramble golf outing held at Deer Run Golf Course at the end of July. We played golf in the morning and enjoyed the River (floating & boating) in the afternoon. The next year spouses joined in the fun and soon we found ourselves borrowing ...'s second home in Van Buren to enjoy the River with our young children. Later, ... (my wife) and I decided we should have our own place, but our financial wherewithal at the time dictated we partner with another couple from the group. The ...'s and ...'s (... & ...) from St. Louis partnered up and bought ...'s place off M-107 in 1990. We bought our first boat that same year, 1990. 1990 was the also the first year we began hosting my family reunion on the river. Soon we bought a second boat as our children grew older and we began to entertain family, friends and clients more frequently. In 2006, we added a third jet boat (down river boat) to better facilitate entertaining on the river. This year ... and I will host our 20th ... n Family Reunion in Van Buren. Approximately 20 family members (ages 10 to 93) will be in Van Buren from July 1 thru 5. The group enjoys the river each day using our 3 motorized boats and four (4) kayaks. Many in our reunion group would not be physically able to enjoy the river were it not for the safety and accommodations of the motorized boats. My family loves and respects this unique natural resource, the Current River. My family respects the privilege to enjoy the river and the Park and respect the privilege of others to do the same. We obey the rules of the Missouri Water Patrol and the National Park Service and expect others to do the same. I offer the following comments for your consideration in the matter at hand: -Over our 19 years of owning a second home in Van Buren we have aided 10s of floaters using our motorized boats. Perhaps a life or two was saved along the way. Boaters make the waterway safer. -We always bring more garbage back with us than we create. We pick up countless cigarette butts left by floaters, refuge from over-turned floaters, refuge from overnight floaters camp sites, refuge from floaters day picnicking, etc. Floaters sink empty beverage cans that litter the bottom of the river. Boaters keep the river cleaner. -Horse power, in my opinion, should not be used to regulate the use of the river. Look at the federal highway system. Floaters and boaters alike all make it to the river just fine without regard to horse power or the size of the vehicle they choose to drive. Who paid for the National Park? -Boaters are subject to sobriety check points after enjoying a day on the river. Floaters are not. Perhaps there would be fewer complaints from floaters if they were not allowed to become publicly intoxicated creating hazardous conditions for themselves and others (floaters and boaters). Perhaps there should be a sobriety check point for floaters along the river. I ask the question, what kind of visitors do the National Park and Van Buren want? -The river/national park should not be made into a private water park for the commercial benefit of a few. The proposed alternatives are all just another step toward that end. Does the National Park Service and Van Buren really want the river used that way? Perhaps the National Park Service should be the only outfitter to service the Park. -Personally, ... and I have brought millions of dollars of revenue to the local economy. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars refurbishing and expanding our river home using only local contractors, suppliers and labor. We have purchased 17 lots within the Deer Run Subdivision and, unlike some; we actually pay our</p>	6/22/2009	No		CODE CONSULTANT S, INC	MO	63017

	<p>subdivision assessments. I have purchased six (6) boats from local builders and rely on other local vendors for supplies and service. We patronize local restaurants, stores, gas stations, etc. -Floaters often bring in their own supplies (drinks, food, etc.) for their day/overnight trip on the river leaving only the resultant garbage for the local economy and the National Park. What kind of visitors do the National Park and Van Buren want? -... and I have paid millions of dollars in taxes over the years (state & federal) and expect a few of those dollars have funded both the Missouri Water Patrol and the National Park Service. We are proud to pay our way and support these very important and necessary services and appreciate the good job all do to protect the Park, the waterway, and its visitors. A special thanks to the Park Rangers and Water Patrol men and women who patrol the river. -Lastly, about the 800 pound gorilla in the room, if the rules were changed, what does the National Park Service suggest we do with our motorized boats? I don't know about others, but I'll need a \$60,000 bail-out. What do I do about the more intangible devaluation of my developed and undeveloped property? That too sounds like a lot of money to me. What if the feds told you, that you couldn't use your \$60,000 SUV to drive on federally funded highways, because they received a proportionate number of complaints from those who did not like or have SUVs and did not have a vested interest in SUVville? I encourage all involved to carefully evaluate the decision at hand. The future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and Van Buren weighs in the balance. There is a place for all law abiding respectful citizens to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, whether it is from a tube or the seat of a motorized boat, regardless of horse power. Enforce the laws/rules already on the books across the board (floaters and boaters alike) and maintain the diversity of law abiding visitors that come to enjoy the National Park and Van Buren for many years to come. ... and I respectfully request there be no change in the horse power limits allowed in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park. We support the No-Action Alternative. cc: Kit Bond, US Senator for Missouri Clare McCaskill, US Senator for Missouri Wiliam "Lacy" Clay, Missouri Congressman District 01 Jay Nixon, Missouri Governor Peter Kinder, Missouri Lieutenant Governor Robin Carnahan, Missouri Secretary of State Chris Koster, Missouri Attorney General Albert Liese, Missouri House Representative Joan Bray, Missouri District Senator</p>					
2587	<p>Dear NOSR Superintendent, As a life long user of the National Ozark Scenic Riverways, I wish to submit the following comments on the management plan currently being developed. I strongly endorse a plan which will consider the following: 1) I wish to see the rivers and their designated borders maintained in a natural state as much as is humanly possible. 2) Limit accessibility to only those areas already established by the Park Service. Do not add any additional access points. Eliminate access area not established by the Park. 3) I agree with the concept of multiple use. That said, multiple use does not give some users the right to "tear up the place" through overuse or by ignoring current laws and regulations. the Park Service needs to seriously determine the numbers of canoeist, motor boats, horse riders, campers, and hikers which can use the areas without some adverse affect upon the various ecosystems within the part. 4) Reduce or eliminate motor boats on the rivers above Big Springs. This will prevent noise pollution, bank erosion caused by waves, exhaust fumes, and oil spills/leaks on surface waters. If some boats are allowed in certain areas, they must adhere to low decibel numbers even when the motor is running at top speed. 5) Ban the use of all ATV's in back areas like: old logging roads, gravel bars, and within the rivers. Administer heavy fines and confiscation of vehicles by those who would operate within these "off limits" areas. 6) Establish a Wilderness area within the Big Springs area where the old state park boundary was located. Personal insights and additional comments into statements listed above: (1) The Current & Jack's Fork Rivers are real treasures for the Ozark region of Missouri and we must do all we can to maintain their true natural beauty. We must all work together to maintain the rugged beauty of these river systems including their ecology, spring systems, as well as, the unique plants and Animals. (2) Over the years I have camped out on many gravel bars, especially along the Jack's Fork River. I have experienced ATV's & 4 wheel vehicles drive up to my campsite by people I did not know. They were able to access the gravel bar by using old logging roads with the Park boundary. These roads were clearly NOT to be used by motorized vehicles. Some gravel bars are completely covered with ATV tracks and you can see where they drove through the river to access the opposite side. The operators will cut trees and downed logs to get access to gravel bars on the river. Activities like these, must be stopped by increasing enforcement and administering heavy fines and even the confiscation of vehicles by repeat offenders. (3) A good river, trail, and access point experience does not mean you must encounter massive numbers of people, boats (canoe & motorized), horses, & hikers. Such overuse can only lead to the destruction of important habitats especially around springs & small natural areas. It may become necessary for the Park System to reduce numbers the issuance of a permit system. The permits should state dates and times to start and end your trip (canoe trips and trail rides/hikes), numbers in party, & places to camp for overnigheters. At this time (2009) I feel that such a system is not necessary but further studies of use may indicate such guidelines & procedures may be necessary in the future. (4) Nothing, absolutely nothing, distracts more from a great river experience that to hear the high pitch wine of a motor boat going up or down the river. For several minutes while it is passing your campsite, canoe, or leisure place along the river, you can hear nothing but the scream of the engine. Gasoline motorboats should be off limits above the bridge at Van Buren unless the operators/owners can keep the noise, at high throttle, below 65-70 decibels. If users of the river feel they need a motorized boat than they can use electric motors. They can arrange float shuttles just like those who canoe. Going upstream will not be an option unless they have strong motors. The only exception to this would be the use of motorized boats by the Park Service in their official duties of maintenance & repair, emergencies, and ranger patrols. (5) As a final note, I have floated the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers since the early to mid 1960's. The Park Service has worked hard to help preserve and maintain this area for future generations with little monies or personnel. Hopefully, we can enhance these rivers by establishing a good management plan which will have river preservation at its core and not destroying the river by overuse. Everyone needs to work together so we can enjoy these two clear rivers with the realization that we must all sacrifice in order to maintain a natural and well balanced ecological system for the enjoyment of all.</p>	7/29/2009	No		MO	64735

2588	<p>Dear Mr. Detring: It is with great concern that I write to you regarding the update to the management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I first visited the Riverways the year it was established in 1964. I have canoed and camped at the Riverways frequently over the years since that time. Over the past decade in particular, I have witnessed a degradation of this priceless public resource that should never have occurred under the watch of the National Park Service and Department of Interior. I worked several years in park management and was a GS-0025 Park Ranger for eight years with another federal agency. I understand the difference in enabling legislation between ONSR and other National Parks such as Buffalo National River. I am also cognizant of the funding and staffing challenges facing the National Park Service. The most important point I wish to make regarding the ONSR management plan is this: the available resources must be prioritized to protect the environmental integrity of the resource above all else. In order to accomplish this goal, I strongly urge the following priority strategies be incorporated in the updated management plan: -Limit concessionaire canoe numbers by river reach to those which do not impact the environment and allow enjoyment by others including limits compatible with sanitary facilities and management by ranger/law enforcement personnel. -Require concessionaires to provide seasonal portable toilets in accessible locations to support the numbers of their rental customers. -Limit the number of horseback riders and eliminate horse access to gravel bars and areas subject to seasonal flooding except for a minimum number of stream crossings. -Prohibit the development of additional horse trails in alluvial zones, especially in the upper reaches of the Current River watershed. -Restrict powerboats to below the confluence of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and limit engine size to 15 horsepower from the confluence to Big Spring. Restrict power boats above Big Spring to low/minimum wake speed for safety and to limit wave wash erosion on stream banks and protect fish spawning beds. While camping across from Big Bluff on the Current River, a handful of boats travelling at high speed repeated passed back and forth creating much noise and clouding the water. A few years ago, a powerboat passed at full bore within a few feet of my child's kayak above the confluence of the Current and Jacks Fork. -Remove wild/feral horses and non-native species (hogs) from the ONSR. (This should be easier than shooting transplanted otters). Camping at Round Spring this May, the ground was covered with manure with horses aggressively charging at myself and others. I saw a NPS van driving around several times but no one appeared to be addressing the situation. Ban off-road vehicles from ONSR period. -Close access points to public lands that are only accessible from adjacent private property. -Within fiscal and staffing limits, prioritize staff to enforcement/resource protection personnel. If resources are not sufficient to maintain the facilities, focus available staffing on protecting environmental integrity, property boundaries and control of illegal activities. Actively collaborate with the State of Missouri to develop conservation easements. I was disappointed that the public meetings held to gain public input on the ONSR management plan did not include a meeting in the Kansas City area. Many public meetings were held in your local area. A substantial portion of the user base of ONSR is from Western Missouri and Eastern Kansas. I understand that economic exploitation of the ONSR resource will be a local political priority. Still, the ONSR was not created for the purpose of local financial gain. At present, the owner and operator of Cross Country Trail Rides in Eminence Missouri has 3,007 horse stalls available for rent located immediately adjacent to the Jacks Fork River. Horse waste has been identified by the U.S. Geological Survey as the primary contributor to fecal coliform bacterial contamination in the reach below Eminence. Although the horse complex is located on private land, horse access to the river should be eliminated in this reach until bacterial counts are reliably below that for body contact recreation. The Park Service does not owe these people a living at the expense of safe use of the river by the public. I regret that I no longer go to the ONSR in the summer. I will not take my children paddling there except in the very upper reaches away from most powerboats. Change is needed at ONSR. The environmental problems there have been well documented for decades. A classmate and friend, now a PhD professor of ecology, helped measure the negative impact of powerboats on aquatic life at ONSR in the 1970's. I will urge my congressional delegation to provide the new management plan with sufficient appropriations. Please support the establishment and implementation of a new management plan that will restore these wonderful rivers to a sustainable environmental and recreational resource. Sincerely,</p>	7/29/2009	No			KS	N/A
2589	<p>Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing to comment on the general management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) on behalf of the Columbia Audubon Society which includes approximately 450 members in Central Missouri. Audubon's mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, focusing on birds, other wildlife, and their habitats for the benefit of humanity and the earth's biological diversity. The ONSR is within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (MA), designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are the most important to migrating and breeding birds. Many Audubon members have long used the ONSR for birding, canoeing, camping, photography, fishing, nature study and other outdoor activities. In recent years, however, we have noted a serious decline in the natural environment of the Riverways as well as the opportunity for a quality recreational experience. There seem to be two major problems which are degrading both the natural resources and the recreational use of the Riverways. The first major problem is abuse by illegal activities. This is primarily the result of the Park Service's (NPS) lack of control over the numerous illegal roads and the resulting illegal use by illegal ATVs and other motorized vehicles. It appears that there is now a road leading to virtually every gravel bar. The presence of these vehicles is damaging and polluting the natural resources in the Riverways. The frequent presence of these vehicles has also made a quality recreational nearly impossible. River users at campsites and lunch stops on gravel bars are subject to the noise, pollution and disruption of the sudden appearance of motorized vehicles. All illegal roads in the Riverways should be closed. Ant-there should be no more than 15-20 legal access points on the entire 134-mile length of the Riverways. And the NPS must initiate serious enforcement of against illegal uses. The second major problem is the overuse by boaters, canoeists and horseback riders. While these are appropriate uses there should be limits on the number of boats, canoes and horses in the Riverways at the same time. Vast flotillas of partying canoeists and speeding power boats impair the experience of families who wish to enjoy a peaceful float on the river. Trail rides consisting of thousands of horses are unacceptable. Also, the permitted horsepower and speed of motorized boats should be drastically reduced and motors prohibited on the Jacks Fork and the Upper Current above Two Rivers. The Columbia Audubon Society supports management policies at least as strict as those in Alternative A. We reject alternatives C and B because we believe they would result in long term degradation of the park. We also strongly support the proposal for the Big Spring Wilderness Area. This</p>	7/29/2009	No		Columbia Audubon Society	MO	65205

	3,400 acre area is the backcountry portion of the former Big Spring State Park and represents an outstanding opportunity for protection as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. Essentially, the National Park Service should be guided by the 1964 law that established the mission of the ONSR: 1) To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and 2) To provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. Sincerely, c: Senator Kit Bond Senator McCaskill Representative Blaine Luetkemeyer Governor Jay Nixon						
2590	RE: Ozark National Scenic Riverways To whom it may concern: I am a resident of Chesterfield Missouri. My Husband, ... and I have been property owners in Van Buren, Missouri since 1990. We have a lovely second home overlooking the Current River where we have enjoyed much of our 31 years of marriage with our three children. We all go both boating and kayaking on the river together. According to the National Park Service, in 2006, 371 complaints were filed with the (NPS) which led to their proposing alternatives (A, B, &C) As well as a no action alternative. The (NPS) also verified that there were approximately 1.8 million people who utilized the Ozark national scenic river ways in 2007 for all recreational uses. The 371 complaints received total one complaint per 4,852 visitors or less than .02% of the overall visitor population. How can such a small minority influence boaters losing their options on the river? Most local and visiting boat owners have 40 horsepower engines. We use this river year round for fishing, entertaining, gigging and floating. Depending on which alternative is passed, we could be forced to reduce our motor size to 25 horsepower or, under another proposal, purchase a motor that is rated 40 horsepower at the power head. These boats will not push our families in an 18' boat with just a 25 horsepower engine. If we want to talk about who is destroying the river, let's talk about the floaters. EVERY time we are on the river, we are picking up trash that the floaters leave behind. We walk up and down the gravel bars picking up trash as well as picking it up out of the water. We love and respect the Current River. We also consider it a privilege to be able to use such a lovely national treasure and hate the fact that others disrespect it. The floaters get drunk, leave their trash and dirty the water. There needs to be more limits put on the number of people allowed to float per day. Most of the people do not bring much revenue to the Van Buren community except to the one and only outfitter in town. They take no responsibility for these people. They just make their profit off of them. With having that many people in the river, much of the time they are also walking in the water, which stirs up the bottom and disturbs the fish. We have had to tell them before not to break off the cane break because it is protected by the park service but they don't care. Another point in having a 40 horsepower boat on the river is the fact that we as boaters rescue floaters who do not know how to swim. How do you think that would work with only a 25 horsepower boat? We also have a 225 horsepower engine and boat that we run down river below Big Springs. As I understand it, would be of no use to us any longer if one of the alternatives passes. Would the Bank of Obama bail us out for this boat and engine? Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. I hope you will take my thoughts into consideration for the benefit of the Current River, as well as the community of Van Buren and our endearing state of Missouri. Sincerely, Cc:Kit Bond, US Senator for Missouri Clare McCaskill, US Senator For Missouri William "Lacy" Clay, Missouri Congressman District 01 Jay Nixon, Missouri Governor Peter Kinder, Missouri Lieutenant Governor Robin Carnahan, Missouri Secretary of State Chris Koster, Missouri Attorney General Albert Liese, Missouri House Representative Joan Bray, Missouri District Senator JoAnn Emerson, U.S. Representative for Missouri Kevin Engler, U.S. Senator for Missouri Mike Dethrow, Missouri Representative JC Kuessner, Missouri Representative	6/22/2009	No			MO	63017
2591	Dear Mr. Detring: I am writing to present my views on proposed changes to the future Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In a nutshell, I want the natural aspects of the area restored so that my grandchildren will be able to experience clear clean streams and nature at its best. Specifically I want the following: 1. Use by motorized boats and jet boats substantially minimized. I support the horsepower limits of Alternative A. 2. Strictly limit commercial trail rides in numbers and locations to cut erosion and pollution. 3. Eliminate off road use by vehicles. This is not only a safety issue but also an erosion issue. The thin soil of the Ozark Region is too fragile for off-roaders to destroy. 4. Eliminate illegal wildcat accesses to the rivers. This only aids in destruction of the riverbanks and adds to soil erosion. 5. Save the Big Spring remnant wilderness by designating it for the Wilderness System protection by Congress. It is my personal belief that these areas should not be accessed by motorized vehicles unless the vehicle aids in the use of the area by a physically handicapped person. Let's preserve this wild area in its natural state and let citizens who want to experience it use their arms and legs instead of their motors, wheels and horses. It will then be a healthy experience instead of a polluting one. Sincerely, cf: Senator Kit Bond	9/8/2009	No			MO	64069-1268
2592	Dear Mr. Detring: Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for the General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Current River and its watershed are one of the most biologically significant regions in North America, and support a variety of global priority habitat types, plants, and animals, including some species found nowhere else on earth. These resources also provide world class terrestrial and aquatic recreational resources, and support a vibrant forest products and tourism industry. Maintaining these critical resources requires sustainable management of the Current River system and its watershed to ensure the long term health of the diverse biological systems found here. Both human and natural systems are totally dependent upon the long term health of these resources. Park service management should thus aim to sustain the totality of system components in a healthy condition for the benefit of present and future generations, and ensure that activities which result in resource damage or degradation are prevented or mitigated. In this sense, the Conservancy has no ideology or position regarding any activity only that it be carefully evaluated for its potential for resource degradation and regulated accordingly. The enclosed comments provide specific recommendations based on the Conservancy's data and experience in working to conserve the irreplaceable resources within the Current River and its watershed. We would be happy to provide more detail at your request. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continuing our history of successful partnership to sustain these critical resources. ----- Comments by The Nature Conservancy to Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan/Wilderness Study proposal Q.1) In many respects, Alternative A emphasizes some of the key issues upon which the long-term health of the resources safeguarded by ONSR depend. The Conservancy advocates a greater focus on management of natural communities and biodiversity as well as protecting water quality within ONSR. Reducing negative impacts to the Park by limiting those activities that threaten ecosystem health, water quality and overall conditions of the Park;	8/3/2009	No		The Nature Conservancy	MO	63144

	<p>e.g., excessive horse use, equestrian and vehicular traffic in and near streams, an extensive informal road and trail systems, off-road use of vehicles and ATVs, will provide greater benefit to critical resources while allowing compatible, high quality recreational use. TNC would also like to see stricter horsepower limits as well as areas that are off-limits to motorized vehicle traffic, including motor boats. These off-limits areas should be driven by biological need and critical habitat and spawning seasons, and would include sensitive natural communities such as caves, springs, and locations providing critical habitat for rare and endangered species. Q2) TNC believes that the citizens and the resources will be best served through a strong focus on managing ONSR to maintain healthy, diverse, sustainable natural communities and water quality. This will ensure both long term viability of the recreational and economic resources, as well as ensure that the biological systems upon which these depend are healthy. Any threats that degrade the long term sustainability of the system, including unplanned or overused equestrian traffic, boating activities that degrade in-stream habitat or water quality, off-road ATV use, illegal road installations, development in violation of easement restrictions, etc. must be controlled to conserve and restore and maintain the ONSR as a healthy, functional system for both present and future generations. Q3) TNC believes that there is currently sufficient public access to the resources of ONSR, and there is no need for developing more access, which would produce deleterious ecological impacts. Overuse and under-management of public access, particularly in county road construction/ maintenance and illegal roads and trails, already poses significant problems to water quality, sediment levels and nutrient loading associated with erosion and runoff from these uses. TNC does not think there should be an increase in acceptable horsepower limits within the ONSR, since existing horsepower regulations allow more than adequate boat access to all reaches of the river. Higher horsepower motors have higher volume and velocity jet plumes which increase perturbations to in-stream habitat, stir up fine sediments and disturb spawning cycles and invertebrate populations. Increased horsepower limits will likely contribute to higher speeds and increased wakes, increasing stream bank erosion and sediment loads into the river. Maintaining lower horsepower limits will help to mitigate these threats, while still allowing the full range of recreational access. Q4) In addition to maintaining the critical watershed of the Current River system in healthy forest cover, the Current River system and its surrounding terrestrial habitats contain numerous features of global conservation significance, as explicated in TNC's Ozarks Ecoregional Assessment. Conservation of these globally significant conservation resources, including unique natural communities, rare species populations, and karst features (caves, springs, sinkholes, etc.) should be a prime goal of comprehensive Riverways management plans and activities. Q5) TNC would like to see the ONSR managed to sustain its biological integrity, ensuring the continuity of the resources upon which both the habits and local recreational industry depend. Adverse or illegal uses that contribute to degradation of water quality and biodiversity should be prevented, including aggressive enforcement of appropriate regulations.</p>						
2593	<p>Executive Director, Dear Superintendent Detring, I had an opportunity to visit Missouri last week to facilitate a discussion with the Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen regarding the Missouri Wilderness Coalition Proposal for seven new wildernesses in Missouri. For a horseman from the western states, the differences were striking, especially the relatively few truly 'wild Places' that remain. There were also some similarities in the number of small acreages that I observed with familiar barnyard pets. Of course, that isn't a surprise, I have heard about Missouri's quality mules and Missouri Foxtrotter horses for years. It is as much a part of Missouri's identity as the Appaloosa horse is to the Palouse region of Idaho and Washington. But, to the purpose of my letter, Missouri horsemen are concerned that wilderness classification will result in prohibition of horseback riding and pack and saddle stock use in the few remaining parcels of wild land available to them. They are also concerned that land managers will take these same opportunities away through their planning processes. This came as quite a surprise to the representative from the Wilderness Coalition participating in our meeting who felt that horses were entirely appropriate in wilderness, and was surprised to hear that they were not specifically mentioned in the Act. The emerging belief that horses are not appropriate in wilderness is something that Back Country Horsemen are addressing at a national level, and what we're finding, is that it is also a concern with mainstream wilderness advocacy groups as well. I would like to share with you a comment from a high level Wilderness Society representative at our BCHA national board meeting last April: "It is my hope that we here today can saddle up and work together to protect more wild places as wilderness. And together we can help the American people understand and truly recognize that horseback riding in the wilderness is a time-honored all-American tradition." I was alarmed to hear that none of the alternatives in your proposed GMP (except the no-action, which rarely emerges as a truly viable alternative) will allow equestrian use in the primitive/wilderness zone. This would appear to be a decision predetermined without benefit of analysis, and a decision intended to accommodate a small minority who simply prefer not to share our wild places "The keep everybody out but me" sect, as described by ex-Secretary of Interior Cecil Andrus. Those of us who enjoy our recreation from the back of a horse are not too different than those who choose to hike or backpack. We want the same variety of experiences sharing a pleasant environment with a group of like minded horsemen on a well developed trail, or, on another occasion, enjoying solitude in a primitive natural setting only available in a primitive or wilderness setting. The only place that we have to enjoy a pack and saddle stock experience is the large tracts of public land available in our parks and forests. As observed by our Missouri Wilderness Coalition friend, it is difficult for many of us to comprehend wilderness without the pack train. Nearly 100 years ago, Aldo Leopold, a patriarch of the wilderness movement, shared the belief that the Nation should set aside large tracts of land that would serve as "anchor points so society would always have a touchstone to the past." Leopold believed that "Public wilderness areas are, first of all, a means of perpetuating, in sport form, the more virile and primitive skills in pioneering travel and subsistence." Two examples "are as American as a hickory tree; they have been copied elsewhere, but they were developed to their full perfection only on this continent. One of these is canoe travel, and the other is travel by pack-train." In a speech commemorating Leopold's contribution to the concept and establishment of wilderness areas in the United States, Harvey Broome, President of the Wilderness Society, observed that "In 1921, Leopold wrote an article on the subject of wilderness in the Journal of Forestry. The plea in the article was for physical space -- a space so large that one had room to maneuver -- space which would absorb a two weeks' pack trip and be devoid of roads and artificial trails and other works of man. The man who wants wilderness, he said, wants not only scenery and hunting and fishing and isolation, but riding, daily movement, and the variety found only in a trip through a big stretch of back</p>	8/11/2009	No		Back Country Horsemen of America	WA	98338-1367

	<p>country." (Living Wilderness Winter 1954-55) It is difficult for us to imagine that those responsible for introducing wilderness legislation did not intend that wilderness would perpetuate primitive travel with horses and mules. If the "pack train" is regulated out, it will not be the same 'wilderness' that Leopold envisioned -- it will not be a "touchstone" to our past and an expression of our cultural heritage. Wilderness will be little more than a 'playground' for the young and physically able. We hope that you will reconsider the structure of your alternatives and include traditional and historic equestrian use as appropriate in the primitive zone, and in any area recommended as wilderness. The other concern that I heard from Missouri horsemen was the premise that equestrians were responsible for the water quality degradation problem. From the pictures that I have seen of the hundreds of canoeists and other users who flock to the Riverways, I am not surprised that there is a problem. This would appear to me to be a 'total use' problem more so than a 'horse' problem. I would hope that your analysis would focus on the practices of all users that contribute to the problem and address those specific practices and users responsible rather than impose a 'carte blanc' restriction on equestrians. The water quality argument sounds to me like just one more tool of the exclusionist extreme to advance their anti-stock agenda. Over the years BCHA has addressed the concern that equine manure introduces intestinal parasites such as giardia. Research from the University of California proves that this likelihood is minimal. Then there were claims that equines introduce weeds; current research from Dominican University of California, suggests that this claim is grossly exaggerated. And recently we are hearing reports that equines are the singular cause of impacts on the trail. A number of researchers, including Dr. David Cole from the Leopold Institute, have determined that hikers and horses cause the same type of impacts it just takes more hikers to have the same effect (there are many more hikers on our trails than horses). All of these are rationalizations that opponents of stock use employ to manipulate managers to favor their specific biases. Conflict between hikers and horse users is a conflict of values. Addressing a values or emotional issue with resource restrictions is not going to solve the problem! The problem needs to be addressed as a social issue and not a resource management issue, and alternatives to restrictions need to address it as such. Once a decision is made to accommodate 'all' legitimate users, and hikers are required to assume part of the 'cost' or responsibility of resolving the issue, both groups will begin to work together with your managers to find equitable and acceptable solutions. I recognize that the comment period has closed for your planning effort, but hope that you'll take these concerns under consideration during your process. Sincerely,</p>						
2594	<p>RE: Comments related to the National Park Service's Preliminary Alternatives for General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Dear Superintendant Detring: We are providing for your review the comments of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (Department) related to the Preliminary Alternatives for General Management Plan/Wilderness Study (GMP) for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). While the information released by the National Park Service (NPS) is a good point of departure, the Department believes that additional discussions among the federal and state land managers and with other public and private entities, will be of value as the planning and evaluation proceed. The Department sees the importance of protecting the water quality and aquatic integrity of the rivers; preserving the biological integrity and natural heritage of the watershed; protecting the wild scenic beauty for present and future generations; while providing for public uses. Water Quality The Department's Water Protection Program has reviewed the GMP and offers the following comments related to water quality. We strongly recommend that the NPS fully explore all water quality issues and impacts as part of the planning process. We acknowledge that while the information provided at this stage is largely silent in reference to water quality impacts and deals primarily with recreational opportunities, that the NPS is engaged with the Department to address these issues. The Department feels that adequate water quality protection must be an essential feature of the GMP as it is essential to maintaining the value of these resources. Should water quality decline, those recreational uses will slowly decline as well. Both the Current River and Jacks Fork River are protected by the Missouri Water Quality Standards (10 CSR 20-7.031) as Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRWs). The National Park Service (NPS) and other landowners in the area are required to comply with the water quality protections that come with this designation. As ONRWs, the Current and Jacks Fork have the strictest anti- degradation requirements. The Department suggests that the NPS will need to address these issues as they develop the GMP, the Environmental Impact Study or ecological assessment, and select the preferred alternative. In Alternative C, the NPS will need to show how water quality will be affected by the resource impacts in more heavily used areas. Natural resource management strategies for all alternatives should be thoroughly discussed. The Department recommends that the NPS expands on the discussion of water quality, fisheries management, and restoration efforts. The Department recommends that the NPS incorporate watershed planning into the GMP. The document should discuss the influence of land management practices on water quality. The plan will also need to address the impacts of the range of park uses, including equestrian activities, camping, canoeing, other recreational activities, and wilderness designation, on the rivers' water quality. On page 3 under User Capacity, there is discussion of developing Management Zones. The purpose of the management zones seems to be a framework for site specific planning and management decision-making on use and protection of resources. The GMP will need to include a discussion of water quality impacts related to user capacity. According to the 2009 Superintendent's Compendium, the 2006 NPS Management Policies states that "the primary responsibility of the NPS is to protect and preserve our natural and cultural resources while providing for the enjoyment of these resources by visitors and other users, as long as use does not impair specific park resources or overall visitor experience." The GMP will need to address conflicts that may exist between use and resource protection, define under what conditions and how use will be restricted to ensure protection. The Department also recommends that the NPS discusses how this addresses the water quality impairment on the Jacks Fork River. In the introduction of the Rapid Watershed Assessment, the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) notes in reference to the Current River Sub-basin HUC# 10010008 that "the related tourism industry serves as a significant local economic factor and the region's greatest water quality threat." The GMP should address how preserve and improve water quality in concert with sustainable tourism. The Department recommends that the four Biological Reference Streams within the ONSR boundaries should be protected as much as possible to continue efforts related to water quality monitoring, assessment, and ambient water quality standards. Topic Question sasked by NPS staff on website 1. From a water quality protection perspective, preliminary alternative A would seem to best protect the natural resources within the park.</p>	8/7/2009	No		Missouri Department of Natural Resources	MO	65102

<p>Other alternatives would require that effective policies and rules be instituted and enforced. The Department sees an inverse relationship between range of uses and the need for more rules and enforcement to provide the same water quality protection. Education could be a key to gaining compliance, though problematic as many visitors are in the park only for a short time, do not attend formal presentations, nor visit offices, and many come from out-of-state. The Department suggests that consideration be given to the following comments in the</p> <p>a. Protection of headwaters yields the greatest benefit to water quality. The headwaters of any waterway and its surrounding watershed have been shown to be especially important to the health of the waterbody. The Department suggests a management approach that is more protective as it proceeds upstream towards the headwaters. Both water quality and a range of visitor experience can be provided. A wilder, more natural experience can be provided towards the headwaters, while more diverse recreation opportunities could be allowed on the mid-to lower sections, provided there is adequate protection of water quality.</p> <p>b. Interpretation and educational efforts greatly enhance visitor compliance with rules and help visitors understand how they impact resources. Visitors could be offered education related to water quality. Topics could include Karst topography, explaining how losing streams, springs, and caves are related to water quality and quantity; explaining the causes of and cures for bacterial impairment of Jacks Fork; offering visitors ways they can improve or preserve resources/water quality; and providing "leave no trace" programs.</p> <p>c. Monitoring efforts noted in Alternative C's Natural Resource Management section would be beneficial for whichever alternative is chosen in order to determine the baseline and track natural resource conditions to know whether management practices are working.</p> <p>d. Under the summary of river-based management zones, the Department recommends that the NPS addresses natural resource conditions in a similar way as in the cultural resource condition. The Department suggests stating explaining when and why best management practices (BMP) should be implemented to prevent degradation of resources.</p> <p>e. The GMP will need to explain the effects of regulating motorboat horsepower and how wave action affects water resources and bank stability.</p> <p>f. Floodplain development would be highly discouraged as noted in the summary of river- based management zones. The GMP should define floodplain and explain that will controls be instituted to ensure water quality protection if development does occur, such as erosion control BMPs and setbacks for riparian corridors.</p> <p>g. Increasing the likelihood of visitor contact with NPS staff would be beneficial in protecting the resources through education and enforcement.</p> <p>h. Alternative C notes that "there would also be more boat ramps and trails for hiking and horseback riding." These facilities would not necesse most compelling reason for the park. The ONSR has been identified as a major flyway for migratory birds and the Current River hills as a unique ecosystem. As such, the Department considers the management practices described in Alternative C that offer to preserve the scenic resources may not adequately protect the natural environment. The Department suggests that there may be merit in the NPS adopting the Alternative A management zones and the Alternative B management strategy. The general management strategy of Alternative B should be augmented with the Alternative A: Visitor Experiences and Activities component and the Visitor Services and Facilities component. The Department's Division of State Parks has offered a further discussion and comparison of the alternatives by individual components below.</p> <p>Overview</p> <p>Alternative A</p> <p>Alternative A can be interpreted as very restrictive. Returning the visitor experience to the era when the national riverways was established seems improbable at best. The restrictive covenants and easements within the stream corridor have been difficult to enforce and have led to the management difficulties and issues that exist today. Aggressive enforcement of the laws and agreements already in-place will be a challenge for the future, but is necessary to achieve a restful and restorative ONSR character. However, the region cannot be managed as a static, unchanging museum experience.</p> <p>Alternative B</p> <p>The overarching goal of improving visitor appreciation for the resources via discovery, if successful, will produce stronger long-term support for the ONSR. The better people understand a place and the more they know about it, the more likely they will be to protect and preserve it. Engaging people in all facets of the ONSR -natural, cultural and recreational opportunities is in keeping the State Parks mission and is desirable to foster in the ONSR. It also supports the Current River State Park mission to expand visitor awareness of the diverse recreational opportunities available in the region.</p> <p>Alternative C</p> <p>Simply put, managing for scenic resources does not do justice to the natural systems as a whole. Too many incompatible uses can be explained-away as not being immediately evident to the untrained eye. This is not an acceptable management strategy for a unique, fragile and important ecosystem.</p> <p>Visitor Experiences and Activities</p> <p>Alternative A</p> <p>This is a highly desirable alternative. This portion of Alternative would also fit well within the structure of Alternative B.</p> <p>Low impact, family friendly recreation experiences support efforts to develop visitor appreciation and protect natural and cultural resources.</p> <p>Alternative B</p> <p>Very similar to Alternative A, but without the level of commitment and not as compelling.</p> <p>Alternative C</p> <p>The least attractive alternative as it appears to be more consumptive in nature. It also tries to be all things to all people and the area simply can't do that. Motorized recreation activities were not part of the original ONSR concept and do not need to be introduced.</p> <p>Visitor Services and Facilities</p> <p>Alternative A</p> <p>It is critical that this portion of Alternative A be adopted. Illegal roads provide access to nuisance visitors as well as contribute to natural resource destruction. If anything comes out of the GMP update, it should be the will to better enforce the property boundaries of the ONSR and eliminate the indiscriminate, unauthorized development that is occurring. Repairing damaged areas and removing roads and access points is vital to the long-term survival of the area as a scenic riverway.</p> <p>Alternative B</p> <p>This alternative is not as critical as the option presented in Alternative A, but does not seem incongruous with it either. It seems appropriate that along with the closure of unauthorized roads, a greater trail network could be developed. Expanded universal accessibility opportunities are always desirable. Increasing the number of trails from popular river stopping points to points of cultural interest would make an attractive alternate activity to traditional gravel bar goings-on.</p> <p>Alternative C</p> <p>This alternative comes across as developing for the sake of developing. Greater regard must be given for the carrying capacity of the rivers and the landscape.</p> <p>Interpretation and Education</p> <p>Alternative A</p> <p>Living history programs are always interesting and popular, but would be confined to certain areas along the stream. This alternative offers less flexibility and would be very costly to operate.</p> <p>Alternative B</p> <p>Dispersing activities along the river would benefit the ONSR. This alternative supports additional and diverse activities with a broad range of appeal. It also encourages visitors to look at the ONSR as more than simply a floating stream, but a place with distinctive natural and cultural resources.</p> <p>Alternative C</p> <p>Interesting concept but somewhat contradictory to other proposed goals. Encouraging consumptive activities while trying to teach resource stewardship is possible, but very difficult</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>from a management perspective. Concerns include those most attracted to the activities would be least likely to practice stewardship. Natural Resource Management Alternative A Supports original vision of the ONSR in its preservation of the landscape. Restoring degraded biologic communities is desirable. A specific reference to exotic, invasive species control is desirable. Alternative B Similar to Alternative A, but more stringent with the research, monitoring and information dissemination components. A specific reference to exotic, invasive species control is desirable. Alternative C This is a difficult line to walk by monitoring natural features as they degrade with the intention of suspending activities at the brink of irreparable damage. Once the management plan is in effect and visitor expectations are set, changing course at the eleventh hour will be difficult to communicate and enforce. Managing the scenery is a minimal approach and does not fully support the natural resource values that are defined in the Current River State Park Natural Management Plan. Cultural Resource Management Alternative A This alternative lacks a cultural appreciation component. Preservation is not enough. The unique cultural resources and ways of the Ozarks should be explained, shared and appreciated. Alternative B This alternative appears to strike a balance between Alternative A and Alternative C -greater cultural resource appreciation and education, but not at the expense of the resources themselves. Alternative C The mention of "more intensive management actions," is somewhat worrisome. The effort to showcase cultural features is laudable, but there is concern that this effort may come at the expense of the resources themselves. Wilderness Alternative A A wilderness tract would be an attractive feature in the ONSR for some users. The designation of a special wilderness designation would be a defining feature for a small portion of the public lands in this area, but should be thoroughly evaluated. Alternative B Same as Alternative A. Alternative C The considerations of managing the area for its natural and primitive character as opposed to the full protection of a wilderness designation will need to be thoroughly evaluated. Geology The Department's Geological Survey Program has assessed the geology for the OSNR and has offered the following comments for your consideration. The Jacks Fork and Current River flow over Cambrian-age and Ordovician-age cherty dolomite of the Eminence and Gasconade Dolomite formations. Bedrock in the hills near the rivers is composed of Ordovician-age Roubidoux Formation and Gasconade Dolomite and Precambrianage volcanic rocks that form igneous knobs. The Roubidoux Formation consists of sandy dolomite and sandstone while the Gasconade Dolomite is a cherty dolomite with a lower sandstone member. The 1.3 billion-year-old Precambrian-age volcanic rocks in the central portion of the area are compoed off used volcanic extrusive known as rhyolite. The dolomite bedrock in the area is known for its karst features. These features include caves, sinkholes, and springs. There are 54 recorded springs within the scenic waterways. Twenty-three of these springs are unnamed or the name is not known. There are records of six former surface iron mines and five former surface copper mines within the scenic waterways. There are no records of underground mines within the area. The iron deposits are primarily limonite found in filled sinkholes. The copper deposits are secondary replacement of the dolomite found close to the igneous knobs. There are minor faults near the scenic waterways. However, these faults are ancient and do not show signs of movement within the past several million years. While the New Madrid fault zone is within 60 to 100 miles of the scenic waterways, the risk associated with a major earthquake for this area is low, except near steep bluffs where rock falls may occur. In closing, we would like to commend the National Park Service for all their efforts thus far and for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continued involvement in the process of developing the General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please feel free to contact me at... Sincerely,</p>						
2595	<p>Dear Superintendent, I am writing in regard to potential revisions to the management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have been an avid canoeist for almost forty years and I've been the Director of a watershed organization for twenty years. In reviewing the proposed alternatives, it seems to me that Alternative A would most closely address the concerns that I have about the management of the ONSR, without doubt the most significant and high quality resource of this type in Missouri, and possibly in the Midwestern United States. But I want to do more than just support an alternative, which is, at best, attempting to fit solutions to many complicated challenges into one box. I would like to elaborate on some of my personal experiences, as someone who has floated, hiked and otherwise enjoyed the Scenic Riverways for many, many years. The upper Jacks Fork is my favorite river in Missouri, where I have spent many enjoyable days camping and snorkeling in the crystal clear water (which my daughters loved to do) and where I've caught (and released) lots of nice smallmouth. Mostly, these days, I float above Alley Spring, even dragging my boat over riffles during low water times, just to experience some solitude, since the lower river gets so much more use. In recent years, I have not floated much on the Current, particularly in the summer, because of experiences that I and my friends have endured on that river, some of which have been very unpleasant. As for horse trail riding in the Riverways, I was very frustrated during one trip on the upper Current (above Cedar Grove, as I recall), when we tried to find a gravel-bar campsite that did not have a major horse trail within a few feet of it. It appeared to me that the horse trail basically went right down the center of the riparian zone, crossing each riffle diagonally from bar to bar and transecting the middle or back of nearly every gravel bar. Where these trails went from gravel to loam, the trail had been incised into the earth several feet in places, providing an opportunity for serious erosion and "unraveling" of the riparian area. If horse trails are to be allowed, they should only cross the river at right angles (like bridges), and at infrequent intervals, and should otherwise maintain some distance away from and above the river (for the views, but also to keep horse manure out of the riparian area). This approach would help to segregate the horse and canoe uses to some degree, and possibly avoid conflicts. As for ORV use, I have more than once seen full-sized pickup trucks drive across the river, even within the ONSR lands. On the upper Current River, one truck drove right up to our lunch stop on a gravel bar, with the stereo blaring. This kind of use simply must be stopped. Maybe the Park Service needs a "Floaters Watch" group, similar to Neighborhood Watch, to watch for and report serious violations to the Park Service. Another bad experience my family had involved the first (and last) time that we tried tubing on a section of the Current River near Eminence. Jet boats swerved at high speeds through our group of tubers, who obviously were low in the water and therefore not terribly easy to see. These boaters seemed to have little regard for the safety of nearby swimmer/floaters. These uses are clearly not compatible from a safety standpoint. In fact, because of the shoreline erosion and other damages, not to mention the "boat in" parties, I would like to see jet boats entirely banned, except maybe for the very lowest stretches of the river. This use is most certainly in conflict with the spirit and</p>	8/8/2009	No			MO	65802

	<p>intent of the Scenic Riverways, in my opinion. Since I usually avoid canoeing the Current in the summer, I can only report from the experiences of friends, but almost every one of them has experienced hordes of drunken party boaters, sometimes of a very belligerent nature, spoiling their float trip. I understand that to some extent, authorities are attempting to address public drunkenness and profanity and drug use on the river. I have experienced the awkward situation of floating with my family and having them exposed to these kinds of people. Maybe it's time for some type of a minimum paperwork "sign-in" system, whereby at least one person registers as the "responsible party" for a group (maybe this would work for larger groups, say of at least 15 people). That way, when complaints arise, the offending party can be located and contacted. A permit system might help this problem, but I'm sure the local concessionaires would balk at that. Maybe permits could only be required for larger parties. On western rivers, if you violate your permit conditions, you will no longer be allowed to float that river. I also have great heartburn over the numerous points of access to the Jacks Fork, which, as I mentioned, is my favorite river. It seems that every year since I've been floating this river, more and more accesses have appeared. Almost every gravel bar in some sections during the summer has become a "drive in" party spot. I know these people are not walking far because they have big coolers, chairs, etc. Sometimes their ORVs are parked right on the bar. This seems to be particularly troublesome just above Alley Spring. Some accesses appear to have received official "approval" from the Park Service by the appearance of a trash can. When I was active with the Ozark Society many years ago, we met with representatives of the Park Service about keeping the Jacks Fork as our state's only true "multi-day wilderness" float stream, and they agreed that this was a goal of the management plan. This meant limiting the accesses to only four on the river above its confluence with the Current. Now, I dare say there are at least twenty accesses, either approved and developed, grandfathered, or illegal but not shut down. I know this is a sensitive issue with the locals, but the quality of the wilderness "feel" of the Jacks Fork is being seriously jeopardized by all of these unauthorized accesses. All of the above being said, as a watershed organization administrator, I know the difficulties involved in working with a wide variety of stakeholders, particularly as a federal agency in a rural, conservative area with notoriously strong "keep the government out of our business" attitudes. For the "rules" to be upheld, in my opinion, it will take a true partnership between the National Park Service and local county prosecutors and sheriffs. If the local enforcement people are not bought into the management plan and helping to uphold its provisions, Parks personnel will have a very difficult time enforcing regulations or overriding local resistance to policy changes. I don't know exactly how this could happen, but perhaps the local enforcement personnel could at least "sign off" on the plan. In closing, I want to acknowledge that the Park Service has been handed a very difficult challenge in protecting the resource, while allowing reasonable use. But I believe that river users, from Leonard Hall's day and even before, have generally seen these rivers as primarily floating streams, particularly for fishing and gravel bar camping. This is the tradition that allows the rivers to be fully experienced by people. I also believe that this is the founding and most fundamental and reasonable use that should accompany the Scenic River designation, and the most basic use envisioned when the ONSR was established. In my opinion, any use that negates or diminishes the quality of the floating experience (which, to me, involves a meaningful relationship between floaters and the river, not just a means to get away from legal authority in an unmonitored floating vehicle) is not in keeping with the original intent of setting these high quality gems aside as federally protected special areas. The only "use" unde</p>						
2596	<p>RE: Comments related to the National Park Service's Preliminary Alternatives for General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Dear Superintendant Detring: Enclosed you will find the comments of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Water Protection Program (Department) related to the Preliminary Alternatives for General Management Plan/Wilderness Study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This letter is being sent as an attachment to the Department's main comment letter due to the program's desire to fully address concerns related to water quality contained in or the lack therefore in the General Management Plan/Wilderness Study Newsletter #3: Spring/Summer 2009 (newsletter). General Comments While the newsletter provides a good sounding board for initial discussions, the Department believes that details, particularly about water quality issues, impacts, and preservation/conservation, have not been fully explored. The plan is nearly insubstantial in acknowledging water quality impact. The main discussion seems to consist of recreational opportunities. While recreational opportunities are likely the primary visitor use, without adequate water quality protection of the water ways, those recreational uses will slowly decline with the declining resource. Both the Current River and Jacks Fork River are protected by the Missouri Water Quality Standards (10 CSR 20-7.031) as Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRWs). With such a designation come water quality protections that the National Park Service (NPS) and other landowners in the area must comply with. As ONRWs, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are held at the strictest antidegradation. This will be something to consider when developing an Environmental Impact Study or ecological assessment. Natural resource management strategies for all alternatives are quite vague, though the protections or improvements noted would be valuable. Topics that expand upon water quality, fisheries management, and restoration efforts would be beneficial. In Alternative C, how will water quality be affected by the higher tolerance for resource impacts in more heavily used areas? (See comments about antidegradation above). Is the NPS using watershed planning methods? In the document there seems to be a disconnect or lack of details related to how land management will affect water quality. The plan does not discuss the impact of equestrian activities on the rivers. The plan is geared toward camping, canoeing, other recreational activities, and wilderness designation but there is not a strong link between water quality impact and park use. The Jacks Fork and Current Rivers are designated as Outstanding National Resource Waters in the state Water Quality Standards. These waters receive special protection against any degradation in quality. On page 3 under User Capacity, there is discussion of developing Management Zones. The purpose of the management zones seems to be a frame work for site specific planning and management decision on use and protection of resources. However, as these zones are defined later in the plan there is no discussion of water quality impact. According to the 2009 Superintendent's Compendium, the 2006 NPS Management Policies states that "the primary responsibility of the NPS is to protect and preserve our natural and cultural resources while providing for the enjoyment of these resources by visitors and other users, as long as use does not impair specific park resources or overall visitor experience." When conflicts arise between use and resource protection, how does the superintendant limit pubic use? How is it determined that the</p>	8/10/2009	No		Missouri Department of Natural Resources	MO	65102

	<p>resource is impaired? How does this relate to the water quality impairment on the Jacks Fork River? The introduction of the Rapid Watershed Assessment conducted by Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) on the Current River Sub-basin HUC# 10010008 notes that "the related tourism industry serves as a significant local economic factor and the regions greatest water quality threat." The General Management Plan should address how a balance between tourism and water quality will be established. There appears to be four Biological Reference Streams within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) boundaries. These should be protected as much as possible to continue efforts related to water quality monitoring, assessment, and ambient water quality standards. Topic Questions asked by NPS staff on website 1. Speaking solely from a water quality protection perspective, preliminary alternative A would seem to protect the resources within the park. However, if proper policies and rules were put into place and enforced, then a more lenient alternative may provide the same water quality protection while simultaneously providing the same or more recreation. Education seems to be key in the later equation. This might be a challenge, for many of the visitors are not in the park long term, do not attend formal presentations, nor visit offices. Based on personal experience there seems to be quite a few people from out of state enjoying the wonderful resources within the park, which also creates a challenge with educational efforts. 2. The following parts should be included in future management: a. Given this great country and its wonderful diversity, the visitors of the park have many different needs and wishes. While it may be difficult to accommodate all, the major parties can be represented in the General Management Plan. For the headwaters to have limits on motorized sports (water and land) seem to benefit the water quality where it can really count. The headwaters of any water way and its surrounding watershed have been documented as very diverse areas especially important in the health of the water body. Through limited access and non-motorized activities (less noise and wave action), both the water quality can be protected and a sanctuary maintained for those individuals who value nature by itself. On the mid to lower sections, activities could be more diverse, allowing more recreation, but should still keep water quality in the forefront. b. Interpretation and Educational efforts would greatly enhance visitor compliance with rules and help visitors understand their impact on resources. Not really mentioned was visitor education related to water quality. Topics could include Karst topography (e.g., losing streams, springs, and caves in the park and how these features depend on and influence water quality and quantity), bacteria impairment of Jacks Fork, ways visitors can improve or preserve resources/water quality, and leave no trace programs. c. Monitoring efforts noted in Alternative C's Natural Resource Management section would be beneficial for whichever alternative is chosen in order to determine the baseline and track natural resource conditions to know whether management practices are working or not. d. Under the summary of river-based management zones, it would be beneficial to have a similar statement for natural resource conditions that is contained in the last part of the cultural resource condition (i.e., resources subject to degradation will be stabilized using best management practices [BMPD. Explain when and why would or would not implement a BMP. e. Explain how resource conditions will be improved and to what extent by regulating motorboat horsepower. How does the wave action affect water resources and bank stability? f. Floodplain development would be highly discouraged as noted in the summary of river-based management zones. How is the floodplain defined? Should development occur in the floodplain, what mechanisms would be in place to ensure water quality protection (e.g., erosion control BMPs, setbacks for riparian corridors)? Under the summary of river-based management zones, the nonmotorized zone seems to have conflicting statements about river fords. Under overall visitor experience, it is sas with the local watershed group or recreational organization, might help with customer- relations and education of resource protection. We would like to commend the National Park Service for all their efforts thus far and the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continued involvement in the overall process. Should you need further assistance addressing issues related to water quality, please contact the program at ... Sincerely,</p>						
2597	<p>The purpose of this letter is to provide a response to the invitation for public comment by the National Park Service, Ozark National Scenic Riverways on the proposed General Management Plan / Wilderness Study. I wish to commend the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for proposing alternatives that could begin to address much needed options regarding the restoration of Missouri's plant and animal natural heritage communities and the opportunities for the public to participate in the plan development. The highest and best future condition for Ozark National Scenic Riverways the is one where the biological integrity (natural processes and optimum biodiversity) of the forests, glades, rivers & streams, woods, are restored to a self-sustainable condition to the maximum degree possible. Accordingly I believe "Alternative A", with conditions and modifications as noted in the comments below, more closely sets the preferred long range direction that will eventually achieve the desired goals, and urge its adoption. 1. Public Values. The US Census Bureau projects that the US population is now 307,048,437 and is experiencing a net gain of one person every 10 seconds. It also projects that the population of Missouri will increase 14.9 percent from 2000 to 2030, and that the adjoining state's populations will also increase. - no state is projected to lose population. It will insure that outdoor recreation is an increasing value as a scarce resource for the National Park Service(i.e., the nation). A strong demand of major segments of the 2030 public will be oriented in the search for those recreation areas that provide an opportunity for immersion in their individual vision of what represents the values of our natural heritage ambiance. Thus the VALUE of the Scenic Riverways will evolve more toward wild/outdoor recreational activities as the Disneylandesque ambiance factors (present trend at the Riverways) decline in relative value. And because this kind of demand cannot be answered by commercial substitution, recommend this background consideration be given prominent weight in the proposed MANAGEMENT PLAN.. 2. Suggest that concepts such as "Restore biological integrity" (see Biological Integrity vs Biological Diversity; Bioscience Vol. 44 No. 10, 1994) of Terrestrial Natural Communities be integrated in the narrative regarding the long range management. This would more explicitly be inclusive of a "....systems wholeness, including the presence of all appropriate elements and the occurrence of all processes at appropriate rates." 3. Contain ALL off-road vehicle(ATVs, dirt bikes, dune buggies, et al) use to paved roads, & highways where legally licensed motor vehicles are permitted. The only exceptions should be for official use by National Park Service staff when performing duties related to public safety, resource management, monitoring and protection. 4. Contain all equine activity to those areas and carefully designed trails that will minimize the impact on the goals of restoring the biological activity of the Riverways. Horseback riding trails should not cross Ozark Riverways perennial streams except at locations</p>	8/3/2009	No			MO	63123-7133

	<p>where hardened crossing points are constructed that will prevent erosion and pollution from frequent usage. Enforcement rules should include the closing of trails where the users demonstrate disregard for the maintenance of the highest quality of the resource. 5. The volume of equine activity should be regulated and managed to a level that does not impact and/ or prevent other legitimate recreational users from enjoying their version of what a "National Scenic Riverway" should be all about. Small groups of riders at intervals in time and space where one group is not usually in view of the next group would provide a guideline that is commensurate with "scenic" values, clean water and a safe environment. 6. Close the Riverways to ALL publicly owned motorized boats, water jets, water skis, et al. The only exceptions should be those water craft needed for official use by National Park Service staff when performing duties related to public safety, resource management, rules enforcement, monitoring and protection. 7. The volume of visitor use permitted for canoeing, tubing, et al, should be strictly regulated so that the perception of the scenic values (the basis of establishing the "Riverways" in the first place) is not impaired. A reservation and permit system that will provide a reasonable opportunity for intervals in time and space for small groups must be designed and implemented. Such a system should be based upon the potential for any one small group to complete a "float trip" largely out of sight of next small group. Visitor programs of this sort are routinely operated at many other National Parks in the US. 8. A rigorous, enforceable, and enforced water quality testing system should be included in the Management Plan. The testing results should be linked to a predetermined action REQUIREMENT to immediately respond to threats to public health and/or to the highest quality biological integrity. If the public is aware that a public health plan is in place and that appropriate responsive action by resource stewards can be expected, it will much more likely to be understood and accepted. 9. Wilderness or Wild area designation for, e.g., Big Springs locality, should be adopted with specific modifications and exceptions. Resource stewards must be authorized to take landscape scale resource management actions that will restore and maintain native flora and fauna to conditions and sustainability believed to have existed prior to the advent of european settlement in the US. This must include the natural processes that are required such as prescribed fire and other activities that will not preclude the suppression and control of invasive species or diseases(including those that have not yet been INTRODUCED). 10. Access sites to the Riverways should be restricted to only those sites that support and sustain the visitor space and frequency objectives noted in the paragraphs above. All other river and stream access must be closed to vehicles of all kinds. 11. In keeping with the recommended goal note (in paragraph 2.) above, another Plan process might begin by designating all of the territory within the legal boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a potential Wilderness/Wild area. Then draw boundaries around all of those areas that must be exduded due to acceptable cultural development(acceptable to a scenic riverways) and desired visitor accommodations, and propose the remaining landscape and rivers as Wilderness/Wild areas. ONSR,Mgt.Plan.Comments 20090731 Please make the above comments a part of the official record on the Management Plan. And place my name/ address on the mailing list for a copy of the final Plan. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the planning process for the OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS. Sincerely,</p>						
2598	<p>RE: Comments ONSR general management plan Dear Sir, Please except this letter as my comments, suggestions, and opinions, on the development of your guiding future management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This letter is also being e-mailed to the planning team in Denver, Colorado. However, I still felt that it was important to mail this as a "hard copy" to the office/individuals who will have some of the final suggestions in the decision making process. First, I am not real happy with any of the alternatives in their present form. I feel that each needs some tweaking to be effective. I am also not happy to just answer the five questions on your comment form. Based upon the way that I see things at the present, I would be inclined to vote with the "NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE" first, followed by alternative A. The driver for my "no alternative" selection is based upon the fact that when the riverways was established, certain requirements and guiding conditions were setup. I believe that the Park Service has let slip many of these guiding principals for the Scenic River. A scenic river also has certain connotations of being scenic! Enforce the current standards before adopting additional restrictions. Not a proven track record here. An "Alternative A" selection is given as a secondary choice, because I believe when conflicts arise between the environment, and environmental protection, humans should lose. Preservation is the most important thing that the Park Service can do. That said, here are many of my comments for improvements in the current condition. Build upon them as you see fit. But this is what I want the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers to be for now and for the future. -Highway 106 continues to be a major bike route. The road is scenic and travels through mostly undeveloped parts of the Ozarks. Including two segments of ONSR, Alley Springs and Powder Mill. MDOT doesn't appear interested in doing anything to help prevent accidents with conflicts between bicyclists and vehicles. NPS needs to take the lead and at least develop bike lanes through both park areas. 18-24 inches on either side of 106 would sure help. Maybe this would pressure MDOT to continue this improvement. It is only a matter of time before a bicyclist's death happens. Heck, if the NPS and MDOT had bike lanes, I would love to get out and ride. Too dangerous at present. -Scenic means just that. I do not believe that seeing all kinds of RV's, trailers, campers, and vehicles along the river's edge are very scenic. In some places this has been allowed to get out of hand. Enforce what and where this type of activity is allowed, i.e. Log Yard. The gravel bar was to be for boaters and floaters, I believe. You have a campground for camping when not in a boat or canoe. Gravel bars need to be used for off water users only. Not everyone who has a campers or tent. Not real scenic when I see 100 vehicles along the river. Enforce existing rules that limit accesses. Keep vehicles and equipment away from the water. The same applies to other areas like Powder Mill. Gravel bars used during gigging season doesn't need to have all kinds of vehicles, open fires, etc. on them. Enforce scenic river standards. Too many dispersed sites perhaps? A scenic river designation means limited access spots. You can't be everyone's friend. -Houses and in holdings within the NPS bounds. What has happened there? I though existing homes would be removed when those holders died or decided to move on? Lands were purchased in the past and some had easements to prevent development. Restrictions were made in developments and improvements. Is this being monitored and enforced? A home right next to the river (in Spring Hollow) was sold and then a new porch was added. Aren't there existing rules on development of properties within the riverways boundaries? I understand that another home, which overlooks the rivers downstream from Log Yard, is also up for sale. What gives here? Scenic means scenic. Not just scenic for a selective few who can afford it. If and when properties come up to be sold, then the NPS should step in with a</p>	7/29/2009	No			MO	63638

	<p>"fair market" value of the home/land and purchase it. I remember some standards out west where inholders were allowed a lifetime permit, but when their life ended, so did ownership. Heirs were not allowed to sell properties. Weren't there provisions made within the ONSR lands on some of these properties? Again, scenic river! -Scenic means scenic. Why are power lines still seen within the park boundaries? Find funding or grants to help the cooperatives put high voltage electrical underground. -Horsepower of boat motors seems to be a big deal. I have to admit that I don't have a powerboat, but I do understand where the locals are coming from. Wonder why do you confuse people? Make it a 25 horsepower throughout the river system. Like the Eleven Point Scenic River. You confuse everyone with seasonal variations and location differences. Standardize. I live about 3 miles away from the Current River, yet even during the summer, I can still hear powerboats on the river. Why? I'm told that the larger the horsepower of the boat the more noise it will produce. But, I don't hear all of them so there must be some variations. Don't you have some type of noise pollution laws in place? 25, 40, or ? doesn't matter to me, but the noise pollution does. If I can hear at my house, I cannot believe how loud it is along the river. Scenic! If you do decide to lower the horsepower along the river, then you have to give the users time to adjust. Require a 25 hp maximum within 7 years and then about six years out start writing warnings. But to overnight require a reduced motor.. .yes, if I was a powerboat user I would also be really upset unless the NPS had some type of buyout program. -ATV use in the park needs to be prohibited. There are probably more legal users that not, however, those few have screwed up things for others by taking the ATV off roads and/or into the river. Yet, the larger UTVs (including electric carts) should be allowed. These are two passenger vehicles, which are expensive and not really built for off road use. Many older people are starting to use these. At least try it. Allow two passage vehicles on roads only. If it doesn't work, it can be made illegal. After all you allow "street legal" motorcycles within the riverways. They can and do make it off roads on occasion. -Close all those roads that are not needed for limited access points, resource management, or inholdings. Open roads encourage illegal use and resource damage. Enforcement needs to be made at the expense of county commissioners. Priority needs to be made to resource protection and scenic values. The public use comes second. -You have made great improvements by limiting use of springs/spring branches, limiting rowdy behaviors, banning glass and Styrofoam, but there are other scenic river laws that need to be enforced. -If too many people, groups are a problem then you must limit use/access. I have seen one too many canoes floating the river at times. The same applies to horse use. Keep pollution down to nothing or at least a manageable level. -You might open talks up with the US Forest Service about taking over Watercress Recreation area there in Van Buren. Get you Congressional representatives involved. The Forest Service can't seem to keep it up to the same maintenance standards as the NPS. I'm not sure if you can do this, but I would like to see the NPS take over this site. After all it is adjacent to your main office and a holding within the Current River. Laws need to be changed if they prohibit NPS from owning lands within city boundaries. -If the NPS can get additional money for development(s) and/or enhancements based upon your alternatives, make sure that if personnel are hired, that with limited exceptions, field</p>						
2599	<p>Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Dear Mr. Detring: These comments are submitted on behalf of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment ("the Coalition") regarding the General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways, ("the GMP") which is currently under development. Missouri Coalition for the Environment is an environmental non-profit organization located in St. Louis, Missouri, serving the entire state to promote clean water, clean air, clean energy, and the preservation of open space. We have 1100 members, all of whom have an interest in preserving the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins. The Coalition finds that none of the proffered alternatives, including the "No-Action" alternative, is sufficient to accomplish the National Park Service's goals of protecting natural resources and providing a premium natural heritage experience. The Coalition believes that in order to effectively accomplish these goals, the National Park Service must take preservation measures beyond those included in the proffered alternatives, including Alternative A. The specifics of our position are set forth in the comments as follows: Answers to Provided Topic Questions 1. The proposed alternatives, including the "No-Action" alternative, are insufficiently comprehensive and inadequate to meet the stated goals of the National Park Service and the purpose of the enabling legislation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Many of the proposed plans of action are commendable but more specific details must be provided. The specifics of our position are addressed below. 2. The elements of the preliminary alternatives, which the Coalition wants included, are addressed below. 3. The elements of the preliminary alternatives, which the Coalition strongly wants to be omitted are also addressed below. 4. The Coalition is a large membership organization that has an interest in all areas located within the 134 miles of the Riverways constituting Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("ONSR"). Our interests include floating, fishing, riding, hiking, camping, hunting, conserving natural resources, rare landscapes, sensitive native species, karst topography, culture and history, maintaining water quality and air quality, and preserving our native and natural heritage. 5. The important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national Riverways, which should be included, are addressed below. Existing Policies to Combat Natural Resource Management Issues Must be More Strictly Enforced The existing policies implemented by the National Park Service to address ongoing natural resource management issues affecting ONSR must be more strictly enforced. In 1964 Congress established ONSR with "the purpose of conserving... unique scenic and other natural objects" for use and enjoyment by the public, including the "preservation of portions of the Current River and Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams." In order to accomplish this goal, the National Park Service drafted its Superintendent's Compendium, outlining national and ONSR-specific regulations and policies.' Unfortunately, and in many cases illegally, these regulations and policies are frequently violated due to inadequate enforcement. The Illegal Use of ATVs and Other Motorized Off-road Vehicles Must be Eliminated The current ONSR policy reflects an intention to allow use of ATVs and other motorized off-road vehicles only on established roads passable by full sized automobiles.' Furthermore, Congress has specifically provided that "ATVs and UTVs operating in the outlying campgrounds may do so for ingress and egress purposes only to county or park roads open to legal use."4 Under both park and federal policy it is clear that there is no legitimate place for use of these vehicles, other than for transportation on county, state, or federal roads, in a park managed for use of its scenic and natural qualities. Unfortunately, even with these</p>	8/3/2009	No		Missouri Coalition for the Environment	MO	63130

<p>regulations in place, illegal ATV use continues to be prevalent throughout ONSR. The evidence of ongoing use within ONSR is abundant, and includes numerous water pockets along the banks of the rivers, pools of gasoline residue, and ATV tracks emerging from the water. Such behavior will completely devastate a natural area by 16 U.S.C. 460m. 2 Superintendent's Compendium drafted under the authority of 16 U.S.C. 3. 3 See http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parlcmgmtiatv-rules-and-regulations.htm. 436 C.F.R. 2.10. compacting soil, destroying plants, and increasing runoff and pollution. Moreover, the use of motorized vehicles along sandbars and shallows detracts from the experience of those who are picnicking, fishing, camping, and swimming along the banks of the rivers. The Coalition strongly suggests that measures be taken to increase enforcement and eliminate illegal use of ATVs and other motorized off-road vehicles within ONSR. Effective Measures Must be Taken to Monitor and Minimize Human Waste Pollution Current ONSR and federal policy provides that "disposal of human waste where a toilet is not provided or available must be buried at least 6 inches underground and a minimum of 100 feet from any water source, high water mark, trail or other developed facility." The reality is that for most people who use the river for recreation, a small hole in the ground shielded by a large tree set alongside, (or just off of), a frequented trail is often the outdoor bathroom. The direct result of this activity is that many areas located in close proximity to open gravel bars have become polluted with human waste. This problem can be alleviated by enacting a few simple measures. The Coalition suggests that the National Park Service adopt more stringent monitoring and locate toilet facilities for patrons to use when relieving themselves becomes necessary. Projects being developed on the Jacks Fork may provide an effective model for the entire Riverways. Expanding signage to direct visitors to proper facilities and monitoring facilities to ensure cleanliness and safety are equally essential. We support additional funding for achieving these goals. Horse Manure Must be Minimized by Enforcing Stricter Conditions on Horseback Outfitting Permits The current ONSR regulations provide that horse outfitters must obtain a commercial permit in order to operate within the park.' When done in a reasonable manner, horseback riding can be an asset to ONSR, and should continue to be enjoyed by responsible park users. However, when as many as 3,000 horses and riders access the waters in a single weekend, their waste can overwhelm the capacity of natural systems making certain areas unsafe for swimming. More specifically, in 1998 a significant amount of fecal coliform bacteria was found in a tributary of the Jacks Fork River. When the National Parks Service and the U.S. Geological Survey conducted a study, it concluded that the pollution was directly linked to horseback trail riding events. The Coalition takes the position that the size of trail parties must be limited and those limits must be enforced because natural systems can be overwhelmed by large parties. The Coalition further recommends that stringent permitting requirements be placed on horse outfitters limiting both trail pack sizes and frequency. Strict Regulations Must be Applied and Enforced to Eliminate Large Horseback Packs and Relocate Horseback Trails As discussed above, the National Park Service must implement and enforce strict regulations to eliminate large horseback packs and relocate horseback trails. Although a 36 C.F.R. 2.14(a)(9); See Also Superintendent's Compendium at 15. 6 See Superintendent's Compendium at 11-12. 3 MISSOURI COALITnoise very well and may amplify the sound of a device that is otherwise in compliance. Additionally, there is no evidence that the noise abatement regulations have been sufficiently enforced, as parties often complain of other users avoiding enforcement by turning their equipment down and then proceeding to slowly turn it back up. At the root of these problems is the impossible task of drawing the line of what exactly is unreasonably loud. Finally, the only way to eliminate the noise created by motorboats is to limit mixed-use zones to boats with 10 or less horsepower, as in the Buffalo National River. In response to these issues the Coalition strongly encourages the National Park Service to ban all electronic audio equipment unless used with headphones. Furthermore, the Coalition recommends the elimination of mixed-use river zones unless limited to boats with 10 or less horsepower. Programming In addition to its natural beauty, the ONSR is located in a region with a rich cultural heritage, history, and unmatched biodiversity. Because of these tremendous assets, the new GMP should increase efforts to educate visitors and area residents about the natural, scientific, and cultural heritage within the ONSR and the region. In addition to partnering with conservation educators such as the Missouri Dept. of Conservation and expanding outdoor skills training in canoeing, camping, and hiking, the GMP should emphasize educational activities and events on wildlife ecology, geology, biology, Ozark history and culture. It should encourage partnerships with local residents and groups to develop research, curriculum, materials and events to share critical knowledge about the region. Organizations like Audubon Missouri, Wild Turkey Federation, the Missouri Mycological Society, the Missouri Botanical Garden, the Missouri Department of Education, Missouri Speleological Survey, the Society of Wetland 'I See http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parknews/controlling-rowdiness-on-the-rivers.htm 36 C.F.R. 2.12(a)(1). Scientists, and American Rivers may be willing to partner on educational and research programs. Individuals such as old time fiddlers, storytellers, historical re-enactors, genealogical researchers, historians, craftsmen, farmers, trappers, anglers, and others may also be willing to share their knowledge to celebrate the rich traditions found here. Wilderness The National Park Service should pursue a wilderness designation for the Big Springs Natural Area. It should also clarify the implications of that for the public and its own staff. There is much confusion about whether or not hunting would be permitted there if the area was designated as wilderness. Currently, there is no hunting since it is a natural area. However, most wilderness areas in Missouri permit walk-in hunting. Please clarify which situation would apply. Conclusion None of the proffered alternatives, including the "No-Action" alternative, adequately address natural resource problems within Ozark Natural Scenic Riverways. The General Management Plan can and must do better. It must include measures that will be taken to more strictly enforce existing park policies and regulations. Additionally, the General Management Plan must include the implementation and enforcement of new measures to address new challenges including excess legal and illegal river access points, and increasing park congestion. In order to accomplish its goals the National Park Service must provide a General Management Plan that includes detailed solutions to inadequate enforcement and insufficient regulations. The NPS must make sure that its measures are easy to understand, reasonable, and practical for visitors because all Americans, and especially Missourians, feel that this treasure is "ours" and we want it preserved and protected while also having the opportunity to experience it. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed alternatives for the National Park Service's new General Management Plan for the Ozarks Natural Scenic Riverways. Sincerely,</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

2600	<p>Virginia R. McKee!, A.B., M.S.W Comments on the National Park Service Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) We write as a 70 year old Missouri resident/physician from 1966-71 and from 1974, after U.S. Army Medical Corps service as Captain and Major in Texas, continuously until the present time (September, 2009), and his wife based on 40 years experience as Missouri residents and 48 years being married. While I was a faculty member at Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis from 1974 until retirement July 1, 2005, I made periodic trips to various parts of ONSR for trail mapping, nature photography, hiking, camping and canoe trips. My wife purchased a home in Van Buren City in May 2005 to assist with her mother's care, and in March 2008 my wife and I purchased a second home in South Van Buren, near Rose Cliff Lodge and the Landing, with a direct view of the Current River. The nickname for this house was "River Cottage." ... and I and ... mother ... moved to Van Buren permanently on April 18, 2008. Her mother passed away in May 2009 and is buried in Van Buren City Cemetery. Therefore the ... are current Van Buren residents, Carter county taxpayers, and own a home that is directly impacted by Current River commercial and tourist activities that do affect our quality of life on a daily basis. We are both proud to be Missourians, happy to be members of the greater Van Buren community, and are pleased to have such a terrific resource as ONSR literally in our front yard. My wife and I were among the first to map and create a website for the entire Trans-Ozark trail route through Missouri, including the Current River section, and the Arkansas Ozark Highlands Trail that parallels the course of the Buffalo National Scenic River. We also attended and made numerous comments at the Governor's Commission on Chip Mills and went on several of their field trips to learn more about southern Missouri timber management. We have been members of the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis and the Missouri Coalition for the Environment. Specific Comments About the River Management Plan The ... attended two Park Service meetings on the management plan in Van Buren and in St. Louis. These meetings were useful to us in defining the options that were being considered. We stopped to read and hear what other attendees were saying about the NO ACTION options as well as about options A, B and C. We also made our own comments and ... filled out a formal comment form in St. Louis. ... also wrote to Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson after hearing about an invited but closed to the public meeting she held with 15 local people who espoused power boating use on the river and adamantly oppose any restrictions on current motor horsepower limits. Apparently the Dan ... letter outlined a different view that led an Emerson staff person to call and say the Emerson Cape Girardeau office had 300 letters FOR the NO ACTION option, with my letter being the only one opposed and in favor of canoes and other non-powered river craft over power boat use. I commented that the Congresswoman had thus far not gotten a very representative sampling of public opinion for there are many others who feel as I do. I also read Congresswoman Emerson's comments to the Park Service about the river management plan. Part of my reason for commenting further is to add a voice in opposition to the NO ACTION Voice of Voice of the Ozarks members, to Congresswoman Emerson, and to others of their persuasion including commercial river interests in Van Buren. Among options A, B and C, those actions I favor the Park Service taking in the new 15 year management plan being formulated include the following: [1] Supply the public with far better maps that show access points along ONSR that can be used for nature photography, and are in addition to the sometimes very busy and crowded boat ramps that are unsuited to this recreational activity. The Park Service should create more such river access observation points away from camp sites such as Big Tree that our family also enjoys. [2] Propose to Congress that it declare the designated area near Big Spring National Park as a national wilderness area. This determination was apparently precluded in the last 15 year plan. It is a good idea whose time has come. [3] Build walking trails to natural scenic spots along ONSR and create brochures to inform the public of such resources. Many natural ONSR features are unknown to the public, remain "hidden," and are not enjoyed thus diminishing the value of BSNP/ONSR. [4] Create habitat maps for particular types of ONSR wildlife to facilitate hobbies such as birding, nature photography, and simple observation. "Topo" maps and the current ONSR low resolution brochure map reveal little of the natural resources along ONSR except for campgrounds and a few access roads. Detailed maps should be available on a dedicated ONSR website. The Park Service should solicit ideas for such maps, brochures and education guides from ONSR enthusiasts via a blog and website. [5] Reduce motor size to 20 HP maximum all along the 134 mile length of the Current River and ONSR. Make many areas electric trolling motors only. [6] Institute "rules of the road" for power boats who must sharply "throttle back" to reduce wake size and impact when passing people in non-powered craft each and every time. There needs to be an aggressive concurrent education campaign aimed at promoting safe boating. Boating accidents and fines should be reported to the public. [7] The overall goal of ONSR management plan for the next 15 years should be to strictly adhere to original Congressional intent as endorsed by the Missouri Coalition for the Environment. We commend and endorse MCFE's article by ..., Coordinator, Friends of Ozark Riverways, for the article "Saving the Current River, Again," in The Alert, Fall 2009, page 7. ... recounts: "The Park Service's mission as it was created by Congress states: (to) preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers and the springs and caves and their karst origins, (and) (to) provide for the uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of the natural riverways resources." [8] The Current River is not a pretty sight from the Highway 60 bridge in Van Buren. The banks are full of downfall and the river itself is clogged with partly submerged downfall of trees that create a severe safety hazard. One such broken off tree trunk could easily pierce a metal boat hull. Clearing the Current of obstacles appears to us to be a recently neglected activity that needs to be urgently addressed.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS While we are not current enthusiasts, we respect the fact that many of our neighbors embrace power boating as part of their river heritage and enjoyment. We understand that canoes and power boats have shared the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers for decades. There have been tensions, but not wars 0 However, it is clear that power boaters could, and should, make strenuous efforts to moderate the speed and throttle settings of their motors when passing tubers, light kayak and raft users, and canoeists. During a canoe trip on the Labor Day weekend (Sunday, September 6 specifically) from Waymeyer to the Landing (-8 miles), my wife, daughter and I were passed by dozens of power boats with 40 HP motors. I had paid \$50 to a commercial vendor for transport and canoe rental. The Current was crowded that day with canoes, rafts, kayaks, and tubes with many small children, dogs, and men and women relaxing on the beaches and sand bars. Only two out of dozens of power boats made an obvious effort to "throttle back" as they passed the non-powered river people. Each time a power boat passed our canoe rocked</p>	9/11/2009	No			MO	63965
------	---	-----------	----	--	--	----	-------

2601	<p>Preliminary Alternatives Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan On behalf of the East Ozarks Audubon Society (EOAS), I would like to respond to your request for comments regarding the ONSR draft general management plan and wilderness study. As you may know, EOAS is based in Farmington, MO and consists of several hundred environmentally concerned citizens from a 6-county area. Many of our members regularly visit the Riverways and some of our members are regularly involved in volunteer work there. Our primary concern is that the general management plan must favor and enhance your mandate for preserving and protecting the natural and cultural resources for the enjoyment of future generations. Too often in the past and unfortunately continuing to this day, Park management has shown a bias towards permitting overuse by the present generation, often to the detriment of the resources. Restoration of degraded resources therefore also needs to be a major component of the general management plan. We will outline some of the problems we see, and comment on the proposed alternatives.</p> <p>Issues Wilderness: One of the most positive proposals in the draft plan is for management of the "Big Spring" tract as wilderness. This would be a big asset and has our wholehearted approval as noted below, the visitor seeking peace and quiet otherwise has a very hard job finding it within the Riverways, and this tract of mature Ozark forest is certainly worthy of Wilderness designation. Hopefully, ONSR can coordinate with neighboring landowners Mark Twain National Forest and Pioneer Forest to manage a broader area for its excellent wilderness values. Motorized Access: The network of authorized roads within the Riverways is so extensive that visitors seeking an escape from motor vehicles find it nearly impossible to do so. Greatly exacerbating this situation is the vast network of unauthorized "traces" created and maintained by illicit off-road vehicle users. This results in widespread problems with erosion and noise. It also results in a lot of river access points being largely given over to noise and partying, a situation inimical to the enjoyment of the resources by others. Unauthorized ORV use must be brought under control and illicit roads permanently closed. Traditional "traces" currently given over to ORV use can and should be converted to non-motorized trails. Riding ORVs is not by any stretch of the imagination a "traditional" use of the resource. Traditionally, it was easy for a canoeist to camp on a gravel bar far from the madding crowd. Nowadays, virtually ALL gravel bars have road access and the camping canoeist is as likely as not to be rudely disturbed. There are well in excess of 100 motorized access points to the rivers vastly in excess of the 15-20 envisioned when the Park was established. Horse riding: Unlike ORV riding, travel by horseback within the Riverways is both traditional and appropriate. What is not appropriate is permitting massive commercial trail rides consisting of many hundreds of riders at once. It has been documented that the resulting large quantities of horse manure results in significantly degradation of water quality in the rivers. Surely this cannot be permitted to continue the general management plan must include enforceable guidelines for commercial horse rides. It is simply not acceptable for a National Park unit to have to close its rivers to swimming and bathing because of sewage! In particular, day use limits far below the current excessive and exploitative use need to be established and enforced. Hiking: While commercialized horse riding and ORV driving have been allowed to flourish out of control, the most traditional way of all of exploring a National Park on foot has been neglected. The paucity of hiking trails speaks of misplaced priorities. There is excellent opportunity to develop hiking trails along existing routes e.g., some of the current illicit ATV trails and old road beds. Canoe and inner tube use: Although far more benign in impact on the resources than motorized recreation, in the case of canoe and tube recreation there tends to be too much of a good thing. At peak times, a traditional Park experience communing with nature and generally enjoying the great outdoors is well nigh impossible. Again, overuse results in degradation of the resource bank erosion, littering, etc. Enforceable limits need to be placed on commercial renting of tubes and canoes. Motorized boating: Since the last general management plan, motor boat use has increased to such an extent, especially on the Lower Current, than canoeing these stretches is an unpleasant and hazardous experience, akin to trying to bicycle on a major 4-lane highway. Horsepower limits need to be tightened considerably, and excessive speeding needs to be strongly discouraged by the establishment and enforcement of strict speed limits. It's a National Park, not a motorized speed racing track! Water quality and hydrological research: Apart from the horse manure situation, which the Park can control, water quality in general is a difficult problem owing to the watersheds extending far outside the Park, and moreover being to a large extent unknown, owing to the karstic nature of most of the recharge area. The general management plan needs to address the problem by first obtaining better definitions of the watersheds, especially of the larger springs, and second by collaborating with neighboring agencies and landowners to preserve the quality of water entering the Park via springs and streams. Easements: The many scenic and conservation easements (c. 9000 acres in total) within the ONSR boundaries have often been neglected or mismanaged, and many easement violations e.g. construction of large private buildings have been allowed to occur unchallenged. NPS needs to enforce existing legal easement obligations. Proposed Alternatives We have heard many comments from other respondents that the alternatives are confusing and difficult to interpret we agree with those critiques. For example, it is not apparent why the large tract opposite Cardareva Bluff is managed as a primitive zone in Alternative B but only as a natural area in the generally more conservative Alternative A. No Action Alternative We trust that NPS agrees with us that this is not a realistic or acceptable option. None of the issues or problems discussed above would be addressed and the Riverways already unfortunately well below NPS standards would continue to deteriorate. Alternative A This seems ingeneral to be the most promising of the alternatives offered. We fully support the goal of emphasizing "greater opportunities for traditional, non-mechanized forms of recreation and visitor experiences." We would urge that those areas proposed for primitive management under Alternative B be also included under primitive management in Alternative A. Alternative B The educational and interpretive aspects of this alternative sound ambitious and admirable unfortunately, interpretation always seems to come up short when it comes to actual funding. The proposal for learning centers and a great deal of ranger led activity may be more of a wish list than a realistic goal. Alternative C We do not support this alternative. Intensive development and efforts to increase levels of visitation will only serve to exacerbate all of the problems outlined above. The first priority must always be preservation of the resource for future generations, and alternative C fails in that regard. Moreover, the existing infrastructure is more than ONSR can adequately maintain, given funding constraints. It is hard to imagine how even more developed sites and structures can be adequately maintained. We do not support managing the "Big Spring" tract as other than wilderness. Recommendations We support the adoption of alternative A, but some changes need to be made e.g. rationalizing the mix of "primitive&q</p>	7/20/2009	No		East Ozarks Audubon Society	MO	63620
------	--	-----------	----	--	-----------------------------	----	-------

2602	<p>Dear Mr. Detring, I just graduated from Missouri State University in Springfield Mo, with a bachelor's degree in Construction Management. In my young career I have had the opportunity to travel around the world and enjoy some of the breathtaking scenes our country has to offer. Current River, without hesitation, is the most beautiful place I know. Having grown up in that area, I want to continue to preserve it for my future generations to enjoy as much as I have. I have worked on Current River to take care of tourist float trips for two years. I know what economical impact that tourist makes on the economy of many small towns surrounding the Current River area and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am an avid gigger and smallmouth fisherman. I love the peace and serenity that the river holds for outdoorsman such as me. I also love to recreational boat ride on the Current River. It amazes me every time I catch a glimpse of a bald eagle soaring through the trees, or the wild horses grazing on the green grass. I have floated the upper Current and witnessed an abundance of wild parties. This kind of lewd behavior keeps most families from floating the upper section of Current River. It also hurts the fishermen that enjoy one of the finest fishing sections of the river. In your General Management Plan it shows no solution to the problem. It is this section of the river that draws the most negative attention from the press. It creates an eye sore that keeps many families from enjoying the Current River area. If these party crowds are allowed to spread down river, it would create a more broad party area rather than keep it contained. This doesn't seem cost effective, because it will take more people to patrol a broader party area. As an avid recreational boater, I would hate to see you lower the horsepower rating. After lowering the horsepower rating in 1984, a 40 hp motor would not carry a family up and down the river; therefore decreasing the average family from enjoying the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Modern technology has allowed motors to increase in power and allowed families to return to the river. I feel strongly that EPA is doing everything necessary to cut down on pollution. I do not agree that if the National Park Service cuts the horsepower rating down that it will reduce motorized boats on Current River. It will just reduce the number of families on the river. After all, the purpose of the General Management Plan is to create of more family friendly atmosphere. We also have to take into consideration the economical impact of trying to reduce the motorized boaters on the river. The Ozark National Scenic Riverway is a substantial part of the midrange production of outboard engines and flat bottom jon boats. In the declining economy trying to reduce these engines and boats it will hurt businesses and possibly cut jobs. Decreasing the horsepower rating will also depreciate all of the 40 horsepower boats currently being used in the National Scenic Riverways. There is no other place nearby that these boats could be used therefore depreciating them in value and making them hard to sell. This will only take money out of the pockets of local boat owners who provide a sizeable income to local businesses. One of the bigger issues with motorized boats is that floaters complain of their speed and waves, regardless of horsepower, carless and imprudent driving occurs with the driver, not the size and speed of their vehicle. In my 25 years on Current River, the National Park Service has issued no expectations of floaters or motorized boat drivers. In my field of Management I have learned that to get results, I had to set some expectations. My recommendations to solve a problem with floaters and motorized boaters are to set some expectations between them. Boaters should have a recommended driving style that is enforced to mediate between boaters and floaters. Concessioners should set an expectation of floaters of how to deal with boaters. Boaters can not steer their boat at low speeds, nor can they shut down and stop in a shallow area due to damage that might occur to their boat. Why is there no expectations given to those who use and enjoy the National Scenic Riverways? Why doesn't the new General Management Plan address any expectations of boaters, floaters, tubers, horseback riders, hikers, or anyone else who enjoys the Ozark National Scenic Riverways? I would recommend starting expectations with children in school. Implementing a school program that teaches kids how to take care of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It would teach them how to clean up after themselves, properly operating a canoe or motorized boat, take a national boating drivers test, and keeping exotic wildlife from spreading to and from our local Current River. In addition to setting expectations, I would love to see better river access points. I do not believe there should be more access points, just improvements on the existing ones. Round springs and Powder Mill river access are very difficult to access and therefore create river pollution. Trucks that get stuck in gravel aggravate the river much more than creating a nice boat landing. It also discriminates against people who do not have a vehicle to access that boat ramp. I would recommend a stiffer punishment for those caught littering in the Ozark National Scenic Rivenway. Every year I personally pick up peoples trash left behind. I find it very offensive to me, when people litter in the river. I feel that if stiffer fines were handed out people would be more self conscious to take care of their own trash. In closing I applaud the Ozark National Scenic Riverway and the National Park Service for their efforts to keep the river clean, increasing more family friendly activities, and protecting one of the most beautiful rivers in the world. I would love to take a bigger part in contributing to these efforts to improve the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. If I could help in anyway to make the park more enjoyable to all, please let me know. Thank you for your time.</p>	6/8/2009	No			MO	65721
2603	<p>Dear N.P.S. First of all we would like to cover the 5 questions that are asked on the comment form. Q1) No Action is the best alternative. Q2) No Action. Period. These waterways where taken better care of when the public owned them. Q3) Alternative A: If this Alternative A idea is implemented that prohibits boats from being on the river at all. Does this mean that Water Patrol cannot be on the river unless they are in a canoe, kayak, or tube? What if someone was to get hurt, are we just going to wait for them to float that person down in a canoe...there is nowhere along the river to call for help. Only the floaters that may have seen the person get hurt would know to tell someone if they seen someone. Who are they going to see first that would know what to do? Locals of course! How are people going to be rescued? As it is, locals in boats would take the person that got hurt and their family and take them to get help somewhere. If these boaters are not allowed out there on the water, the victims are going to get to suffer quite a while longer. What about flooding? When there are people stranded out there in canoes, kayaks, or tubes? Q4) There are many areas along the rivers that are special. By being raised along the rivers, there is many great attributes that the river has brought to lots of families throughout the years. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? Refer below Questions that we have: 1) If "We the people" own these national parks, out of all the parks and trail in Missouri (Pony Express National Historic Trail, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Ulysses S Grant National Historic Site, etc.) why have we not been asked on decision making changes to them? However, these areas where asked to fill out a comment sheet and mail it in on what they think should be done with the ONSR. 2) Our rural communities have been the main</p>	7/23/2009	No			MO	65571

	<p>attractions. It has been said "it's like going back 50 years." Why change anything? Is it a rule that every so many years a new regulation needs to be made to these rivers? 3) If preservation of the rivers is the priority of these new rules/regulations than why hasn't the farmland that was taken away been preserved? 4) As the owner of recreational motorized watercraft, as well as an avid canoeist, our family spends a lot of time on the river. Our canoe trips on the current & Jacks Fork rivers have been nothing but fabulous. As far as problems with boats on the river, we have found that they are respectful enough to slow down in places they are able to. Understandably this cannot be done on shoals. Complaints of boaters no slowing down and being disrespectful is coming from the mouths of undereducated tourist that don't understand that these boaters have no choice on shoals and should be grateful that if by chance (a very slim chance) they were to tip over it would be in shallow water. The floaters then are furious with the boaters and if the boater was to stop to help clean up the canoe mess, a lot of times the canoer's will cuss out the boaters. To be able to share and enjoy the rivers for both canoer's/floaters and boaters it would be beneficial to give the floater an informational brochure warning these floaters about the boater's choices. This will give the tourist that come to enjoy our rivers information about local motorist. As well as, allows the locals to enjoy the rivers also. This leaves both local and tourist enjoying the river together. 5) As far as managing horsepower on these streams/rivers. We feel that the rivers will regulate itself 6) Why are the local people that take care of these rivers all year long being regulated to remove the only life they have ever known? The river is for floating and enjoying nature. Whether it is tubes, rafts, canoes, kayak or motorboats. However, it seems that the local people are the only ones getting the fault. It seem like to only rights that are being taken away is from the local people that actually have to answer and take care of these streams. If preservation is the key, wasn't it the local people that made them significant? 7) As far as roads, this is another special part about the rivers. Old home places where down these roads...you know the farms that were taken away. People love to go back and remember these places only if they just have pictures, memories, or have just heard stories. These places are special.. .not just special these places are the memorabilia of their family and how they lived. However, a lot of these places can't even be found except for a fireplace, well or some landmark that set the place due to not be preserved. Just think how awesome that would be to float down the river and see these old preserved farms. You wouldn't just be getting to enjoy nature but you could also be getting the history of how the Ozarks was actually lived. Amazing! This document is being sent from the following:</p>					
2604	<p>Good Morning My comments regarding the Ozark National Scenic River ways are as follows: I would like to see the Current River area preserved with consideration given to restoration of the illegal roads and trails, Big Spring wilderness designation, and generally I am supportive of Alternative A. I was taken to Montauk in a bassinette as a baby and 55 years later I still visit my river regularly. I watched the changes take place up and down the landscape. Some of them are of great use for the outdoorsmen and make conservation 'sense'. There are others that don't make any sense to me at all. People come from all over the country to see this pristine majestic river. The Current is 70% spring water. The only river on the continent with this high percent spring water is the Snake River in Idaho. On the current river there are 4 springs of the first magnitude, 5 of the second magnitude and countless others. Visitors come here to find what they cannot find elsewhere. Pristine waters, deeply shaded runs through bluff lined valleys, otters playfully following a canoe, spring peepers or maybe the seldom seen species cave dwelling grotto salamander and the rare Ozark hellbender. For bird watchers that come from all points they rely on the peace and quiet that the area is known for to view the 150 or so type birds that inhabit the region throughout the year. Even a non bird watcher city kid enjoys a hoot owl or whip-poor-will while camping. Fishing on the current has changed over the years and changed again. Old timers told me stories of the cold headwater catfish that used to inhabit the deep holes that they called chuckle heads. They admitted they were fished out 50 years past. The annual sucker fly in Licking was always a mystery to me but years ago a gentleman at Steelman Lodge told me it was a Current River harvest once a year, scored and deep fried; the best fish fry of the year. Fisherman come for brown trout, chain pickerel, grass pickerel, largemouth bass, rainbow trout, shadow bass, smallmouth bass, walleye, and warmouth. Other game fish species including black crappie, channel catfish, flathead catfish, paddlefish, sauger, spotted bass, white bass, and white crappie. There are endangered species; These include 117 species of plants (flowering plants, ferns, fern allies, and mosses); 7 species of insects; 5 species of crayfish; 10 species of mussels; 1 snail species; 17 species of fish; 4 species of amphibians, 7 species of birds; and 6 species of mammals. Six species within the watershed are federally and state listed as endangered. These include the Visitors come here to find what they cannot find elsewhere. FURTHER MORE On the current there are the rarest of all springs found: ebb and flow springs that fluctuate flow due to air chambers deep within the conduits of the spring that fill and 'belch' increasing water flow- it's that or the water source is so large it moves from the gravity of the moon. The cave network is said to originate through the deterioration of the Ozark Mountains over 100 million years in the past. The development and life of the caves come and go in relative short periods but the beauty and spectacle remains an organic living part of the river. Visitors come here to find what they cannot find elsewhere. In Missouri we have 3 state parks that are set up for ATV's and motor cross bikes with trails. There you can run your loud motorized vehicles and no one will complain. In Missouri we have 8 state parks where we have provided horseback riding trails and many of those have group camp sites set up for equestrian clubs. There you can ride wooded trails and create ruts in the earth that may or may not affect local water shed and no one will complain. In Missouri we have 25 state parks with boat ramps where all forms of boating is available. There you can leave a trail of oil on the water and pollute until your heart is content and no one will complain. These type recreations are available elsewhere and should not be part of the Ozark National Scenic River way experience in my opinion. My tax dollars have provided a place for those activities. When I want peace and quiet, ancient mountains, and tranquil settings that take your breath away I can travel to the Current River. I think when people want to ride ATV's, ride horses that criss cross the river disturbing sediment covering food sources/eggs for darters and other small fish, and even run motorized boats that unnecessarily pollute the water when for centuries poling served the river travelers quite well, they should go where those things are available and leave the Current River to it's designated position as a NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY. I do not appreciate the lack of enforcement of laws on the river. I was young and I enjoyed my party days. But my friends and I were always respectful of the families that might be our co travelers on any river we floated. We don't need any new regulations or laws, we just need some gentle guidance for these few who have forgotten they share the river with everyone. Having the Gestapo questioning everyone</p>	7/20/2009	No		MO	63301

	with a cooler is certainly not family friendly and neither is a lewd and lascivious acts on the gravel bars by some intoxicated young people. A rather delicate situation and I don't envy the men and women with the job of enforcement. The use of the river has increased and additional manpower is required during peak usage. I've sat at cedar grove on a hot summer day with my children playing in the water rushing through the tubes under the low water bridge and seen things I wish they hadn't seen. I've personally talked to young men about being responsible for their drunk girl friend as they proceed down the river and what a great responsibility they have in making sure if that canoe tips over you must make sure her inebriated face is up and out of the water. Then I pray my daughters never get that drunk on the river. And to think I used to party with the best of them when I was younger makes me feel a bit older than I care to be. I love my river. People come from everywhere to share her. People who wish to do things that are appropriate elsewhere should go elsewhere just as countless others have traveled to go to the Current to enjoy what it provides for them. I greatly appreciate your time and the opportunity for this forum. My home is in St Charles, MO but my heart has been at the headwaters of the Current River all of my life. Respectfully						
2605	Dear Superintendant: I am writing regarding Missouri's Ozark National Scenic River Ways. When developing a new general management plan, please consider the following points: 1. Vehicles of all sorts particularly all terrain vehicles should be limited in access to the Ozark River Ways. They should be allowed on legal roads only. ATV's should be denied access to the River Valley and beaches. 2. Horseback riding should be controlled in numbers and locations to limit erosion and pollution. 3. Motorized boats especially jet boats should be denied access to the river. 4. The big spring ruminant wilderness should be protected by way of congressional act. Thank you for considering these points. Sincerely, cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/14/2009	No		MID COUNTY ORTHOPAEDI C SURGERY AND SPORTS MEDICINE	MO	63141
2606	As a conservationist and dedicated supporter for the wilderness/enviroment and an active Member of the Sierra Club, I would like to address my concern in regards to the Ozark Scenic National Scenic Riverways which includes the Current River and the Jacks Fork. 45 years ago, Congress acknowledged these waterways to be first under federally protective measure. As Missourians, protecting the Riverways from exploitation by second class management is our precedence. Us citizens of this homeland won't endure this feat. For Missouri residents, ONSR communities and contiguous vicinities, it is crucial for this wonderful vista to be re-established back to its native condition. This geological attribute is known for its picturesque grottos, colossal overhangs, radiant springs/tributaries, flourishing woodlands/wild vegetation, etc., provides vital habitat for bird migration/proliferation and is serves home to wild turkey, otters, salamanders, etc. It's also known to be the only wild horse refuge in the heartland. Presently, we're facing a critical matter in regards of how the ONSR is being approached. Some tribulations include unlawful admittance, excessive use, etc. in the Riverways. A number of them include boating and unlawful wildcat motor access which degrades waterways, spoils tranquility and jeopardize safety of other motorists/swimmers, disturbs acquatic life. Therefore these measures must be well enforced so the waterways doesn't become "expressways". As an alternative, I would encourage canoeing, kayaking, rafting and tubing as a safer, quieter, non-polluting, less damage to the eco-system, and a more pleasing expedition in a constrained mode. As with vehicles, the use of them off authorized infrastructures must be phased out since they endanger the safety of campers, harm wildlife and ruin gravel bars. Horse trails can't be eliminated, but should not be near waterways and restrictions must be placed on the horses trudging through rivers/streams as these steps could reduce the access of animal waste that fouls the water and cause algal blooms which is detrimental to marine existence. Next comes a portion of the earliest unscathed land in the Big Spring area This segment of the backwoods is an aspirant for the Wilderness System and contains a quantity of the greatest pine/oak in Missouri. It is very important that the Park Service defends this area and recommend this to Congress. Last involves egotistical, insurmountable, and raucous, boors who libate excessively and leave refuse behind. They should mind their etiquette and respect neighbors at the Riverways or they can take their disruptive conduct to local bars, not the sandbars, as this type of demeanor won't be tolerated. These are just a few subject matters I want to bring to attention. As citizens, we must intervene and stay focused on these circumstances. If we can rehab classic cars, revitalize historic towns, etc., the same can be accomplished for the Riverways and could open the gateway to rejuvenation of other state/national parks throughout the globe. I know this can't take place instantaneously, but it can happen if we all lend a hand. It is a worthwhile endeavor to resurrect these treasures back to their splendor as these wonderful eco-systems offer tranquility, ambience, etc., It's essential they stay immaculate and not become "theme parks". Thank You.	9/13/2009	No		Sierra Club- Eastern Missouri Group	UN	N/A
2607	Re: Save the Current River Again Dear Supt. Detring, Some 20 years ago when I first moved to Missouri from the Pacific Northwest the Missouri Rivers offered me solace and a point of state pride when talking about the beautiful out-of-doors here. The Current River and _lad& Fork were my favorite places to take newcomers and state visitors, especially during the fall foliage and early spring runoff when the rivers were quiet before the crowds came. We identified the tracks in the sandbars and the nearby birds, as well as the seasonal flowers. Too, we enjoyed the sounds of human silence in the midst of nature's symphonies. Over and over these past two decades as I canoed on these rivers rye noticed more party noise from floaters, even during the off-seasons, motored noise from nearby ATV vehicles and even on boats, increased trash scattered around, and deeply eroded ruts down to the streams. What was so attractive for so many years is now lessening as a place of pride. These quiet pristine along the Current and Jades Folks River respites from urban life are now diminishing as a Missouri treasure. And, for what? Yet, it is not too late for better management and focus on the natural wilderness. Thus, it is up to you and others to ensure that we don't lose this once protected area for both regional wildlife and humans. Please save the Current and Jades Fork Rivers, once again. Thank you.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65203
2608	Dear Superintendent Detring: I am writing to add my voice and support to the movement to acquire more protection for our National Scenic Riverways. "Unique" is not just a descriptive word, but a fact: In 1964 Congress declared the Current and Jacks Fork as our country's very first federally protected river, the 134 mile long Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Now, after intervening years of lack of sensitive, realistic management, there is noticeable degradation. A list of damaging practices that have not been meaningfully addressed include: overdevelopment, illegal roads, off-road vehicle trespass, and perhaps most destructive of all, commercial trail-ride exploitation featuring crossing and recrossing of vulnerable streams a practice probably not allowed in other conservation aware states. Overcrowding, too many people and canoes and loud boats	9/10/2009	No			MO	65279

	and unrestricted trail riding are ruining a resource that all Missourians should be proud of and concerned about. I hope the current attention to this area results in a meaningful realistic General Management Plan. Finally, please protect the Big Spring remnant wilderness and propose it for the Wilderness System. Sincerely, Cc: Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, Governor Jay Nixon, Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer						
2609	I hope you will accept these comments on the General Management Plan. I have been a patron of the park since the early '70s. I have since experienced rivers in the east, west, southeast, northwest and southeast parts of this country plus in Costa Rica. To experience the Current and the Jack's Fork is unique and different from the Eleven Point and the Buffalo National River. It is the resource that is different. I prefer Alternative A in the information provided which most protects the resource. The activities and issues listed in the other alternatives can be found elsewhere. The resource and the legislation that enabled the establishment of the national park are not found elsewhere. I would encourage wilderness designation of the area close to Big Springs. The Ozarks are an oasis between the Smokey Mountains and the Rockies for national wilderness areas. Our federal wilderness designated areas are small when you compare their size to the total federally owned areas. It puts this area on the map nationally. Wilderness areas are shared not only by hikers and backpackers, but also by hunters. We live in a finite world. It did not feel like that in the '70s. Thanks for you attention.	9/9/2009	No			MO	63701
2610	Dear Sir: I have been reading about the Current & Jack Ford Rivers and of the increased use of them. They will no longer be scenic if the use is continued at the current pace. Please limit the use of ATVs, motorized boats and horses. None should be eliminated but the number should be significantly reduced and the many entrances into the rivers should be curtailed to a few that are managed and maintained. Erosion and contamination will make it so families will not want to be in the water and then the only use will be horses and ATVs. This area should remain a wilderness Thanks C: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskell Governor Jay Nixon Congressman Todd Akins	9/9/2009	No			MO	N/A
2611	Re: Current River and Jacks Fork River Dear Mr. Detring: The Ozark National Scenic Riverways are a precious resource ans we should not allow ramps and illegal roadways to destroy our heritage. We must maintain an atmosphere where wildlife can flourish and that is not too crowded with humans. We must focus on keeping native biodiversity and natural rpirian communications. We cannot maintain this and have mobile campers on an open field. Too many bank openings will promote erosion and destruction of our resource. This is also a significant bird area. Birding is a huge attraction for tourism, so it would be self-defeating to allow the area to become uninhabitable for the beautiful birds that attract so many visitors. As a member of the public, I feel very strongly the Ozark national Scenic Riverways must be protected. Thank you, Cc: Claire McCaskill, Senator Kit Bond, Senator Jay Nixon, Govern	9/9/2009	No			MO	63332
2612	Dear Mr. Detring, I'm writing in regards our National Scenic Riverways in Missouri, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We've floated and camped along these rivers many times over the last 30 years and enjoyed the beauty, serenity, and pristine aspects of these scenic rivers. However, times are changing and not for the better. I've become concerned about the increasing use of these rivers in ways that create long term damage. There is an increasing use of off road vehicles that are inflicting damage on the streams and stream banks and increasing the number of illegal access points along these rivers. There is also a lot of trail riding going on in large groups that have to be commercially organized. These frequent and extensive trail rides are damaging the stream banks and leaving fecal matter pollution in the river. There needs to be limits placed on activities that cause damage to these "national treasures" we have in Missouri. Protecting the resource must be the first priority. Please strengthen the management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to turn around the degradation that is evident today. Thank you for your time. Sincerely,	9/8/2009	No			MO	63130
2613	Re: Riverways (Current & Jacks Forks Rivers) Public Comment Dear Mr. Van Buren, I am one of the many who are concerned about the degrading of our rivers from illegal access and use of various vehicles. Missouri and Arkansas are blessed with some pristine rivers that must be protected from commercial trail rides and especially motorized boat-s4-ATVs. Most of the population of Missouri resides in urban areas and the rivers (and state parks) are the only areas that we can truly find peace and outdoor beauty. Please protect these areas from the degrading the of the rivers and noise pollution. Quiet and clear rivers must exist. I appreciate your support. Yours truly, cc: Senator Claire McCaskill	9/8/2009	No			MO	63122
2614	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
2615	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
2616	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
2617	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63935
2618	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63937

2619	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63020
2620	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
2621	Response to Question 1: No Action!!	6/27/2009	No			MO	63755
2622	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			TN	38006
2623	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2624	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			IL	62939
2625	Response to Question 1: No Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
2626	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2627	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2628	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			AR	72430
2629	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2630	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63846
2631	Response to Question 1: No Action!	6/27/2009	No			AR	72404
2632	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2633	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2634	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63964

2635	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2636	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63701
2637	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2638	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2639	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			FL	33919
2640	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63633
2641	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63629
2642	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63629
2643	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63629
2644	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63629
2645	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/27/2009	No			MO	63629
2646	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hr. power at the out put shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63459
2647	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE IN HORSEPOWER, IF ANYTHING AT LEAST A 75 H.P. MOTOR, 4 TO 6 PEOPLE IN A 40 H.P. BOAT/MOTOR, COME ON NOT EVEN CLOSE TO ADEQUATE. CAN'T PUT A WHEEL CHAIR IN A SMALL BOAT, NEED ACCESS FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS! Response to Question 2: ABSOLUTELY NO TUBES! CANOES, RAFTS, BOATS ARE ACCEPTABLE, THEY CAN MANAGE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR LITTER, CANS, ETC. CANOES AND RAFTERS AT LEAST HAVE PADDLES TO CONTROL THEM. Response to Question 3: TOURIST SEASON IS ONLY 304 MONTHS LONG, BUT THERE IS VERY FEW LITTTERING CITATIONS BEING ISSUED. WATCH THE TUBES, SEE THE LITTER, ISSUE CITATIONS! Response to Question 4: WAYMEYER TO BIG SPRING, LIMITS ON #'S OF TUBERS PER DAY. Response to Question 5: WHY NOT BETTER ACCESS, NO CHARGE FOR FAMILIES TO CAMP ON CERTAIN AREAS, GRUBB HOLLOW, PIN OAK, ETC.	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2648	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2649	Response to Question 1: A is by far the best option for this national jewel that is being over-used to death. NPS mission is (to my recollection) "to preserve UNIMPAIRED for the enjoyment of FUTURE GENERATIONS." None of the alternatives, (Save A) come anywhere close. Response to Question 2: --Non- motorized stretches of the rivers --Primitive areas --localized development - not spread out along all accessible sites.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65201

	*Protection of Ozark heritage - cultural AND natural Response to Question 3: --Increasing traditional commercial services --not making Big Spring a wilderness area (Alt. C) --Focusing on increasing visitor use & facilities Response to Question 4: Pulltite Spring & Cabin area Janup Cave (all of the Jacks Fork) None of the alternatives seem to link land designations (Developed, primitive, etc) with adjacent river designations. How can you get a primitive experience if motor boats are going by? Response to Question 5: Yes. low cost, lottery-awarded guided overnight trips for families with children, esp. those w/o camping equipment.						
2650	Response to Question 1: We prefer Alternative B. Drop the wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. Response to Question 2: B-- Managing popular activities in balance with other discovery and learning opportunities. Place 40 HP limit on outboard motors between Big Spring and Gooseneck Response to Question 3: Wilderness designation for Big Spring. -The proposed is vague and hints at restrictions and changes from present conditions. There is a sense of finality to a "Wilderness Designation." It can, once in place, only be changed by an act of Congress. Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: No	7/9/2009	No			MO	63935
2651	Response to Question 1: A seems like the preferable option, although I appreciate the intrepretative aspects of B. The emphasis on cultural Ozark resources and natural resources will provide much needed support in this region of the country. Wilderness or natural designation should not hamper management of the natural resources. Response to Question 2: Strong stewardship of the natural resources within the Ozark NSR is a crucial ingredient. The rivers traverse and abut some of the most beautiful and high-quality natural areas within the state. Protecting and actively managing these natural resources should be one of the top priorities. Response to Question 3: Illegal road building, ATV-use, and horseback riding should not be accepted, tolerated, or accomodated. The desires of a few should not be able to negatively impact the experience for the rest. Response to Question 4: Jam-up bluff, Prarie Hollow Gorge, the Devils sinkhole, and many of the bluffs contain fantastic flora & faunal communities. As long as those places are protected and managed, then the A & B are acceptable. Response to Question 5: Prescribed fine for for best management of communities.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63139
2652	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE IN HORSEPOWER, IF ANYTHING AT LEAST A 75 H.P. MOTOR, 4 TO 6 PEOPLE IN A 40 H.P. BOAT/MOTOR, COME ON NOT EVEN CLOSE TO ADEQUATE. CAN'T PUT A WHEEL CHAIR IN A SMALL BOAT, NEED ACCESS FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS! Response to Question 2: ABSOLUTELY NO TUBES! CANOES, RAFTS, BOATS ARE ACCEPTABLE, THEY CAN MANAGE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR LITTER, CANS, ETC. CANOES AND RAFTERS AT LEAST HAVE PADDLES TO CONTROL THEM. Response to Question 3: TOURIST SEASON IS ONLY 304 MONTHS LONG, BUT THERE IS VERY FEW LITTTERING CITATIONS BEING ISSUED. WATCH THE TUBES, SEE THE LITTER, ISSUE CITATIONS! Response to Question 4: WAYMEYER TO BIG SPRING, LIMITS ON #'S OF TUBERS PER DAY. Response to Question 5: WHY NOT BETTER ACCESS, NO CHARGE FOR FAMILIES TO CAMP ON CERTAIN AREAS, GRUBB HOLLOW, PIN OAK, ETC.	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2653	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. Should be modified to allow NO motorized vehicles anywhere. Response to Question 2: No motorized vehicles. Response to Question 3: No motorized vehicles should be allowed. They can be used on lakes. Response to Question 4: Not Yet.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2654	Response to Question 1: No Action	6/22/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2655	Response to Question 1: We prefer alternative B. Drop the wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. Response to Question 2: B-- Managing popular activities in balance with other discovery and learning opportunities. Place 40 HP limit on outboard motors between Big Spring and Gooseneck. Response to Question 3: Wilderness designation for Big Spring. - The proposed is vague and hints at restrictions and changes from present conditions. There is a sense of finality to a "Wilderness Designation." It can, once in place, only be changed by an act of Congress. Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: No	7/9/2009	No			MO	63935
2656	Response to Question 1: A is by far the best option for this national jewel that is being over-used to death. NPS mission is (to my recollection) "to preserve UNIMPAIRED for the enjoyment of FUTURE GENERATIONS." None of the alternatives, (Save A) come anywhere close. Response to Question 2: --Non-motorized stretches of the rivers --Primitive areas --localized development - not spread out along all accessible sites. *Protection of Ozark heritage - cultural AND natural Response to Question 3: --Increasing traditional commercial services --not making Big Spring a wilderness area (Alt. C) --Focusing on increasing visitor use & facilities. Response to Question 4: Pulltite Spring & Cabin area Jamup Cave (all of the Jacks Fork) None of the alternatives seem to link land designations (Developed, primitive, etc.) with adjacent river designations. How can you get a primitive experience if motor boats are going by? Response to Question 5: Yes. low cost, lottery-awarded guided overnight trips for families with children, esp. those w/o camping equipment.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65201
2657	Response to Question 1: A seems like the preferable option, although I appreciate the intrepretative aspects of B. The emphasis on cultural Ozark resources and natural resources will provide much needed support in this region of the country. Wilderness or natural designation should not hamper management of the natural resources. Response to Question 2: Strong stewardship of the natural resources within the Ozark NSR is a crucial ingredient. The rivers traverse and abut some of the most beautiful and high-quality, natural areas within the state. Protecting and actively managing these natural resources should be one of the top priorities. Response to Question 3: Illegal road building, ATV-use, and horseback riding should not be accepted, tolerated, or accomodated. The desires of a few should not be able to negatively impact the experience for the rest. Response to Question 4: Jamup bluff, Prarie Hollow Gorge, the Devils sinkhole, and many of the bluffs contain fantastic flora & faunal communities. As long as these places are protected and managed, the the A & B are acceptable. Response to Question 5: Prescribed fine for best management of communities.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63139

2658	Dear Sir, I want to comment on the Ozark Scenic Riverways. I have taken many trips by canoe on various beautiful rivers in the Ozarks. I love them and want them to be protected from human spoilage. Please help! Don't allow wildcat motor access. Keep vehicles off illegal roads. Control numbers of trail riders. Control use of motores on boats. Help Big Spring Remnant to be a part of the Wilderness System. Thank you in advance for your concern and help. cc. Sen. Kit Bond Sen. Claire McCaskill	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2659	Dear Superintendent Detring, I am writing to thank you for extending the comment period on the Riverways to September 11 so that I might write with great concern for Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways. When I moved to Missouri almost a decade ago, I rejoiced in the many scenic, natural rivers awaiting me in the Show-Me-State. Missouri's unspoiled waterways are part of what defines our state and makes us a national and natural treasure. But, I've become increasingly concerned about the care and management of our waterways, particularly of the Current and its tributary the Jacks Fork. There has been increased illegal use of motorized vehicles in these areas, which threaten to turn our natural and wild places into glorified grass freeways. The illegal wilcat motor accesses must be eliminated, as must the use of vehicles off of legal roads. These motorists threaten not only the natural environment they crush with their giant tires, but also campsites, grass, and the peaceful experience of being in Missouri's nature. If I wanted to watch vehicles careening uncontrolled and without regard to nature, I'd stay in St. Louis and camp on the freeway. I'm deeply concerned by the increasing number of off-road tire tracks, natural damage, and even the riders themselves zipping through the brush, trees, and natural spaces that I've seen this season. This illegal use must be curbed not only because it is just that, illegal, but because it ruins the experience of Missouri's nature for those who come to see the nature itself, and not to inhale the exhaust of motor- riders. While my broken serenity may not be the most pressing concern for the park service, certainly the lasting environmental damage these vehicles are producing must. Another concern for me is the excess of motorized boats and especially jet-boats that have disrupted many a peaceful experience on the river for me and my family. These boats must be more strictly controlled. It is your duty as Park Superintendent to ensure Missouri waterways are accessible and available to enjoy for all people, even those with motorized boats, of course, but the high and frequent use of such motorized vehicles threatens to do damage what little wild spaces we have left in Missouri. I hope you will take immediate action to address these concerns and protect Missouri's remaining natural and pristine waterways so that when my children grow up, they too can rejoice in the natural wonder of our state. Cc: Governor Nixon Senator McCaskill Senator Bond Representative Clay	9/8/2009	No			MO	63130
2660	Response to Question 1: "A" is closest, but I would like to see even further: severe restrictions on motorized boats, elimination of horses in the portions of watershed controlled by NPS, severe cut back on # of canoes allowed on river/day - cut back on party atmosphere. Response to Question 2: I like the addition of back country and wilderness experience areas in the "A" scenario, but would like to see them expanded. Response to Question 3: No horses in the water No motorized vehicles (ATVs) in water or on gravel bars Motorized boats limited to below Powder Mill. Response to Question 4: I am a land owner in upper current watershed, so that area is important to me. I think it should be managed more as wilderness esp. considering its proximity to Roger Pryor backcountry. THIS River is an International Treasure Response to Question 5: Think about "sound sheds" I dont want to hear motors when I am trying to have a backcountry wilderness experience.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65201
2661	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is the closest to my idea - however I feel Alternative B will be most palatable politically-- Response to Question 2: Wilderness-- Response to Question 3: Concerned about the trail rides-- Response to Question 4: Love boating the upper river - have property on the Lower river - Response to Question 5: Buffalo Nation River seems well run - less people of course put less development - that's what I'd like to see on the Current -	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2662	Response to Question 1: I SUPPORT MAXIMUM RESTRICTIONS ON MOTORIZED BOATS, MAKING ALTERNATIVE A THE MOST ATTRACTIVE. I DO LIKE THE CONCEPT OF "SMALL LEARNING CENTERS" INCORPORATED IN ALTERNATIVE B, BUT NOT WITH MOTORIZED BOATS. Response to Question 2: RESTRICTIONS ON MOTORIZED BOATS, WILDERNESS AREA PRESERVATION. Response to Question 3: MIXED USE ZONES. THERE ARE OTHER PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO TAKE THEIR MOTOR BOATS. Response to Question 4: I USE ALLEY MILL FOR A YOUTH PROGRAM ANNUALLY - VISITING THE MILL SITE AND TAKING YOUNG PEOPLE CANOEING FROM ALLEY MILL TO EMINENCE. I ALSO CANOE PULTITE TO ROUND SPRING.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2663	Dear Mr. Detring: I am writing to add my comments to the management plan for the Ozark Scenic Waterways. The problems with the management of the Waterways that concern me the most are: 1. Commercial trail rides: As an avid trail rider myself I am well aware of the impact horses can have on a trail. In our saddle club here on Stockton Lake we are constantly doing trail maintenance to stop erosion and water pollution and we are just a few riders. We need to limit the numbers of horses on the cross country trail rides so that we can restore the trails and improve the quality of the water. 2. Off Road Vehicles belong on the farm not on the gravel bars of our scenic rivers. They do too much damage to sensitive areas. 3. Protect the Big Spring Wilderness remnant and include it in the Wilderness System. It is too valuable to our country to loose some of the finest stands of old growth forest in the state of Missouri. 4. Stop illegal Motor access to the river. 5. Don't allow motorized boats on the river. We need the peace and quiet to appreciate this beautiful area.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65785
2664	Dear Sir, We are writing this letter because it has come to our attention that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers are being degraded on an increasing scale. As campers and canoeists, we feel that the use of these rivers by motorized ATVS and jet boats must be strictly controlled, if not banned altogether. As the Current and Jacks Fork rivers make up the federally protected Ozark National Scenic Riverways we feel the National Park Service should be given more clout in the prevention of the degradation of these beautiful rivers. Our understanding is that the Park Service has undertaken development of a new General Management plan to guide the future of this park. Illegal wildcat motor access, off road vehicle use, commercial trail rides, motorized and/or jet boats must be more strictly controlled. Please do everything within your power to see that this National Scenic Riverway remains as pristine and clean as possible, for us and future generations.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63106

2665	Response to Question 1: Alternative A - These rivers should be as natural as possible - repair park overuse Response to Question 2: Repair park overuse - limit commercial use Response to Question 3: Please, no more visitors centers, no more cement. No park service demonstrations. Park Service should police park only and keep natural areas natural	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2666	Response to Question 1: I prefer alternative A. No motors to smaller motors. Returning the park to a quieter more pristine area is what I would like to see. Response to Question 2: I like the wilderness areas. I would like to see plants & wildlife have a chance to thrive. Response to Question 3: high horsepower motors should not be allowed in most of the Park. Horse, atvs & development cause excessive damage. Response to Question 4: Alternative A protects the Jacks Fork very well, as well as the upper current. Those are the most important areas. Response to Question 5: Quiet canoe floats - not rafts of canoes with drinkers & partiers. Ranger led nature walk, could teach people an appreciation of flora & fauna.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2667	Response to Question 1: Alternative A or B Response to Question 2: Wilderness area at Big Springs, natural zones, areas you can float without motorboats tipping you over. I'd love to have a guided float with camping on a gravel bar. Response to Question 3: more motor boats, more ATVs Response to Question 4: Big Springs, Round Springs. I've stopped by just to look at Big Springs or eat. I've camped with Scouts at Round Springs. I think A & B are fine. Response to Question 5: I love the SPA era construction and hope it will be maintained.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2668	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. Discontinue horseback riding. Allow individuals to have overnight float trips & camp on gravel bars. Don't have this activity exclusively guided, but have people register their plans for overnight float trips Response to Question 2: Close illegally developed roads, allow only lower horsepower boats, guide services to help people explore a cave, new trails for bike riding - not all challenging - easier riding, primitive camping for backpackers. I wish there were ways to control crowds Response to Question 3: No horseback riding, no ATVs to destroy waterways, only low horsepower motors. Allow only 10 hp motors if there must be motors but preferably no motors Response to Question 4: Make Big Spring a wilderness area - preserve it	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2669	Response to Question 1: Alternative A with additional restrictions for horseback riding. I would limit the use of horses to small groups - no more than 8 - and reservations would be required so there would be no more than 4 or 5 small groups at one time. Response to Question 2: Non-motorized area needs to be strongly enforced. There are enough areas in the state for motorized recreation. "Family" activities with small children around are not safe with motorized activity. Response to Question 3: None. All parts of Alternative A should be included plus horseback riding restrictions Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are "special" and require "special" protections. Response to Question 5: This area needs even more protection than it had in 1984. Rules need to be tightened - enforcement needs to be increased. If our National Parks aren't protected - where can we go for outdoor enjoyment?	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2670	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is the best except it allows way too many horses with urine and feces contaminating the waterways, making the water unsafe for body contact. Response to Question 4: My favorite thing is canoeing, and for this, I value quiet, clean water, protection of wildlife, and preservation of the natural state of the rivers and surroundings. Response to Question 5: So many access points just becomes development. Access points should be more limited, as the original plan stipulated, to protect the river.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2671	Response to Question 1: A for Current also A for Jack's Fork Response to Question 2: Lowing HP getting motor off all together Response to Question 3: Rasing HP Response to Question 5: Manage like the Boundy Water Canoe Area	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2672	Response to Question 1: I like A - reduce boats w/motors or get rid of them get rid of the horses and B - provide educational materials for the public Response to Question 2: education use - too many, no motor boats should be allowed horse use - get rid of it Big Spring as wilderness is good NO DRUNKS ON THE RIVER! Response to Question 3: Do not include increased use. Do not include more use by motor boats. Response to Question 4: - Big Spring as wilderness is good - Jack's Fork horse use need to stop - that area is the best in the park. Response to Question 5: - require use permits to limit numbers - provide guides or guided tours - increase interpretive materials - don't let MDC put trout in the river within the park - really need data on water temperature!	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2673	Response to Question 1: Alt. A Response to Question 2: making the Jacks Fork a non motorized river. Response to Question 3: I see no reasaon to increase allowed horsepower on any protected river. There are plenty of unprotected rivers for large engine boats. Response to Question 5: purchase the lands along the entire length of the rivers, for better mgmt/control of non point source pollution.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2674	Response to Question 1: No action and "B" both are ok for me, however B would be preferable Response to Question 3: I don't like ATV access and think horses should stay out of the wate. Response to Question 4: The "gaps" allow access I think is too open. Response to Question 5: I like the accesses now available for stores and parks for camping. I think maped emergency phones would be a pluse	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2675	Response to Question 1: A is Best by far, But I am oppossed to Motorized above Van Buren Gap. Response to Question 2: No ATV trails, No horses in River No New trails or campgrounds Keep it primitive wildernes as much as possible Response to Question 3: No 40 horse motors on Rivers! Only 9.9 horse for park service and MCC staff only The 40 horse swamp my canoe and erode Banks, Noise Pollution Response to Question 4: Jam up Cave Response to Question 5: Promote wilderness managment and Leave No trace	6/24/2009	No			MO	65255
2676	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Get out of Park! Response to Question 3: Get out of the Park! Response to Question 4: Let us take care of it we have done it for years! Response to Question 5: Get out!	6/24/2009	No			MO	63638

2677	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 2: Wo;dermess designation in Big Springs Response to Question 3: No limits on HP - unacceptable Response to Question 4: Big Springs - yes, if designated wilderness	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2678	Response to Question 1: ALL OF YOUR PLANS ARE TO RESTRICTIVE TO HORSEBACK RIDING. perhaps you could limt # of horses per group - or charge outfitters a fee that would be shared by their riders.- Response to Question 2: Limit # of canoes Response to Question 3: Horseback riding your summaray newsletter was helpful but didn't (in chart form) provide - plan A,B,C - differences and limitation Response to Question 4: Therefore no action Response to Question 5: Thanks for having this meeting	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2679	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Mother Nature Did a Hell of a Good Job. You Can't Improve On it. Response to Question 2: Preserve the Best Part of Missouri As It Is For Our future Generations Less ATVs and Power Boats is A Must. Response to Question 3: DO NOT ALLOW ANY ACTIVITIES WHICH CAUSE DAMAGE TO THE ENVIRONMENT OR DISRUPT THE NATURAL BEAUTY, PEACE & QUIET OF MISSOURI'S GEMSTONE Response to Question 4: ALL 134 MILES NEED TO BE LEFT ALONE LEAVE IT ALL ALONE. *(YOUR INFORMATION ON ALTERNATIVES IS BUREAUCRATIC & CONFUSING) Response to Question 5: Reduce outboard Boat Motors to 40 Horse. 20 HP At the pump Has Gotten me up & Down the River for 50 years.	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2680	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION. the only way to make it better is to take away previous restrictions on the river. Response to Question 2: None, the river is a beautiful place we've been able to enjoy and it is not being polluted or ruined in any way by human interaction. God created this land for us to live on and take care of, which we are doing. Response to Question 3: limitations on horsepower and creating more zones should NOT be included in ANY future plans. Zoning would create more problems and solve nothing. Eliminate current zones! Response to Question 4: The alternatives are not helping anything. Many local towns would be ruined in your attempt to preserve. Their livelihood relies on tourism the river brings and regaurdless of the people, it's still beautiful Response to Question 5: Park Service Leave!	6/24/2009	No			MO	65201
2681	Response to Question 1: I am not informed enough to comment on the proposed alternatives. I value the effort of NPS to gather public comment and review. Thanks. Response to Question 5: I think the NPS should participate in conservation planning and implementation outside NPS boundaries. The Current River faces a lot of challenges and not all needs can be met or decided on NPS land alone.	6/24/2009	No			MO	Unknown
2682	Response to Question 1: No action No more zones, no limitations on horsepower I want to see rationale more than someone complained about noise Response to Question 2: No action, the alternative that by law should be explained more fully in your biased materials. Response to Question 3: Alternative A Alternative B Alternative C Management Zones Response to Question 4: - these alternative have not addressed the issue that camping outfitters, boat manufactors & other individuals have developed a livelihood around the activities you are trying to restrict Response to Question 5: Your information provided at these meetings is ridiculously biased towards one side of the issue (change). You need to provide unbiased fact to the people, not opinion	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2683	Response to Question 1: I like Alt B the best. I come to the park for camping & canoeing & nature observation. I have not floated past 2 Rivers and so have not encountered motorized traffic to speak of. I prefer to not have motors in the upper reaches of either the JF or CR. Motorized traffic definitely should be allowed, but prefer low hp above 2 Rivers or at least above Eminence on both Rivers. Response to Question 2: No opinion Response to Question 3: I think a use study might be insightful - because it seems part of the problem is just too many people (& horses) at one time at one place.	6/24/2009	No			MO	Unknown
2684	Response to Question 1: A is closest. But more is required. Response to Question 2: 1. Most important is to remove motor boats 2. Remove horses. We like to float in peace and quiet and we like to swim (with grand kids) in clean water. Response to Question 4: All the Scenic Waterway System is PRECIOUS to me.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2685	Response to Question 1: Plan A Response to Question 2: We need to have permits for entry. Response to Question 3: No motors - either on water or land (Emergency vehicles exceptional) Response to Question 4: The springs in particular! Response to Question 5: Permits!	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2686	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Leave Response to Question 3: things Response to Question 4: as is Response to Question 5: on Jack Fork & Current	6/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2687	Response to Question 1: C. more Trails - For mechanized for over the Hill People not just Hiking Trails for the young. I am 63 yrs - 5 by-pass on Hart. We Trail ride Ford Broncos, we dont leave Dung like Horses. I think Horse Trails and mechanized Trails can use the Same Trail to see the Ozarks. Response to Question 2: Developed Zone Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: From Club House Landing to the South would be good Trails for all - mechanized - Horses, If you Have many Hikers So. of Van Buren, Fix the Walk Bridges Response to Question 5: I want all mechanized Equipment show Proof of Insurance for Trail Riding, also Have a Fire-Exstenuse for Fires, Trash Bags, NO oil Leaks, Like the Horses Have - Piles of Dung near Streams.	8/3/2009	No		Stream Team 2515 and Mo. State Highway Patrol	MO	63012
2688	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: reducing 40 hp motor at the pump.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63026

2689	Response to Question 1: Yes - Alternative A Response to Question 2: Limit Horsback riding. Eliminate or Restrict ATVs & Jet Boats Response to Question 5: Educate the Public that ATVs and similar recreational activities cause irreparable harm to these beautiful areas	6/26/2009	No			MO	63141
2690	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is by far the only option I want. I want NO motorized vehicles allowed, especially boats. No horses allowed in & next to rivers, NO ATV's. Response to Question 2: limiting of motorboating and ATV's and horses in the rivers	6/26/2009	No			MO	63130
2691	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is closet Response to Question 2: Wilderness. Lots of primitive and natural areas. Response to Question 3: High speed motorboats and ATVs should be banned.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63112
2692	Dear Sir, I have camped along the Current River and canoed and camped on the Jacks Fork. I greatly appreciate these resources, but am very concerned that their value is being degraded by overuse, particularly by motorized boats and vehicles. I am also concerned about the effect of increasing numbers of livestock and horses in the area and their potential to degrade water quality. The very concepts of scenic and natural are being diminished by what have become current usage practices. This is not what was intended when the national riverways were established for all, not just for the benefit of local populations. I strongly support a return to a more wilderness-like management practice as described in Alternative A. There are fewer and fewer places where the natural world is left to maintain its integrity and for the enjoyment of those who prefer to minimize their impact so future generations can appreciate a natural ecosystem. Thank you for your attention, Copies to Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, and Governor Jay Nixon	9/14/2009	No			MO	65202
2693	Dear Mr. Detring, My name is My wife ..., sons ... and ... and daughter ..., as well as my parents, .. and ... and too many others to name herein have spent a considerable amount of time in Missouri Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We have enjoyed horseback riding, canoeing and camping along this beautiful riverway. I have personally seen the damage done by horses, 4-wheelers and jet boats. Some outfit these vehicles to actually drive underwater with extended tailpipes that go six or seven feet into the air, destroying the river bottom. Historic action needs to be taken to save this national treasure. This kind of protection is not new. Anyone who has visited a coastal area has witnessed the way dunes have been protected by boardwalks, etc. so that the human impact of incursions from land to water are not overly burdensome. I think that the park service has done a decent, although not perfect job of enforcing the laws which exist. There is no question that this change would be difficult but is absolutely necessary given the devastating impact overuse has had on these treasures. Please take action now. cc Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon Congressman Russ Carnahan	9/14/2009	No		Wolfgram & Associates, P.C.	MO	63108
2694	Response to Question 1: A - Experiencing the rivers with our children, and now our grandchildren, we cannot praise Missouri enough for conserving the beauty of our streams. However, more & more people live at a faster pace, disturbing the swimmers & canoeists with higher speeds through shallow areas. If this cannot be controlled I vote for no motor traffic. Response to Question 2: The plan as it is, is fine. Regulations in place such as for horses need to be looked at closer, as hundred of horses at one time can cause a great disturbance in several different ways. Response to Question 3: Developing more business alone the riverways. We have seen many buses of "floaters" come into the Huzzab access just last week with already drunk people getting onto rafts into canoes. The number of canoes per business should have a limit. Response to Question 4: We love both the Jack's Fork & the Current River. We do cave clean-ups with grotto (Meramec Valley Grotto) members during the year as tourists tend to trash them. I don't want to see caves on the list of things to do along the river - but I don't want to see them all gated, either. Response to Question 5: You all are doing a great job. As the population grows, we just need a limit on how many folks can be using the national riverways at any one time. Permits might work - every other recreation has a cost it seems.	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2695	Response to Question 1: Alternative A best choice Response to Question 2: Closeing & limiting # of access points Closeing unauthorized Roads. limiting HP on motor boats - most of the River limited to NO HP crafts only. Controlling & elimnating ATVs. Response to Question 3: No more developed sites - take better care of those already in use. Dont permit unlimited # of users Response to Question 4: Big Springs Wilderness areas - protected in alternatives A & B overall also need to address # of horseback riders Response to Question 5: Need to limit # of out fitters & # they can permit on busy weekends. We have to face up to limits	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2696	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: --Any limitation on boat motor horsepower -- Any limitations on river access Response to Question 4: --Between powder mill and paint rock. --The area is perfect, No-Action Response to Question 5: --More educational opportunities for younge people.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63080
2697	Response to Question 1: Alternative A completely, but with addition of helping discover the "hidden" things as noted in B Response to Question 2: Low noise, non-mechanized recreation, wilderness designation for Big Spring, living history demonstrations as noted in A Response to Question 3: No action alternative current use makes it chaotic & loud, not a natural environment & not a connection to the area's history & heritage as it stands now Response to Question 4: The Big Springs & Alley Mill should be kept in natural & historic conditions with broadened living history demonstrations and ability to provide some hands-on activity in traditional crafts & folkways Response to Question 5: Protect & celebrate the natural & historic characteristics of the park. make it a get away from noise, air, & litter pollution.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63135
2698	Response to Question 1: No Action plan more enforcement of littering Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: H.P. limit No Camping on gravel bars - Bad idea! Response to Question 4: Below Gooseneck. This plan will cause more pressure on other parts of the River. This over crowding will cause more accidents and problems. Response to Question 5: More enforcement of littering	6/22/2009	No			MO	63939

2699	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No concerns Response to Question 5: Make the whole river have no limit on horsepower	6/22/2009	No			MO	63638
2700	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action. i do not want to see more restriction on horsepower for motor boats. Response to Question 3: closing of roads and or campgrounds. Response to Question 4: All of it. No action addresses it qdequately Response to Question 5: No action. I want my children and their children to be able to use riverways as it was intended for TO RECREATE!	6/22/2009	No			MO	65588
2701	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Restriction on Boats Response to Question 3: Closing Roads, camping, new Horsepower Restrictions Response to Question 4: All of the River Response to Question 5: "no" new Regulations	6/22/2009	No			MO	65588
2702	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Don't Change anything Response to Question 3: A-B-C-	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2703	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: None	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2704	Response to Question 1: No Action Neccessary!!	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810
2705	Response to Question 1: No Action Needed!!	7/31/2009	No			MO	65810
2706	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: We like it as it is Response to Question 5: No	7/31/2009	No			MO	64037
2707	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: None	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2708	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No Action is the Best Alternative	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2709	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: NONE OF THEM Response to Question 3: ALL OF THEM SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED! Response to Question 4: THE HP LIMIT IS TERRIBLE. THE FOLKS FROM SHANNON CO. ARE TIRED OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY TELLING US WHAT TO DO! Response to Question 5: THE GRAVEL NEEDS TO BE REMOVED FROM AREAS TO HELP SWIMMING AREAS.	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2710	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: none, no action Response to Question 3: stay the way that it is, or no action Response to Question 4: no action Response to Question 5: no action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
2711	Response to Question 1: No action. Unlimited Horse Power Rate Horse Power at the jet pump. Response to Question 2: No action. Response to Question 3: Too many changes. Response to Question 4: All of them. Response to Question 5: More and better access to the rivers.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65438
2712	Response to Question 1: I choose the No-Action alternative because I don't feel like there is that much of a conflict between the boaters and people in the canoe Response to Question 3: All of them besides the No-Action Response to Question 5: If there are any problems they will work out themselves	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
2713	Response to Question 1: the best alternative of the 4 is the No-Action. Response to Question 2: The best alternative is the No-Action policy. I strongly feel that things are fine the way they are. Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways water is very important to me, but how it is now is the way I like it. Response to Question 5: No; leave things the way they are!	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
2714	Response to Question 1: No Action!! Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Round Spring Powder Mill 2 Rivers Response to Question 5: Leave Road accesses open. Make more boat Ramps.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466

2715	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: two river, roud spring Response to Question 5: Leave road accesses open and make more landes.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
2716	Response to Question 1: Yes no action is close to what I think should be done with the exception of more camp areas and better boat landings less commercial rentals on the waterway clean the waterway of debris such as trees, logs ect. Response to Question 2: free and public use of the waterways by local boaters, and familys Response to Question 3: limited access, seasonal access, or primitive access	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2717	Response to Question 1: 3 strikes Mandatory confiscation of ATVS, horses and motor boats - if violating off road, horse power limits, and horses found at illegal river crossings. Response to Question 2: Preserve and protect the wild nature of the ONSR. Response to Question 3: Alt. A!!!	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2718	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I wouldnt do a thing to it. Response to Question 2: No-Action - possibly parts of C Response to Question 3: A, B & Most of C Response to Question 4: The Current River from Round Springs down. No Action would be best. Response to Question 5: Canoe Rentals need to educate patrons about the Motor boats.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65560
2719	Response to Question 1: No Further Action Response to Question 5: Rangers on the rivers not in brush with Field Glasses	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
2720	The Current diver holds many desr memories for me and I am distressed by the recent report If the Sierra Club that it is in serious need of attention. In the 1940s or 50s I made my first trip down the beautiful Current with a friend and our young son. At the end we had to walk and hitch-hike the 20 Or 30 miles on t the roads leading back to our car at the starting place. Later with family and friends and with groups of church young people we made the journey, once with my wife surprising us with strawberry shortcake for dessert in our closing meal. As the years progressed we were aware of the incasing traffic and disregard of good camping standards. I would of course ask if ways can,t be found to eliminate motor & horse traffic, reduce entray spots and restore the river to controlled canoe use. It sounds like the time has come to limit trsffkc by requiring permits, gained ahead of time for dated trips, as has been required in the Adirondacks in New York State. It might be possible then for dangers to assess and hold responsible those who abuse the river. A charge could also be made to help support the workers. With deep appreciation for your great responsibility. Sincerely cc: Governor Jay Nixon	9/8/2009	No			MO	64050-2584
2721	Dear Mr. Detring: We have enjoyed the peace and serenity of canoeing on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. These have been the cleanest and clearest jewels of all of Missouri's streams. They are still relatively "wild". Other Missouri float streams have been polluted by cattle and oil from ATVs. Please stop illegal wildcat motor accesses and use of vehicles off legal roads. Also, please limit the use of motorized boats and jet skis. To help keep horse manure out of the riverways please limit the numbers and locations of commercial trail rides. Please ask Congress to preserve the back country hills near Big Spring for the Wilderness System. This will save some of the finest stands of old growth pine and oak in the state. Sincerely, CC: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/14/2009	No			MO	63132
2722	Response to Question 1: The no action plan should be chosen. Response to Question 2: Jet boats should stay like they are. Roads should be opened not closed. Response to Question 3: No Jet boat restrictions! No Road Closings! Response to Question 4: From round spring to Van Burean. Response to Question 5: If rangers and water patrol were around more, complaints would be fewer.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
2723	I am writing with many concerns about the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways- especially the Jack's Fork. I have lived in Missouri for 59 years and would like to see these areas restricted to activities that are not harmful to our beautiful rivers and forests. I think commercial trail rides are out of hand and need to be limited - the amount of pollution to our streams from the horses is causing much damage. Motorized boats and their noise takes away from the experience, plus the amount of pollution it causes to the waters. Offroad vehicles are destroying the land ,banks and stream. - These vehicles should be given a designated area and restricted from traveling all over the area in the forest. They are loud and and need to be brought under control... The wilderness Big Spring area needs protection if it is to survive. Protection of this area needs to be proposed to Congress. We need to preserve these areas for future generations. Please work to save the Jacks Fork of Missouri.	9/8/2009	No			MO	64804
2724	Mr. Detring, This letter is regarding the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers. I grew up in eastern Missouri in the 40s and 50s. My family spent many great weekends fishing and canoeing on these beautiful rivers. My brothers and I were taught from an early age to respect our natural surroundings, to leave a place at least as good as we found it. I was so delighted to hear in 1964 that they were federally protected as the Ozark Scenic Waterways. As a lifelong conservationist and a long time Sierra Club Member, I want to ask you to please take actions to protect the Current and Jacks Fork. My last few trips to those rivers were very disconcerting. The damage by off road vehicles, over development and illegal roads was alarming. We found a few areas of the current that were cloudy rather than crystal clear that I cam to expect. These was an excess of motorized boats and jet skis on the river. I've seen first hand some of the damage they've done! I was also alarmed to find that some of the erosion and pollution is the result of and excessive number of commercial trail rides. All of the excesses must be stopped. These rivers and all of our treasured parks and wilderness areas are not ours to exploit for short term gain. We must be good stewards, so that these natural wonders are preserved for future generations. That is the intent of our stat and national parks, wilderness areas and scenic rivers and waterways. Please use your authority to enforce existing protections for the Current/Jacks Fork Rivers and to push for any additional legislation needed to provide necessary protections. Thank you.	9/8/2009	No			MO	64465

2725	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: all	7/31/2009	No			MO	65084
2726	Mr. Detring, This letter is regarding the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers. I grew up in eastern Missouri in the 40s and 50s. My family spent many great weekends fishing and canoeing on these beautiful rivers. My brothers and I were taught from an early age to respect our natural surroundings, to leave a place at least as good as we found it. I was so delighted to hear in 1964 that they were federally protected as the Ozark Scenic Waterways. As a lifelong conservationist and a long time Sierra Club Member, I want to ask you to please take actions to protect the Current and Jacks Fork. My last few trips to those rivers were very disconcerting. The damage by off road vehicles, over development and illegal roads was alarming. We found a few areas of the current that were cloudy rather than crystal clear that I cam to expect. These was an excess of motorized boats and jet skis on the river. I've seen first hand some of the damage they've done! I was also alarmed to find that some of the erosion and pollution is the result of and excessive number of commercial trail rides. All of the excesses must be stopped. These rivers and all of our treasured parks and wilderness areas are not ours to exploit for short term gain. We must be good stewards, so that these natural wonders are preserved for future generations. That is the intent of our stat and national parks, wilderness areas and scenic rivers and waterways. Please use your authority to enforce existing protections for the Current/Jacks Fork Rivers and to push for any additional legislation needed to provide necessary protections. Thank you.	9/8/2009	No			MO	65807
2727	Dear Mr. Detring, Overuse and abuse of our park has always been a problem to control. I don't need to remind you of the long term effects and permanent loss of the park especially from erosion. Few people want a river where the oil slick is gone by Tuesday each week. I suggest a "Lemans style" race organized by the Park Service twice a year during the shoulder season for power boats to race on Current River. Power boats can go to a lake otherwise. Our Riverways Park has joined the growing number of Parks where the demand for use can not physically be met by the natural resource. Mismanagement, powerful political influences and chronic overutilization of the park will need to be countered by you and your team with the help of our elected representatives listed below. Your difficult juggling act needs the assistance of state and federal officials to again protect the Rivenways resource for our children. Governor Nixon Senator Bond Senator McCaskill Representative Emerson Senator Engler and very important for obvious reasons Rep. J. C. Kuessner	9/8/2009	No			MO	63650
2728	Dear Sir, I am writing to urge you to preserve the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a wilderness area. The motor boats,ATV's and horses are ruining this beautiful , scenic area. Anyone who has visited the area will agree. The noise, trail damage and pollution must be eliminated for the sake of this natural treasure. Sincerely, cc.Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	7/26/2009	No			MO	63366
2729	Dear Mr. Detring: I would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Illegal access to rivers by motored vehicles should be eliminated along with off-road use by these motorized vehicles. As you probably know, pollution and erosion increase with the use of these vehicles in the streams and along the streams. Horse trail rides must be monitored for the same conditions of erosion and degradation of the land around these streams. Overuse by big hoofs doesn't help the riverbeds. It is not necessary to have jet boats and that type of noisy, stinky vehicle on a scenic river there are other rivers for use of those types of boats. The time is past now for allowances such as these. Leave nature as it is with quiet canoes and other types of boats like these pollution and noise levels must be contained. Big Spring pine forest and oak needs to be noted and preserved we need to save our wilderness areas before it is too late to do so. That means actions now. And an increase in size of preservation area wouldn't hurt either. The Ozark Riverways are a great tourist attraction bringing more money into the state. We are very lucky to have the water features we do in Missouri let's keep the Riverways pristine and usable for decades to come by protecting them now and doing this vigilantly while they are still savable. cc to: Governor Jay Nixon Senator Claire McCaskill Senator Kit Bond	8/4/2009	No			MO	63043
2730	Dear Superintendent Detring: I am writing regarding the future Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am certainly no expert on resource management. However, I see a number of issues which any plan must address, as follows: 1. Off-road vehicle use and illegal access to the riverway must be eliminated. 2. The pollution that comes from large numbers of horses involved in commercial trail rides must be controlled, and reduced significantly if not eliminated. 3. The remand Big Spring wilderness area must be legally identified as part of the national Wilderness System, thereby protecting it from incursions due to recreation and development. I would urge that the Park Service only adopt a plan that addresses these issues, so that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be preserved for future generations. Sincerely, cc. Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/10/2009	No			MO	63130
2731	Response to Question 1: I would support Alternative A as the best management plan for the O.N.S.R. I would like to see more wilderness areas included, and more roads closed. Response to Question 2: Inceased wilderness areas and road closures should be included in any management plan devolped for the O.N.S.R. Response to Question 3: Any alternative plans which allow inceased motorized activities in the O.N.S.R. or allow more canoe permits to be issued should not be included in future management plans Response to Question 4: The upper headwaters of the Current and Jack Forks River are special to me. I do not believe any of the alternatives provide sound management pactices to insure thier protection. Response to Question 5: More educational programs on the natural resources of the O.N.S.R., and support of programs that incourage citizen involment in resource conservation such as Missouri Stream Teams. should be important strategies which should be included in any management plan.	7/17/2009	No			MO	63043
2732	Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing to ask that you make the protection of the Current River an absolute priority. The Missouri Riverways are vital to our state. Missouri is a beautiful, natural state, but so much of that nature is being destroyed. I believe ATVs and other off-road and wildcat vehicles must be prohibited from accessing the river. Other commercial trail rides should be much more limited and more tightly regulated. You can see their tracks on sandbars and along the banks, going into the river. The destruction of natural habitats must not be allowed and should be	9/14/2009	No			MO	63109

	prosecuted seriously. On our float trip last year, we were very pleased at how respectful and safe most of the other people on the river were. However, there were several groups who came zipping up river on motor boats. These are loud and very dangerous, but the burning oil and other pollutants they produce are also so bad for the river. I ask that you also continue to work to preserve the wildland near Big Spring. We would all be worse off if this old growth forest were lost. Thank you so much for your time and all you do to keep Missouri beautiful. Sincerely, Cc: Senator Christopher "Kit" Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jeremiah "Jay" Nixon						
2733	Response to Question 1: Stanley Wassell Take No Action Response to Question 2: Response to Question 3: Response to Question 4: Response to Question 5:	6/27/2009	No			MO	63901
2734	RE: Comment regarding General Management Plan Dear Superintendent Detring, I have been visiting the Current and Eleven Point rivers since 1971. In the last couple decades I have observed increased destruction and degradation of areas adjacent to the rivers and with increasing frequency I have encountered persons who were engaged in thoughtless and even aggressive destruction. I realize there is an increasing burden due to a growing population and demand for access to public lands to pursue outdoor activities. However, there are many alternative areas for trail rides, motor boats and four wheelers. There are very few special areas like the national scenic rivers which should rightly exclude or tightly control those activities and others which tend to damage and degrade the scenic river environment. The management plan should include measures to halt destructive uses, and reverse the damage that has been done. cc: Senator Claire McCaskill Senator Kit Bond Congressman Emanuel Cleaver II Governor Jay Nixon	9/8/2009	No			MO	64113
2735	Dear Sirs: I am writing in regard to the changes proposed by the National Park Service to the General Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Changes that are being considered could have a devastating effect on our area. While I understand your concerns about the management of our riverways, I firmly believe that the local people who have been good stewards of our rivers for generations deserve a bigger say in the management of this resource. I have received considerable public input on this subject and the vast majority of that input says, "Leave it alone." Local citizens are well aware of the valuable resource they so fortunate to have near them. Present residents as well as those before them have had a vested interest in taking care of their waterways. I don't feel it is fair to give the voices of those who visit from time to time the same weight as those who live here and use the waterways on a regular basis. I urge you to leave your management policy as is. Sincerely, c: Senator Christopher Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson	9/28/2009	No		Missori Senator	MO	65101
2736	COMMENTS ON ONSR MANAGEMENT PLAN Dear Mr. Detring, Throughout my life I enjoyed immersing myself in the cold springs, clear streams, caves and thick forests of the Current River watershed and want the value of those intact ecosystems available to future generations. Legislation establishing the National Park system mandates that the primary objective of park management is to preserve resources and ecosystems. Overuse and illegal activities have degraded the scenic value and functional natural systems. To restore the resource quality I suggest that the following issues be addressed in the park management plan. -Reduce drastically to a few dozen, the number of vehicle access points to the rivers and gravel bars -Limit vehicle traffic to the legal roads. Absolutely no vehicles in the river. -Reduce and control the number of horses and trail rides in the park and move horse trails to the ridges away from streams where horses cause pollution and erosion and interfere with others' recreation -Limit motorized boat horsepower and prohibit motor boat access on upper stretches of rivers above Two Rivers. There are few places in MO where one can experience solitude, canoeing and fishing without the roar or putt of motorboats. We need some long stretches of this natural experience. -The limited capacity of the ecosystem to support recreation may require restrictions on the number of hikers, equestrians, boaters. NPS should provide for the possibility of restrictions in the plan -The Park Service should submit the Big Spring wild area for official Wilderness Area status -Above all the ONSR needs to focus it scarce personnel and financial resources on restoration of the ecosystem and enforcement of restrictions and regulations that will renew the natural features. The law provides for recreation secondarily, only if compatible with preservation of the nature resources. Personnel need to be courageous and fierce in their defense of the "resource first" value. It's the law! Cc: Senators McCaskill and Bond, Rep. Clay, Gov. Nixon	9/10/2009	No			MO	63130
2737	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: That no action be taken to change what has been in place. Traditions that have been passed down through families for generations should be protected including camping, boating, fishing, etc. Response to Question 3: All of your changes would take away from the local people who pay taxes here so no changes should be included that effect the traditions of those who have been on the river for generations. Response to Question 4: Camping on gravel bar above Sinkin Creek has been a tradition for local people long before Park Service was involved. Response to Question 5: Park service should be a visible presence on the river to help control visitors', mostly non-local, behavior rather than hiding in the bushes to catch rule breakers	8/5/2009	No			MO	63629
2738	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 2: minimal development. Creation of the wilderness area. Response to Question 4: I am most often along the upper reaches of the Current. I would like to see it remain as pristine as possible. ATV use is a problem - noise and damage to back roads. Overuse by horses causes damage to trails. Response to Question 5: Until several years ago, there was a ranger living in a trailer near Cedar Grove. His presence probably improved enforcement of park regulations in the area.	8/6/2009	No			MO	63117
2739	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Just keep the debris cleaned out & the gravel cleaned out of the swimming holes. Allow people to just enjoy nature.	8/7/2009	No			MO	65438

2740	Dear Superintendent Reed: Please accept these comments on the Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and add them to the tally with those who support preserving the natural quality of this magnificent place. I urge you to eliminate illegal wildcat motor accesses and off-road vehicle use. Significant controls ought to be placed on commercial trail rides. The old-growth stands of pine and oak in Big Springs deserve to be included in the National Wilderness Preservation System. Controls on jet boats and commercial trail rides need to be vigorously enhanced and enforced. Please do not allow the Riverways to be diminished as a national outdoor treasure. Include in the Plan more ways to protect caves, save areas for migrating and breeding birds, preserve and improve water quality, and keep more of the landscape free of the annoyances and destruction that go along with ATVs. I have seen mobile campers where they should not be--along the riverbank near unauthorized ramps. This detracts from the peace the Riverways afford to canoeists and other self-propelled visitors. Finally, after all the years of valiant effort to preserve this place, it is time to recognize that we are all "loving it to death." We have to limit the number of recreationists. Thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of preserving the pristine quality of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. cc: Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, and Governor Jay Nixon	9/10/2009	No			IL	62208
2741	Dear Superintendent Detring: On behalf of myself and tens of thousands of others who enjoy Current River and it's Jacks Fork tributary [am writing to express my support of a new General Management Plan to again save the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and surrounding area. Because of the increase in the assaults on the riverways in the form of overdevelopment, wildcat illegal roads, and use of off-road vehicle trespass, as well as uncontrolled commercial trail ride exploitation and unnecessarily large powerboats as well as general overcrowding and abuse we have seen eroded banks, uprooted vegetation and depletion of wildlife while polluting the waters and shattering the peace and quiet of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. We would hope that restrictions would be made upon all of these unnecessary abuses of our pristine area and that the new management plan will eliminate the illegal motor accesses; eliminate vehicle use off illegal roads; control commercial trail rides; restrict or strictly control motorized boat usage and maintain the originality of the wild land and the back country hills near Big Spring. The support of Missourians and all American citizens is certainly needed to reflect upon the natural beauty and continued heritage that we have protected and should continue to protect in Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let this letter serve as the undersigned's support of your continued efforts to maintain this national treasure. Very truly yours, cc: Senator Kit Bond Congresswoman Joanne Emerson Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/8/2009	No		Burns, TAYLOR, HECKEMEYER & GREEN, LLC	MO	63801
2742	Dear Mr. Detring: As a member of the Sierra Club's Missouri Chapter, it has come to my attention that the Park Service is developing a general management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and is accepting public comments on the development the plan. I am writing to express my strong support for the management principles previously expressed by the Sierra Club and other concerned groups, including the National Audubon Society, the Ozark Society, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, the Missouri Parks Association, the Friends of the Ozark Riverways, and the Missouri Wilderness Coalition. An effective management plan for the ONSR must include all reasonable and necessary measures to preserve and protect this unspoiled national resource for current and future generations. Specifically, I urge you to include the following elements -Elimination of illegal wildcat motor accesses; -Elimination of vehicle use off of legal roads; -Control of numbers and locations of commercial trail rides; -Imposition of strict controls governing motorized boats, particularly jet boats; and, -Recommendation by the Park Service that the Big Spring area be officially included in the Wilderness System. Thank you for your careful consideration in this important matter affecting the beauty, biodiversity, and long-term survival of the ONSR. Sincerely, cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill U.S. Representative Emanuel Cleaver Governor Jay Nixon	9/10/2009	No		Sierra Club	UN	n/a
2743	Response to Question 1: No Aciton. I Don't trust your paragraphs A, B or C. The early Ozarks Farms, jon boats, & tourist service - you've already altered & run off. Response to Question 2: Horseback riding. We do not need "parkie" supervision. Response to Question 3: Making "illegal" trails. Angeline is an example of you "best" trails. No thank you. Response to Question 4: I have travel only a small portion of the riverway. The portions I have visited look fine even after heavy human capacity & use. Response to Question 5: We are the Ozarks. We are not Colorado or any other computer based government headquarters. Do not homogenize.	8/7/2009	No			MO	65466
2744	Dear Superintendent Detring: It has been some years since my family and I visited the ONSR area, but those visits made a deep impression on us, and we are anxious to see the area well preserved for the benefit of future visitors. To start with, we urge control of off-road vehicle use, and the photos I have seen of the growth of illegal boat access ramps are quite appalling. This is a place for canoeing and the refreshment of the spirit, not for the roar of engines, from ATVs on the banks and jet boats in the rivers. There are plenty of places in Missouri for ATVs and jet boats, so surely the Current and jacks Fork can be reserved for other, valuable uses. Finally, I urge the inclusion of the Big Spring remnant wilderness into the federal Wilderness System, to insure the survival of this original wild old growth area. I sincerely hope that the future Management Plan will embody a clear commitment to correcting the problems and insuring the maintenance of the ONSR area as the treasure it really is. Yours truly, cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/10/2009	No			MO	65203
2745	Superintendent Detring, I am writing to urge you to protect the Missouri river ways from all forms of motor access. It is essential to ban vehicle use off of the legal roads and to keep motorized boats, especially jet boats, off the rivers to preserve the peace and natural surroundings, We have a real gem in the Big Spring wilderness and I would like to see it as part of the Wilderness System, protected by the parks service. We have a great state, with a rich wilderness, but if we allow motorized access we will lose the peace and ruin the special habitat. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely,	9/10/2009	No			MO	63130
2746	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Do not restric usage and access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Keep fallen trees cut out of the way. Allow gravel to be taken out of deep holes. Do not try to charge people to enjoy the rivers.	8/7/2009	No			MO	65438

2747	Dear Mr. Detring, I strongly encourage you to do as much as possible to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please consider: - Eliminating illegal wildcat motor accesses -Eliminating vehicle use off of legal roads -Controlling commercial trail rides -Controlling use of motorized boats and especially jet boats -Protecting the wildland near Big Spring as part of the national Wilderness System. It is imperative that we become better stewards of the Ozark Riverways for ourselves and our children. Thank you, cc Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/6/2009	No			MO	63501
2748	Response to Question 1: No Action is the best option. Response to Question 2: No more rules. Inforce current rules. Response to Question 3: No Horsepower changes. Response to Question 4: Log Yard - No-Action needed. Keep horsepower the same. Response to Question 5: Inforce current rules. Then no action will be necessary.	8/7/2009	No			GA	30080
2749	Dear Mr. Detring- I regularly float and kayak the Jack's Fork and Current River's and have been doing so for over 35 years. I am writing in regard to the Management Plan for the rivers. I have been very concerned about the degradation that has taken place since I started floating. The rivers are being overused, and the result is that they are being, in my opinion, damaged. Even though I am an ardent user of the rivers, I would like to see a plan in place to limit their use. I would rather face restrictions in my personal use of them than I would see them damaged as they currently are. Here are my more detailed opinions on the matter: 1. Large "party" groups should be restricted from using the river. They are often drunk, loud and destructive. They ruin both the ecosystem of the river and the peace and quiet of nature. 2. Horse riding should be eliminated. There are many,many other places in Missouri for horse riding. They don't need to ride in the ONSR, where the horses are polluting the river, causing an e coli health risk, and destroying the delicate vegetation. 3. All motor vehicles should be banned. Both ATVs and boat motors destroy the peace and quiet of the river present and present a risk to wildlife and plants. 4. Though I am also an avid hiker, I believe trails should be moved elsewhere in Missouri. They are interfering with the primary use of the ONSR as a water-based resource by creating erosion and adding to overuse. Again, there are many, many other places for trails. 5. Access to the rivers should be significantly restricted. Too much access will destroy the character of the rivers. And illegal bulldozing of new roads should be severely punished by law. 6. The Big Springs area should be set aside a wilderness area, to protect it for all time. 7. Disruption of vegetation for bank openings should be prohibited. It interferes with the wildlife and plant ecology of the river. One of Missouri's greatest treasures is these two rivers. They are very unique. We need to protect them as recreational waterways, limit their overall use and move other forms of outdoor recreation to other areas, where they will not interfere with these two river gems that are exceedingly rare and precious. Sincerely, Cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/8/2009	No			MO	63105
2750	Dear Mr. Detring, I write to urge more careful management of the Scenic Riverways so that this unique and precious community is conserved for posterity and not further degraded by inappropriate uses. Currently the area is experiencing enormous pressures of sorts that it cannot endure and that no one initially anticipated. The degradation from ATV's, excessive horse traffic, and the use of powerful motorized boats are antithetical to the purpose for which the Riverways were established. These practices are analogous to riding horses or ATV's through the Louvre. The long term protection of the resource is your highest responsibility and the one the vast majority of citizens embrace. It is time to secure what little is left of the tranquility, biological wealth, and beauty that the Ozark rivers use to provide on a far grander scale. Anything less is a dereliction of duty. Sincerely,	9/10/2009	No			MO	63501
2751	Response to Question 1: No action is the best option. Response to Question 2: No more rules. Inforce current rules. Response to Question 3: No horsepower changes. Response to Question 4: log yard. No action needed. Keep horsepower the same. Response to Question 5: Inforce current rules. Then no action will be necessary.	8/7/2009	No			MO	63638
2752	Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing to support more conservative management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I'm one of the many who has enjoyed paddling down the Current River, but I would give up my paddling if necessary to protect the integrity of this beautiful river. But before I give up my paddling, I hope you will ban off-road vehicles, severely limit the use of motor boats, and even limit horseback riding in this area. Then if you need to restrict access to the area even further to protect the trees and wildlife, I'm willing to forego my paddling. I certainly understand why so many people want to enjoy the remaining wild areas in Missouri, but we need to make sure they don't destroy them. As you are finalizing the Management Plan, I hope you will take a long-range view of the value of this land and water, and make sure that it is sustained far into the future. Thank you. Cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Representative Ike Skelton	9/10/2009	No			MO	64761
2753	Response to Question 1: No action is the best option. Response to Question 2: No more rules. Inforce current rules. Response to Question 3: No horsepower changes. Response to Question 4: log yard. No action needed. Keep Horsepower the same. Response to Question 5: Inforce current rules. Then no action will be necessary.	8/7/2009	No			GA	60080
2754	Dear Reed: In response to your invitation to comment on the new General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I submit the enclosed DVD which I wrote and co-produced for the Missouri Parks Association. I also endorse the analysis submitted by the Friends of Ozark Riverways and authored by The Jack's Fork and Current Rivers are extraordinary streams, worthy of their status as the first federally designated Riverways in our nation. Under Park Service stewardship their beauty, integrity, and recreational quality for the people of Missouri and the nation have been degraded. This degradation must be reversed. It has become clear that ONSR has strayed so far from its organic legislation, P.L. 88-492, and from various other federal laws and regulations including the National Environmental Policy Act, and from the basic statutes and traditions of the Park Service itself, that we are faced with a straightforward resource emergency, a National Park in crisis. Only a serious and unwavering resolve to reform the agency's whole approach to this public asset can restore the nationally significant values and qualities which the Park Service was assigned by Congress in 1964 to protect. I and others have exerted ourselves in recent months to bring this sorry situation to the attention of the public. I can assure you that if the Park Service demonstrates the will and resolve to reform, and to reverse the degradation of the	8/3/2009	No		Tower Grove Park	MO	63110

	Riverways, we will exert ourselves even more strenuously to support the agency in those efforts. Sincerely, CC: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon Rep. Russ Carnahan						
2755	Dear Sir: I'm writing to urge you to protect the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Having just come from a wilderness hike, I'm especially concerned that we keep safe the Big Spring remnant wilderness; it's Missouri's only true wilderness area. In addition, the rivers must be keep free of motorboats and jet skis. They are soothing, iconic rivers, not raceways. Keep traffic on legal roads only; it's the best way to maintain the rivers. ATVs and horse use should also be carefully monitored. The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are beautiful, scenic, serene, and natural. Do all you can to keep them that way; do not allow them to be transformed into defacto Six Flag or Raging Rivers. Thank you for you help in this goal.	9/8/2009	No			MO	63119
2756	Dear Mr. Detring: We are writing to provide you with input from two individuals who have been floating the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers since we got to Kansas City in 1993 as you draw up a general managment plan. The rivers and the surrounding countryside have as the years have gone by shown signs of continuous degradation, as campers have set up close to the river in areas where they are prohibited, riverbanks have been destroyed by vehicles, horses foul the rivers and destroy the riverbanks, and motorboats proliferate. The experience of those of us who float the river in a canoe, trying to leave a minimal footprint while getting close to nature, has been significantly diminished. I am sure it has been diminished for those non-human animals for whom the National Scenic Riverways is or was their home and not just a recreational spot and for whom the Park Service has a responsibility. We would hope that you would ban some activites; i.e., ATV's, riverside caqmping, riverside horse trails, and probably limit the number of floaters on the rivers, since kingfishers and herrons need some time to fish. Please do what you can to preserve this important resource. Sincerely, cc: Senator Claire Mc Caskill Senator Kit Bond Governor Jay Nixon Representative Emanuel Cleaver	7/26/2009	No			UN	N/A
2757	Subject: Scenic Rivers Project 1. Alternative A is closest to my ideal. 2. We must keep some parts restricted to prohibit powered boats, vehicles, and horses in the water. We must protect the trout water. 3. I am against further development and access. 4. On the Current: Montauk to Round Spring should be protected as a fishery and quiet canoe, hiking, and camping section. I would prefer zero motored-boat or ATV traffic. I only go during off-peak times and still often find motorized boats below Cave Springs. 5. Engines, motors, horses, and easy-access detract from the experience of low- impact users (backpackers, hikers, walk-in fishermen, and human-powered watercraft). The reverse is not true. It is similar to the rights of non-smokers to breath-clean air, though smokers may have the right to smoke. It is harder to "get away to the wilderness" when the wilderness is becoming more like a carnival. Please preserve the rivers as wilderness, to the greatest extent possible. Sincerely,	7/8/2009	No			MO	63130
2758	Response to Question 1: The "No-Action" is close, but I would like to see less Taking of rights and more visible law enforcement for the regulations already in action. Response to Question 2: I would like to see the park maintain all the things offered now, to everyone not just a few selected. Response to Question 3: I do NOT want to see the Park eliminate any type of usage to anyone. On the land, water, or in the refuge. Response to Question 4: I Pay Taxes to support all 134 miles as does every US Tax payer, it is all special to me. And all alternatives do NOT address them adequately. Response to Question 5: Noel Poe started a control on the amount of alcohol to take on the river. Now more visible law enforcement would also help the river. The land use for hunters would be helped By an increase in wild life which could be done by making food plots.	8/7/2009	No			MO	63965
2759	RE: Alternative Plans for Ozark National Scenic Riverways management Dear Friends at the National Park Service, I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the three alternative management plans outlined in the Post-Dispatch on June 22. My family has taken regular summer trips to the Current River for the past 20 years, usually staying at Big Spring and enjoying hiking in the public lands and floating and tubing on the Current and Jacks Fork. With each passing year, we have been more and more dismayed by the housing development along the river banks, have been more and more disturbed by the steady disappearance of wildlife, and have been more and more irritated by motor boats cruising up and down the river (with no fishing poles in sight), forcing us out of their paths. Recently, our vacations have coincided with the large trail ride at Eminence, yet another irritating activity that seems at odds with healthy soil and water. Last year was the last straw. Several days after returning home, I discovered a major infection in my elbow that would have hospitalized me had I waited one more day to seek treatment. It entered my body through a slight scrape, which I had been careful to wash and treat before and after visiting the swimming hole. No matter how clear that water looks, there is garbage in there. It seems to me that if you and I say we value biodiversity and habitat health, we shouldn't be swayed by "recreational rights" people who want to ride gasoline-powered vehicles along trails, leave ribbons of oil and gas in the wake of their boats, and denude slopes leading down to spring-fed streams so they can build large "rustic cabins" less than 50 yards away. Needless to say, my family favors Alternative A. Again, thanks very much,	6/25/2009	No			MO	63110
2760	Response to Question 1: No Change! The River should be open to all!!! Response to Question 5: Actually Police the River Not the Woods! Open up more ATV Trails and Charge a Yearly Fee/Permit!!	8/4/2009	No			MO	63028
2761	Dear Sir, We are writing this letter because it has come to our attention that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers are being degraded on an increasing scale. As campers and canoeists, we feel that the use of these rivers by motorized ATVS and jet boats must be strictly controlled, if not banned altogether. As the Current and Jacks Fork rivers make up the federally protected Ozark National Scenic Riverways we feel the National Park Service should be given more clout in the prevention of the degradation of these beautiful rivers. Our understanding is that the Park Service has undertaken development of a new General Management plan to guide the future of this park. Illegal wildcat motor access, off road vehicle use, commercial trail rides, motorized and/or jet boats must be more strictly controlled. Please do everything within your power to see that this National Scenic Riverway remains as pristine and clean as possible, for us and future generations.	9/10/2009	No			UN	N/A

2762	<p>Dear Reed At age 71, I still take advantage of the unriveled Ozark streams. Every summer, my floating buddy and I pick a stream to take a 2 day float. Just a few weeks ago, we floated the Niangua and had a wonderful time. My introduction to Ozark streams in general and to the Current River in particular, began in the late 40's. My father worked for Union Electric as a troubleman, and every summer, yes every summer that I can recall, the family, mom, dad, my younger brother and sister, plus Scrappy our mut dog spent a week on the Current River. Dad would pay a fanner a modest amount to have access to the river and set up our camp on the farmers property. I can't begin to describe the wonderful times we had on the Current. In fact, in those days one would rarely encounter other city folks, not to mention jet boats, or four wheel vehicles of any sort, probably not invented at that time. Suffice it to say that we have many treasures here in Missouri, and the Current is one of them, and we need to preserve it as best we can. Speaking of jet boats, on my recent float on the Niangua, my buddy and I were almost "swamped" by a jet boat, thankfully the only one encountered on the trip. I'm not sure of a solution that will satisfy all parties, but some permanent restrictions need to be put in place to keep this treasure for generations to come, I hope that you will take a hard look at all facts, especially following the money trail, as to commercial interests that want to take advantage of this scenic waterway, and I'm not speaking about canoe rental outfitters. One way to measure the use or unintentional misuse of this area, is to ask the question, DOES THIS USE OF THE RIVER AND SURROUNDING LAND, LEAVE IT IN THE SAME SHAPE AS IT WAS BEFORE THIS TYPE OF USE OR ACTIVITY? If the answer is NO, then we have to address those activities that contribute to the deterioration of this beautiful land and water area. I hope you have a chance to read this letter and that it does not get lost in the shuffle</p> <p>Sincerely</p>	9/4/2009	No			MO	63130
2763	<p>Response to Question 1: Alternative A, and fewer outfitters or limit number of rental canoes, close illegal roads Response to Question 2: area of river with no motors wilderness for Big Spring limit human & horse fecal matter in river Response to Question 3: no ATV's, not more boat ramps, fewer horses fewer horse trails Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: fewer large rowdy groups</p>	8/4/2009	No			MO	63146
2764	<p>Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing to you regarding the Missouri Riverways, in particular the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I has come to my attention, that you are looking for comments from the public regarding your future Management Plan. My family and I are regular users of the Missouri waterways, we enjoy canoeing and kayaking, and camping. We especially enjoy the quite and wildlife during the week whenever possible. Our main interest in the State and National Parks is to have a wilderness experience. That is why I am not in favor of degrading riverways in such parks to "motorways" for illegal wildcat motor vehicles and other types of vehicles, as well as motorized boats and jet boats which lead to erosion of riverbanks, pollution and disturbance. Such activity should be strongly discouraged and penalized. Any overuse for commercial interest such as trail rides should be strictly controlled. I am also urging you to propose to Congress to qualify the Big Spring remnant wilderness and to protect this as part of the Wilderness System. It is very important to my family and me, that Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways are protected for the enjoyment for many generations to come. Thank you for your consideration. CC: Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, Governor Jay Nixon</p>	9/4/2009	No			MO	63132
2765	<p>Dear Superintendent Detring: I am very concerned about the damage that is being done to our National Scenic Riverway specifically the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers and their watershed areas. It is very important that we make and enforce rules to prevent further damage from off-road vehicles, motorized boats and jet boats and too many horses on the commercial trail rides. I have floated these rivers for decades and it is so upsetting to see ATV's on the gravel bars or be passed by the horribly loud jet boats. As a horseback rider, I'm appalled at the large numbers of trail riders going through these rivers. Twenty horses might be okay, but they are going through with several hundred and a limit needs to be set. Please do what is best to protect Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways as a wild and scenic area. Please do not be influenced by people who are making money from their destruction of our rivers, such as the ATV manufacturers. There is no reason to have motorized ANTHING on or near these rivers. Also, I hope that you will please propose to Congress that the backcountry hills near Big Spring become part of the Wilderness System. Thank you. Sincerely,</p>	9/4/2009	No			MO	63025
2766	<p>Dear Mr. Detring, I traveled to Ft. Lauderdale this summer for work. Several people commented when I told them I was from Missouri, "Oh, I've heard it's beautiful up there." It struck me that people who live with some of the best Florida beaches in their backyard know of the beauty of Missouri. I felt pride in my state to be able to tell them of all the beautiful areas like Big Spring, campgrounds in the Mark Twain National Forest (Red Bluff and Marble Creek are personal favorites), and an impressive list of rivers and lakes for floating and boating. I write to express my concern about threats to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and implore you to protect this valuable natural area. As I consider the impressive list of rivers mentioned above it clarifies the fact that Missouri is fortunate to have a wide range of waterways available for a wide range of uses. Why not take special care to protect the one recognized as worthy of national status? It is valuable to the natural ecosystems of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the environment and the integrity of the state of Missouri as a place of nationally recognized natural beauty. That this area has been designated as a National Scenic Riverway speaks to its value beyond the borders of Missouri and to its importance within a larger national system of which Missouri can be a proud part. But only if we protect the area by restricting or prohibiting illegal wildcat motor access, motorboats, commercial horse trail riding and off-road vehicle use. There are ample legal opportunities for such activities outside of the ONSR area. If these activities are not checked they will continue to threaten the unique quality and beauty of the area. Please consider the amazing beauty and value of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in preserving and protecting the area. I was proud this summer to describe the beauty of Missouri to others. I want my children to be able to do the same. Sincerely, cc. Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, Governor Jay Nixon</p>	9/4/2009	No			MO	63110
2767	<p>Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 2: Spring branches cleaned out, dead trees remove from river Response to Question 3: No Action Alternative Response to Question 4: Respect for the riverways Response to Question 5: Bett directions, bette access to different</p>	8/4/2009	No			IL	62298

2768	Re: Current and Jacks Fork Rivers Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing today to add my name to the list of citizens who have spent many enjoyable hours on Missouri's Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and to voice my concern over the declining state of these streams. As a canoe float fisherman for many years, I have had the pleasure of witnessing many wonderful natural sights along Missouri's waterways, but I have also seen the negative effects from those less concerned with maintaining these streams for future generations. Illegal motor vehicle accesses need to be curtailed. Off road vehicles need to be eliminated or at least limited to very specific areas. Increased controls of motorized boats and jet boats must be implemented. And regulations pertaining to commercial trail rides and camping along the waterways should be more rigorously enforced. I ask that the National Park Service and the State of Missouri renew their commitment to these irreplaceable natural wonders. Action should be taken now to preserve the waterways and the surrounding wilderness that, while shrinking, is still beautiful to behold. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of preserving the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Respectfully, Cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/3/2009	No			MO	63069
2769	No responses to any of the questions	8/4/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2770	Dear Superintendent Detring: During the past 30 years, my family and I have floated the Current and Jacks Fork rivers many times. It has been a joy to be a part of the natural environment of a cold clear river. Having been dumped out of my canoe, I can attest to the cold part. The opportunity to see the foliage on the banks, wildlife and birds during the float, added to our pleasure. We must protect the efforts of many people to try to control the many types of vehicle encroachment on these wild and peaceful locations. Surely, there are other places for big boats to go. This is such a special area that once it is destroyed, it can never be reclaimed. We want our young people to have the opportunity to see and experience these rivers so that they will be interested to continue preserving the wilderness areas of our great state. They are our jewels. Trail rides must be monitored so that erosion and pollution do not contribute to unacceptable levels and contaminate the rivers. Thank you for your consideration.	9/4/2009	No			MO	63122
2771	Dear Reed Detring, Since you are Supt. of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I am writing to you to ask that you watch much more carefully the use of our Scenic Riverways of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers as well as the Big Spring area surrounding the Current River. The motorized boats, especially jet boats, must be much more strictly controlled. If this does not happen, the serenity of the rivers will be disturbed for all of us who enjoy the peace that the rivers bring. Commercial trail rides must be controlled in numbers and location. Illegal wildcat motor accesses must be eliminated, otherwise, the riverways will be degraded into motorways. This is already happening in many places. Vehicle use off of legal roads must be eliminated! All-teraine vehicles must not be allowed to roam freely over the land, digging up the moss, lichens, ferns, and other small plants. This is a travisty and should have been eliminated years ago. If it is necessary to ride "those things" then tracks need to be built for them so that people can make money from those who ride these vehicles on the tracks. The authentic pocket of original wildland in the backcountry near Big Spring is qualified for the Wilderness System and the Park Service must protect it and propose this to Congress. It will save fine stands of old growth pine and oak in the stand. Rs I see it, it is the responsibility of you and your staff to take action on the above as soon as possible. This is what you should have been about since you took office and I hope that it will be attended to as soon as possible. Thanks so much for reading this letter. I am 72 years old and it would be wonderful to know that this part of my state will be protected by people like yourself. Sincerely,	9/8/2009	No			MO	63146-4624
2772	Re: Current and Jacks Fork Rivers Protection Dear Superintendent Detring, Thank you for your employment service in managing the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. As a 73 year-old native Missourian, I have lived in many states and have visited many National Parks and primitive camping sites. I have been enthralled and awed by the majesty of the natural environments. After canoeing America's first national river, the Buffalo, Arkansas, my late husband and I purchased a farm and enjoyed living in one of the most primitive areas of the Ozarks. I fear that my grandchildren will not have the opportunity to even visit such a place. As a child, I traveled with my parents and was fortunate to see many pristine sites. After revisiting these sites I have cried for hours to witness the asphaltting of the third best shelling island in the world (Sanibel Island), to see the cutting of wilderness, and experience the tragedy of scum and trash in streams rivers and ocean beaches which were once verdant, clean, beautiful and alive. When I lived in Arkansas, in our national forests, there was program to poison the undergrowth trees such as dogwoods and redbuds because the smaller trees interfered with the growth of trees grown for money As a psychologist, I have experienced Nature Deficit Disorder and the connection to mental illness (described by ... in his book Last Child in the Woods (2005). Children who never experience silence, the rustling of leaves, the call of birds or the sweet smell of growing plants, grow inured to noise, cement and the lack of living things. The also become inured to human compassion and a satisfaction of inner spirit. Witness the number of incarcerated people. Please do not allow further exploitation and degrading of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers. I urge the management plan to stop illegal motor access and protect the health of the rivers. There is no serenity and soul restoring peacefulness when motors are constantly running. The use of four wheelers and cars obtaining access in these primitive areas, contributes to the destruction of the habitat, aids in erosion and destroys the peacefulness enjoyed by others seeking the peace of nature. Thank you for your help in protecting this very small piece of nature for tourists and local residents who need the healing experience of these awe-inspiring places. cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon	9/8/2009	No			MO	65802
2773	Re: General Management plan Thank you for the opportunity to give our views on the General Management plan/Wilderness Study for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. All variety of off-road vehicles should be prohibited to prevent degradation. Illegal roads and trails need to be eliminated. Alternative A would best provide the upgrade needed for control and regulation needed for a fun and tranquil family experience. Sincerely yours,	9/2/2009	No			MO	65401-8512
2774	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 2: That the rivers and springs, spring branches be cleand every spring so canoes, rafting & boating on the rivers, don't get clogged the rivers too be cleaned. Response to Question 3: No Action Alternative Response to Question 4: My Dad was Earl Chilton, he had Round Spring park 11 or 12 years. We always kept the spring branch cleand out, we fixed the water	8/4/2009	No			IL	62298

	crest in our salads. The indians bury there dead around the spring you have taken the little bridge away, it looks terrible were thing is so grown up Response to Question 5: Better directions, better access to the different place.						
2775	Native Missourian. Moved away and came back and I've noticed that water quality has decreased. Increased turbidity level. Waters are not as clean. Not as much aquatic wildlife. Have seen people in canoes, drunk, brandishing knives and guns. Too much wildness.	9/10/2009	No			MO	64093
2776	Dear Superintendent: Regarding proposed changes to Ozark National Scenic Riverways regulations, I support the "No Change" option. Current regulations provide an excellent natural experience for both locals and visitors, and there is no need to alter them. I am very concerned about proposed restrictions on horsepower for jet motors. If such changes are made, the horsepower should be measured at the pump -- not at the powerhead as suggested. Jet motors, when compared to prop motors, have a reduction in horsepower between powerhead and pump of approximately 35%. Thus, a jet motor rated at 60 horsepower at the powerhead will be equivalent to approximately 40 horsepower at the pump. Under proposed restrictions, a boat loaded with family and equipment for a day's outing will be unable to navigate the swift waters and shoals of Current River. Sincerely,	6/13/2009	No			MO	65548
2777	Dear Superintendent: Regarding proposed changes to Ozark National Scenic Riverways regulations, I support the "No Change" option. Current regulations provide an excellent natural experience for both locals and visitors, and there is no need to alter them.	6/13/2009	No			MO	65548
2778	To Whom It May Concern: The Reynolds County Commission would like to take this opportunity to express our view of the actions that are proposed by the National Park Service over the next fifteen to twenty years. The actions of consideration being a, b, c, or no action; we would like to express our concern for no action. Other actions will affect the economical impact which will be devastating to our county as well as surrounding counties. These proposed changes will cause a decline in visitors which will cause decreases in every area of our county. Sales tax money is a major source of revenue for all counties. Our county residents have formed a "stream team" who takes pride in our riverways. This group of volunteers strives to maintain the beautification of Current River. Reynolds County is home to "Blazer Boats" which is a large aluminum boat manufacturer and is a major supplier to many of the surrounding counties. Current River is the center for many fishing tournaments. Over the past ten years, \$75,000 has been raised for Reynolds, Ripley, and Carter County Senior Nutrition Centers to keep these organizations funded due to government cuts. Recreational use such as swimming, fishing, canoeing, boating, horseback riding and atv use will all be impacted and will cause a major effect to daily use. The Reynolds County Commission feels that no action be taken on our waterways. Thank you for your time. Respectfully submitted,	6/25/2009	No		REYNOLDS COUNTY COMMISSION	MO	63633
2779	Response to Question 1: No-action, please leave as is. Response to Question 2: Do not limit access to resources in the riverways Response to Question 3: Limiting access to the river. Response to Question 4: My great grandfather homesteaded along the current in early 1800's and we have had a place there at Carderova (Log Yard) over 50 years. We try to be good stewards of the area for all to enjoy. There seems to be more sludge getting into the river now, Could that be checked to see if it is contaminated? Response to Question 5: More restrooms could help on gravel bars (high ground) in our area. The path from our cabin to the river seems to get used, making it unsightly and unhealthy to walk through. Would be grateful for changes along that lines. Thanks for your consideration.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63028
2780	Dear Superintendent: I am commenting about the "Preliminary Alternatives" document and proposed future plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I strongly support Alternative A. Here is why. I used to float the streams there all the time in the early 70s. I loved it then. I went back about five years ago and it was very different in what I think is a negative way. In two words, TOO MUCH. Too much development overall. In short, Alternative A seems to fit the bill in my mind. Slowing things down so that the riverways maintain and reclaim some dignity and beauty that I remember from the times I was there in the early 70s. Can't we just leave some things be? And it is what is most true to the original plan for the area. One final note. I believe wilderness designation for Big Spring should be proposed. That is huge. Sincerely, Copies to: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill	6/19/2009	No			MO	65203
2781	Dear Superintendent: In regards to the General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I wanted to let you know my ideas as to the future of this wonderful park. I am in favor of Alternative A. I would like park managers to create conditions that recall earlier days and times along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I prefer slower-paced, family-friendly activities, as were common when I was a child in the 1960's, and my family originally started camping at Alley Springs State Park. I especially enjoy swimming and camping. I do not want motor boats on the rivers! I am very much in favor of protecting and restoring the environment and its plants and wildlife to the way it used to be. I agree with Kathleen Logan Smith, Director of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment, in her hopes for the future of the park 50 years from now, when she says, "I want the animals that live on the river to still be there. I want the springs to continue to flow. I want the water to be clear." Again, I am in favor of Alternative A. Thanks for the opportunity to state my views. Sincerely,	7/9/2009	No			MO	N/A
2782	Re: Ozark Nation Scenic Riverways Management Plan Dear Mr. Detring; I am a fourth generation Current River native. My Grandfather was forced to sell his farm to the Park Service in 1968. This was the place where my Father and my Grandfather were born and my Great Grandfather settled in 1900. No doubt if the park was not formed it would have been my birth place as well. My family and I use Current River year round and in doing so take great care and pride in our long heritage of the river. We introduce people to this beautiful place as well as get along with everyone that use's this resource. Once again we are being persecuted by the environmental community and the ONSR who want to stop or regulate the local people from using this natural resource, which was designed as national recreation area for all. You, as our voice in government, should	6/23/2009	No			MO	63638

	understand that there are no studies or any evidence of any problem or harm by any user of this resource. Every person should have the right to use the park, be it ,tuber's, canoer's, hiker's, camper's, boater's, horseback rider's and other's to enjoy it's beauty. You or the ONSR should not let a few people who come here 2-3 month's a year dictate to the people who use this place 12 month's a year In closing we should all use this place together, no one group should be deigned or diminished in motor restriction or number of user's. The ONSR can not show enough problems or accidents or any injuries due to boat's to restrict them in any way. Please don't allow the OZSR to take away our rights for no reason, we need to leave the Current River and the Jack's Fork River ALONE. Thank you for you consideration in this matter. --					
2783	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A Response to Question 2: PROTECTION OF THE ENTIRE WATERSHED BY EDUCATION OF THOSE THAT LIVE IN IT. VIGOROUS SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF THE ECOSYSTEM. Response to Question 3: TRY TO KEEP THE PARK FROM BECOMING LIKE DISNEYLAND. Response to Question 4: THE UPPER REACHES OF THE STREAMS AND TRIBUTARIES ARE THE MOST PRISTINE - BUT ARE SUSCEPTIBLE TO DEGRADATION BY LAND USE PRACTICES. Response to Question 5: HOLD THE LINE AGAINST DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATE - EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT THE VALUE AND FRAGILITY OF THE RESOURCE.	8/5/2009	No		MO	65548
2784	I am writing to you with a great concern about the present condition and use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The park which was established in 1964 was a gift from the State of Missouri. The National Park System is one of the great treasures of our country as it is very unique when compared to the park systems in other countries. It also provides countless opportunities for our citizens and visitors to see and enjoy the great national wonders of the United States. I believe the role of the park service is to preserve and improve the parks for future generations while developing systems for beneficial (but not harmful) use by Americans and our visitors. The change in technology (dirt bikes, ATV's, other recreational vehicles), people's expectations on how the national parks can be used, and the lack of knowledge by some park visitors of improper or overuse in the parks creates problems. Measures need to be taken to improve the parks and correct past problems so that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will have a positive outcome in the future. The following measures must be developed and carried out: 1. Continue to educate the public about proper use of the parks; 2. Limit access points as the parks and riverways are overcrowded, and I have personally experienced this; 3. Restrict mobile campers to official park campgrounds; 4. Create setbacks for horse trails; 5. Establish designated roads away from the river for all-terrain vehicles; Thank you for your consideration in developing better alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Sincerely,	6/2/2009	No		Miller Nichols Charitable Foundation	MO 64112
2785	Re: comment on new management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways There are too many access points on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, which causes the rivers to be overdeveloped, lowering the quality of the rivers. Off-road vehicles are illegally trespassing, degrading the rivers and destroying the quiet. The National Park Service needs to stop ignoring easement violations. Commercial horseback riding, resulting in horse manure and urine, degrades the streams and needs to be reduced. The Big Spring Wilderness area should be protected to support it's recognition as wilderness by Congress. We need our National Park Service to truly protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for our and future generations. Sincerely, cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer	6/19/2009	No			MO 65203
2786	RE: Ozark Natioinal Scenic Riverways Management Plan Proposed Alternatives To Whom It Concerns: Please find enclosed written comments from various interested individuals in connection with the proposed general management plan alternatives. If for any reason you cannot accept these written comments contained herein, please advise immediately. Sincerely,	7/28/2009	No		KENNEDY, KENNEDY, ROBBINS & YARBRO, LC	MO 63902
2787	To All Concerned; I have a real concern about the amount of gravel (sand and rock mixture) that is being allowed to enter into the rivers! Before finalizing a 20 year management plan I strongly feel that we need to address this issue no matter which alternative is selected. I contend that the amount of gravel in the river has much effect on the depth of the water and where the river can freely flow. I have lived and worked in the area of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers all my life (50+yrs) and I have seen many of the long, deep, slow moving holes of water with muddy banks and bottom of these rivers being filled and covered with gravel that moves and travels with heavy rains and flooding until eventually entering into the rivers or what I call "graveling of the rivers." If this graveling of the rivers is allowed to continue I believe the depth of the water in the rivers will lower until there will be no fish, hellbenders, or any other species can live in the river and too shallow for any boating, floating or other uses. I have suspicion that this is why the hellbender is becoming extinct now, because his habitat is filling with gravel. I believe that anybody who thinks about it for a while can think of several reasons why we should not let this "graveling of the rivers" continue. I have some ideas of how to address and attempt to solve this issue and am open for discussion any time. Sincerely & Thanks;	7/25/2009	No			MO 65588
2788	Superintendent, As a friend of the Ozark River Ways, I am urging the Park Service to focus on restoring the degraded natural condition on the river ways. Four types of abuse have taken too large a toll on the Current and Jack Forks Rivers. First there is a proliferation of man-made bank openings and extension of two track roads, which have created many illegal river access points. Another abuse is the horse trails that hug the banks of the rivers. These trails must be redesigned to set back from rivers, creeks and sink holes a sufficient distance to preclude pollution problems. A third abuse is the operation of ATVs off-road inside the boundaries of ONSR and the fourth is the parking of motorized campers on or just above the river banks. ATVs, dirt bikes, and similar recreation vehicles must be banned in the park except on legally designated state and county roads. Mobile campers must be restricted to official park campgrounds designed to accommodate such camping units. This beautiful area needs to be designated a national wilderness area by the National Park Service. Further I strongly oppose alternative B and C options for the management of this area. I would support alternative A provided the Park Service adopts the management policies listed in this letter. The National Park Service needs to control the frequency and number of floaters putting in at various Park Service access points. This may mean a floating permit system, especially during peak user times. Also effective noise control measure need to be enforced wherever visitors play music or radios on the gravel bars. I am also urging the National Park Service to prohibit the use or recreational power boats above Two Rivers, enforce a 10 hp limit between Two Rivers and Van Buren and to enforce a 25 hp limit below Van Buren, where the river channel widens. The future of this important national resource is at stake and you must act to preserve this area for the next century. Sincerely,	7/27/2009	No			MO 63131

2789	Ozark Scenic Riverways - Use of the area. I am 83 years old, a native of Dent County, and have been in constant contact with Current River all of my life. I've fished, canoed, run propeller driven boats and jet boats. I have hunted and trapped along the river. I'm sure I speak for many of the old-time river users. First, we need to do what we can to keep the springs flowing and the gravel out of the river. As far as use goes I hope that the use of personal motor driven watercraft is prohibited along with those ATVs. Rope swings and diving off bluffs is dangerous and annoying. Motor boats. This is a complicated matter. Some use of motor driven boats reasonable. The present rules suite me alright because I don't go to the lower river anymore. No jets above round spring would suit me. Several fishermen I know, all good stewards of the river hope that there will be river access at the new state park at the Alton Club. Maybe the Park Service and the Dept. of Natural resources could do this as a joint effort. Trolling motors and small outboards are helpful for fishermen. One comment on motors and boats. Most jet boat users are very polite, or try to be, but by their nature a jet must be driven aggressively. Again, please consider trying to establish river access at the Alton Club for float fishermen. Keep the springs flowing	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
2790	Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways Governor Jay Nixon Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill We appreciate natural conditions on the riverways. Our views coincide with those of the Missouri Parks Association, and so will not bother with itemization.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63701
2791	Dear Superintendent Detring: Forty years ago when my husband and I planned to explore another National Park, we took a walking tour on our own in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. I came away with an experience that still reappears clearly in my mind's eye. We had been walking in the dark and dense forest, listening to occasional birds' chatter, when suddenly I saw the trees ahead, parting for a small clearing, blindingly lit by sunshine. The abrupt appearance of the sunlight in the midst of the dark woods gave the clearing a sacred quality. The contrast was striking, but suddenly a small black bear cub appeared on the opposite side of the clearing, standing on his hind feet and startled by my presence. I stood transfixed and so did he. My husband came up the few steps behind me, and whispered, "Watch out for the mother." I backed out slowly, and have never forgotten that unique experience the huge enclosing forest, the clearing in the sun, and the little bear cub. All Missourians indeed all Americans should find similar intellectual and emotional rewards from visiting our National Parks. We may see wildlife that we must preserve, rivers and falls, mountains and cliffs, mysterious caves, and beautiful views of sunrises and sunsets that soothe our unease with life. At the moment, Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways are in crisis, although the Current River and its tributary Jacks Fork could be beautiful symbols of the unspoiled Ozarks. So much of the present damage here resulted from illegal roads that make campsites unsafe and ruin gravel bars. This grim destruction will be visible once the summer foliage is gone. An additional so-called "pocket" of original wildland in the back country near Big Spring has been qualified for the Wilderness System. We hope that the Park Service will propose to Congress to recognize it in the System, thus saving some of the finest old growth oak and pine in the state. The members of the Sienna Club trust that these important projects not unknown to the Park Service will be considered for its shaping the Park Management Plan. Sincerely yours,	9/11/2009	No			MO	64477-2100
2792	Re: Horseback Riding Trails Ladies/Gentlemen: Please don't shut down the trails at Jacks Fork to equestrians or shut down any equestrian trails! I've been riding since I was 5, that's 45 years of trail riding. I try to be a responsible rider and try to teach others as well. Take out what you bring in theory. Be as unobtrusive to land and water as possible. I love nature more than anyone I know, love it and respect it and need to ride my horse on trails in parks for tranquility and relaxation at least every week! There's nothing like it. I also enjoy hiking and biking. I need to see that all three types of exercisers/ nature lovers can do this together. I know that we can, I see it taking place in St. Louis County. As for the e coli in the creeks, I'm not an expert on this, but I feel that there are a lot of animals in the woods, could this be the reason? I don't know. I've been told that the e coli in the Lake of the Ozarks is 10x worse because of human waste? Please take in consideration of this country's heritage of horses and horseback riding and keep trails open to equestrians. Thank you for your time and all that you do for the Parks systems!	8/31/2009	No			MO	63069
2793	TO: Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways Re: Comments Concerning General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have visited the Current and Jack's Fork rivers at least once a year for the last ten years or so and love the near pristine quality of these waterways and their surrounding terrain. After reading the alternative horsepower limits for the Current River and Jack's Fork River, I strongly agree with Alternative A in both cases because I believe this alternative will both preserve and improve the unique appeal of them into the future. I also agree with additional suggestions proposed by the Missouri Parks Association to safeguard the Current and Jack's Fork rivers as they attract more and more people in the future. Sincerely,	7/27/2009	No			IA	66219
2794	& Judith Re: Alternatives for Management Current & Jack Fork Rivers Dear Sir: We would like to express our concern for the "Alternatives for Management" for the Current and Jack Fork Rivers. We feel it would be very detrimental to implement Alternatives C and B for the next 15 years. It is our opinion this would lead to serious degradation of this beautiful National Park that we are fortunate to have in Missouri. We are both in our late 60's but have been canoe floaters on the Current River back in the 60's and 70's and would love to go again. We also want our children and grandchildren to be able to witness this beautiful wilderness as we saw it 45 years ago. Also, please support the following: (1) Closing all unofficial river access roads. This will help keep the rivers clean. (2) Ban operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the National Scenic Riverways except on legally designated state and county roads within the park boundaries. (3) Improve management of horse trails along the Riverways' lands enabling the water to become purer. (4) Control the frequency and number of canoes, rafts, tubes, etc to alleviate crowding and rowdy behavior. Sincerely,	7/27/2009	No			MO	64056
2795	As a friend of the Ozark River Ways, I am urging the Park Service to focus on restoring the degraded natural condition on the river ways. Four types of abuse have taken too large a toll on the Current and Jack Forks Rivers. First there is a proliferation of man-made bank openings and extension of two track roads, which have created many illegal river access points. Another abuse is the horse trails that hug the banks of the rivers. These trails must be redesigned to set back from rivers, creeks and sink holes a sufficient distance to preclude pollution problems. A third abuse is the operation of ATVs off-road inside the boundaries of ONSR and the fourth is the parking of motorized campers on or just above the river banks.	7/25/2009	No			MO	63021

	ATVs, dirt bikes, and similar recreation vehicles must be banned in the park except on legally designated state and county roads. Mobile campers must be restricted to official park campgrounds designed to accommodate such camping units. (I would think this would be a no brainer.) This beautiful area needs to be designated a national wilderness area by the National Park Service. Further I strongly oppose alternative B and C options for the management of this area. I would support alternative A provided the Park Service adopts the management policies listed in this letter. The National Park Service needs to control the frequency and number of floaters putting in at various Park Service access points. This may mean a floating permit system, especially during peak user times. Also effective noise control measure need to be enforced wherever visitors play music or radios on the gravel bars. I am also urging the National Park Service to prohibit the use or recreational power boats above Two Rivers, enforce a 10 hp limit between Two Rivers and Van Buren and to enforce a 25 hp limit below Van Buren, where the river channel widens. The future of this important national resource is at stake and you must act to preserve this area for the next century. Sincerely,					
2796	To Whom It May Concern: The Reynolds County Commission would like to take this opportunity to express our view of the actions that are proposed by the National Park Service over the next fifteen to twenty years. The actions of consideration being a, b, c, or no action; we would like to express our concern for no action. Other actions will affect the economical impact which will be devastating to our county as well as surrounding counties. These proposed changes will cause a decline in visitors which will cause decreases in every area of our county. Sales tax money is a major source of revenue for all counties. Our county residents have formed a "stream team" who takes pride in our riverways. This group of volunteers strives to maintain the beautification of Current River. Reynolds County is home to "Blazer Boats" which is a large aluminum boat manufacturer and is a major supplier to many of the surrounding counties. Current River is the center for many fishing tournaments. Over the past ten years, \$75,000 has been raised for Reynolds, Ripley, and Carter County Senior Nutrition Centers to keep these organizations funded due to government cuts. Recreational use such as swimming, fishing, canoeing, boating, horseback riding and atv use will all be impacted and will cause a major effect to daily use. The Reynolds County Commission feels that no action be taken on our waterways. Thank you for your time. Respectfully submitted,	6/25/2009	No		REYNOLDS COUNTY COMMISSION	MO 63633
2797	Dear Governor: In August 2007 we convened for a family reunion of 30 persons and we chose to stay at Big Spring cabins, dine in the lodge there and canoe and raft on two consecutive days. We want to commend you on the beauty of the Big Spring walkway, the Park and the roadways. We found the river beautifully clear, cool and easy to navigate. Our family members from South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Texas and Arkansas loved the area. We are aware of and have read your Planning, Environment and Public Comment material and welcome the opportunity to send comments based on personal experience and your wealth of information. We would like to make you aware of the danger we felt from the number of boats on the river with 40 BP motors. They did not slow down as they passed us in deeper water or, if they slowed, they revved their motors to full speed before we were free of their immediate wake. One boat swamped one of our canoes and another went full speed past us as we swam in the water and missed one of young adults by only a few feet. It would have been impossible for the boat to have stopped had the driver sighted someone in his path. It was a scary experience for all of us. Our group does not plan to return to the River until we can be assured that it is a safer, quieter place than during our last trip. We are not inexperienced canoeists and rafters as we have been on the Buffalo River annually since 1970 and also the Mulberry, Spring and Big Piney Rivers in Arkansas. In addition we have been on the Yampa, San Juan, Main Salmon, Middle Fork of the Salmon, Green and Colorado Rivers. We all agreed that we have never felt as intimidated by speeding boats as we felt on the Current River. No amount of gesturing to slow the boats was effective. We asked a number of persons also canoeing or using tubes to float the river to advise us where our concerns about safety and tranquility should be sent. They told us it would be useless to do so since nothing would be done with the information we supplied those managing the river. We sent a letter to Superintendent Noel Poe but did not get a response. We have been U.S.F.S. Volunteers at Lake Wedington near Fayetteville for 20 years. Because of river and bank degradation ATVs have been limited to FS roads only. This has vastly improved the safety, quietness and the health of the forest vegetation. We wish you well in your work and decisions. Alternative A has many merits that would preserve the rivers and the forests and we recommend its serious consideration. Hopefully this information will be useful to the group in considering limitations on motor size, enforcement of safety rules and avoidance of accidents and the preservation of the Current River and its banks and woodland.	8/3/2009	No			AR 72701
2798	Subject: Scenic Rivers Project 1. Alternative A is closest to my ideal. 2. We must keep some parts restricted to prohibit powered boats, vehicles, and horses in the water. We must protect the trout water. 3. I am against further development and access. 4. On the Current: Montauk to Round Spring should be protected as a fishery and quiet canoe, hiking, and camping section. I would prefer zero motored-boat or ATV traffic. I only go during off-peak times and still often find motorized boats below Cave Springs. 5. Engines, motors, horses, and easy-access detract from the experience of low- impact users (backpackers, hikers, walk-in fishermen, and human-powered watercraft). The reverse is not true. It is similar to the rights of non-smokers to breath-clean air, though smokers may have the right to smoke. It is harder to "get away to the wilderness" when the wilderness is becoming more like a carnival. Please preserve the rivers as wilderness, to the greatest extent possible. Sincerely,	7/8/2009	No			MO 63130
2799	Re: Ozark Nation Scenic Riverways Management Plan Dear Mr. Detring; I am a fourth generation Current River native. My Grandfather was forced to sell his farm to the Park Service in 1968. This was the place where my Father and my Grandfather were born and my Great Grandfather settled in 1900. No doubt if the park was not formed it would have been my birth place as well. My family and I use Current River year round and in doing so take great care and pride in our long heritage of the river. We introduce people to this beautiful place as well as get along with everyone that use's this resource. Once again we are being persecuted by the environmental community and the ONSR who want to stop or regulate the local people from using this natural resource, which was designed as national recreation area for all. You, as our voice in government, should understand that there are no studies or any evidence of any problem or harm by any user of this resource. Every person should have the right to use the park, be it ,tuber's, canoer's, hiker's, camper's, boater's, horseback rider's and other's to enjoy it's beauty. You or the ONSR should not let a few people who come here 2-3 month's a year dictate to the people who use this place 12 month's a year. In closing we should all use this place	6/23/2009	No			MO 63638

	together, no one group should be deigned or diminished in motor restriction or number of user's. The ONSR can not show enough problems or accidents or any injuries due to boat's to restrict them in any way. Please don't allow the OZSR to take away our rights for no reason, we need to leave the Current River and the Jack's Fork River ALONE. Thank you fo you consideration in this matter.						
2800	Dear Superintendent: I am commenting about the "Preliminary Alternatives" document and proposed future plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I strongly support Alternative A. Here is why. I used to float the streams there all the time in the early 70s. I loved it then. I went back about five years ago and it was very different in what I think is a negative way. In two words, TOO MUCH. Too much development overall. In short, Alternative A seems to fit the bill in my mind. Slowing things down so that the riverways maintain and reclaim some dignity and beauty that I remember from the times I was there in the early 70s. Can't we just leave some things be? And it is what is most true to the original plan for the area. One final note. I believe wilderness designation for Big Spring should be proposed. That is huge. Sincerely, Copies to: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill	6/25/2009	No			MO	65203
2801	Dear Mr. Detring: I appreciate this opportunity to respond to the alternatives proposed for a new General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We have friends who own property in Shannon County on the Jacks Fork River, and we have visited and enjoyed their "paradise" many times. I'll be brief. Please do NOT implement the provision within Alternative C that would allow boats with 25 MPH motors to operate on the river, not even seasonally. Such motorized traffic would introduce disruptive mechanical noise to human and other nearby inhabitants; erode fragile river banks; result in a loss of habitat; reduce populations of amphibians, fish, insects, birds, and mammals that live and feed on the banks and neighboring land; introduce pollutants such as motor oils to the river. Please keep motorized traffic off this section of the Jacks Fork River. Thank you. Sincerely,	6/30/2009	No			MO	63117
2802	Re: Comments on Current River Plan Dear Superintendent: Please consider this letter to be a strong recommendation for Proposal A. Current River should be preserved for future generations. The overuse by motorboats, jet skis, horses, dune buggies and just too many people has put a strain on this unique resource. There are plenty of places in Missouri where people can ride in high powered boats. There are plenty of places where people can get drunk and float on water in large groups. Proposal A really does not go far enough. Access and use should be limited. Current River should be preserved for our children. An expansion of use, or even maintaining the status quo, will not save Current River. Sincerely,	6/29/2009	No			MO	64131-2934
2803	Dear Sir: This is concerning the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Unfortunately, I missed the community forum in Poplar Bluff and I have some suggestions I would like to make. My family and I have loved and enjoyed Current River all our lives, but sadly , we have seen bad changes occurring. Overcrowding during the summer season and pollution as well as drunkenness and bad behavior is my first concern. Boat horsepower doesn't matter when you are tubing and a boat comes charging toward you at top speed, be it 20 mph or 60 mph. You have no way to escape in an innertube. We have had numerous close calls with fast, drunk and careless boat drivers. They rear the front end of their boats up so high they cannot possibly see what is in front of them. We have been kayaking and had boats roar past us dangerously close and then they look back to see if they capsized us. Is this safe sharing of the river? My suggestion is to ban boats all together from the section of Current River from Waymeyer access to the Big Spring access on weekends from June thru August. There are plenty of other areas they can run their boats or fish that will not endanger tubers and canoists. We want to enjoy the peaceful, beautiful , clear river safely. They can do what they want any other week day or time of year. I am very grateful for the presence of the water patrol and their efforts to control the drunks and uncivilized people who use the river. They are doing a good job but they badly need more help. Also I am so thankful for the ban on boom boxes on the river. I don't float the river to hear someone else's noise, I come to hear nature. My next concern is the pollution and degradation of the crystal clear water. Too much construction is occurring on the river banks. Trees and vegetation is being stripped from the banks causing erosion which dumps silt and debris in the river jeopardizing water clarity and the health of all creatures that call Current River home. I believe there should be an immediate ban on all construction on the river banks within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and hopefully beyond. Houses already on the banks should be strictly restricted from destroying vegetation and all sewer systems inspected immediately. I know this will be very unpopular but the health and welfare of this precious Missouri treasure must be protected forever. People don't visit this river area to see houses and businesses lining the banks, they come to enjoy the beauty and serenity of nature at it's best. The constant presence of people will eventually destroy the very reason they come here. Please sir, do everything in your power to protect the river foremost, and the people who love it and want to enjoy it safely. The very survival of this precious treasure depends on you and others like you in government agencies. Yours truly,	6/24/2009	No			MO	63967
2804	Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing to you today in support of Alternative A, the first proposal from the National Park Service for management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As a national treasure, the ONSR should be managed with extreme caution, specifically: - limit river access points - restore stream banks to native vegetation and re-route horse trails - restrict ATV/ORV use to paved roads Your consideration of this plan and support of good management is appreciated. Sincerely,	7/30/2009	No			MO	64772
2805	To Whom it May Concern; WHAT: Please choose Alternative A. Please, when considering any future development or protection measures or rules in or near the Ozark Scenic Riverways, always favor protection of nature and keeping the area as it has been for eons of time over human recreation or commercial needs. WHY: There is only just so much "pure" nature left in the lower 48 states, especially east of the Rocky Mountains, and once it is gone, it's gone. The goal of this generation should be to enjoy what the natural world offers in the least harmful way possible and preserve what is left of the natural world for the following generations. Let tourism geared toward those wanting a quiet, natural experience be the rule for the Ozark Scenic Riverways. NOT quiet, NOT so natural experiences are a dime a dozen, let people seek those experiences elsewhere, there are many options for that nearby just an hours drive away from this area. The ecosystem is unique and should be preserved first and foremost over all other considerations. Nature does not need help from man to make it "better" or more "profitable" or more "fun". Canoes only, a	6/26/2009	No			MO	63122

	minimum number of campsites and an attitude of "pass by quietly, take only photographs and leave only a few footprints" should be the rule, forever. Commercial dollars for local residents from tourism can still come from marketing this region as a "pure wilderness experience" and making it unique and separate experience in the Midwest from so many other experiences that are not "pure wilderness experiences." Market what is special about this area, but develop too much, allow motor boats, allow too many horses, etc, and it will cease to be special at all. Respectfully,						
2806	Dear Mr. Detring: I am responding to the National Park Service request for comment on a new General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My husband and I and our son made many canoe trips on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We wanted to introduce our teenager to an outdoor experience where he could learn to appreciate the natural world. He is an adult now and still canoes and kayaks. We have two grandchildren and twin great grandchildren and I would like for them to have the same opportunities to enjoy nature. Therefore, I believe that power boats and jet boats should be more strictly controlled. It was always my concern when I was in a canoe that we would not be able to get out of the way of a fast boat to avoid getting hit, especially since a canoe moves more slowly than a fast boat. I have heard that the number of horse trails has increased tremendously as has the number of horses using these trails. Also, there is a trail along the river which can cause erosion and pollution when horse manure gets into the river. I grew up on a farm. Too many animals using the same ground causes damage to the vegetation, especially when it rains. ATV use has also increased and there are a number of illegal crossings of gravel bars. Campers would like to enjoy setting up a tent, visiting with friends and family, cooking a meal, etc., without the interruption of motorized ATVs. The springs feeding these rivers need protection, especially the Big Springs area. I would hope that .the number of roads and trails could be reduced and illegal trails could be eliminated. I definitely would favor a reduction in the speed of motor boats and jet boats and a drastic reduction in the number of horses using the horse trails. My family greatly appreciates the beauty of these rivers and the opportunity to watch wildlife, camp on a gravel bar, do some fishing and swimming, and guide a canoe around obstacles or through fast water. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, cc: Senator Claire McCaskill Senator Kit Bond Governor Jay Nixon	9/8/2009	No			MO	63126
2807	Dear Superintendent Why am I writing you? It is because the Current and Jacks Fork rivers have problems. They are part of Missouri's largest national park, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. You, other Missourians and I can help restore them and the area to the original beautiful and natural condition. You may have already received detailed information or will get it from the Missouri Parks Association so I'll not repeat that information. The National Park Service has presented three alternatives, A, B and C. to solve the problems. Friends of Ozark Riverways support alternative A that recommends management policies that are needed to solve the current deteriorating conditions and that will provide for the future. I support that same alternative A. I will appreciate your promotion and support of any legislation designed to correct current problems and provide for proper management in the future. Sincerely yours	7/29/2009	No			MO	65201
2808	Re: Comments on Current River Plan Dear Superintendent: Please consider this letter to be a strong recommendation for Proposal A. Current River should be preserved for future generations. The overuse by motorboats, jet skis, horses, dune buggies and just too many people has put a strain on this unique resource. There are plenty of places in Missouri where people can ride in high powered boats. There are plenty of places where people can get drunk and float on water in large groups. Proposal A really does not go far enough. Access and use should be limited. Current River should be preserved for our children. An expansion of use, or even maintaining the status quo, will not save Current River. Sincerely,	6/29/2009	No			MO	64131-2934
2809	RE: Planning for the Current and Jacks Fork Riverways Dear Superintendent; My wife and I have been residents of Missouri for almost 75 years. We grew up floating and enjoying the natural beauty of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We hope your new management plan will help restore and preserve these great natural assets. As a member of the Board of Directors of American Rivers (dedicated to protecting and restoring rivers), I have become acutely aware of how important it is to preserve the wild and scenic rivers of this nation. Certainly, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are worthy of this protection as valuable assets of Missouri and of this nation. We would endorse the four main recommendations for the management plan suggested by Friends of Ozark Riverways, namely: 1. Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. 2. Ban the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes in the Riverways. 3. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverways' lands so that the health of the rivers comes first. 4. Control the frequency and number of non-motorized watercraft. Thank you for protecting and preserving our natural environmental treasures. cc. Senators Kit Bond and Claire McCaskill Governor Jay Nixon Representative Russ Carnahan Senator Joan Bray Secretary Robin Carnahan	7/29/2009	No			MO	63130
2810	Dear Sir, I support Alternative A of the various alternatives for management that have been developed by the Park Service. For over 40 years! have canoed the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers and I have hiked and camped in areas close to the river. I have seen much deterioration of the area, deterioration that I do not see in many of the National Parks, which I also visit. First and foremost, I would like to see all unofficial and extraneous river access roads closed. In addition, the operation of ATVs and dirt bikes should be banned except on the legally designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. While I enjoy horses very much, the numbers of horses in the area has increased considerably, due to lots of trail rides. No question, horses adversely affect the trails and the quality of the streams. Horses should be strictly limited near the rivers. If we put all of these limits in place, we have a chance to save the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Let's do it! Best regards,	7/24/2009	No			MO	63108
2811	Dear Superintendent: I am writing on behalf of the 300 members of the River Bluffs Audubon Society in mid- Missouri. We urge the National Park Service to adopt option A and we are strongly opposed to options B and C. Many of our members have visited the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for years, and the damage to wildlife and bird habitat, stream banks, and the natural environment is apparent. In fact, it seems to be accelerating due to overcrowding and incompatible recreational uses. These conditions need to be reversed. The Board of Directors of River Bluffs Audubon is specifically interested in seeing vehicle access to the river limited. We favor restrictions on horse trails for the erosion and pollution they cause. We would like the Park Service to limit the use of recreational vehicles inside the park since they can destroy habitat and create erosion. We also urge restrictions on power boating in the Scenic Riverways since they are also disruptive to aquatic creatures and are	7/24/2009	No		River Bluffs Audubon Society	MO	65109

	incompatible with other recreational uses. Additionally, we believe the National Park Service should address the problems of overcrowding and improper visitor behavior. The Park Service must enforce regulations that require visitors to behave in a responsible manner. It must also enforce regulations that protect water quality in the scenic rivers and the natural resources of the area. If present regulations are not adequate, new ones need to be adopted. The Missouri Ozarks are a wonderful ecosystem and it is irresponsible and short-sighted to allow degradation of the rivers that are the foundation of this unique natural system. Without good water quality, many birds and other wildlife will suffer. Even tourism will decline. Already, fewer members of our chapter visit this area than in the past. We urge the National Park Service to adopt option A so the area will be attractive to people and wildlife many years from now. Sincerely,					
2812	Dear Sir, My family has enjoyed the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers for many years. We canoe there as often as possible. However, we do not go on weekends because of the noise and crowding. This letter is to give advice for the management plan for this area. There should be strong restrictions on drinking alcohol. Motorized boats should only be used as needed for emergencies and patrols. The upper stretches of the rivers should be kept as pristine as possible, with limited primitive camping only. Trucks and RV's do not belong in the river anywhere, and should have no access to the river banks. The rivers should be managed for native plants and animals. This area is a national treasure and should not be an area for parties. Canoeing, hiking and other low impact activities should be the only activities allowed.	7/21/2009	No		MO	63119
2813	I want to add some views on motorized boat travel on the Scenic Riverways. I sympathize with local concerns. The affected land once was in private ownership. I admire independence, self reliance; and having the government "off our backs." This park, however, was created decades ago. What's done is done, get on with it. There seem to be two themes for supporting motorized travel. First, the idea that motorized travel supports the economic framework for the local community. I don't see many boat dealers between Akers and Eminence. Further south, the river is larger and I have no concerns about motor boat travel south of Van Buren or even Two Rivers. The second point involves "tradition." When I began floating in the mid 60's, it was always a novelty to encounter a motorized john boat. The boat was typically a low horsepower prop driver (jet drivers weren't around) boat out fishing. Power was always reduced as they passed us "canoeists" and friendly waves were exchanged. Sometimes, while camped at night, motoring giggers would briefly stop and visit. There was no sense of animosity; everyone was considerate of one another. Now, the john boats are larger, louder, and faster. The noise destroys any sense of tranquility. The operators that reduce speed when passing canoeists are the minority. Often, the same boat will scream past multiple times while joy riding up and down the same stretch of river. I'm all for tradition but I take exception to the jet boats falling into that category. Current River and Jack's Fork are small, clear streams that deserve better than to be abused by a technological development, i.e. jet drives. Thank you,	7/11/2009	No		UN	N/A
2814	RE: Management Plan, Ozark National Scenic Riverways Dear Superintendent, I am a frequent canoe and kayak paddler on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, often camping there as well. They are, bar none, the most beautiful places in Missouri. I would love to see their condition improved and protected for the future. I agree with the Missouri Parks Association in its support of Alternative A. New rules to limit road access and unauthorized RV camping, excessive horseback riding and the e-coli pollution resulting from horse manure, power boats, load music and overcrowding are all urgently needed. I personally have been endangered by power boats while swimming (with children!) on Missouri rivers, unknowingly endangered by e-coli, and made nervous or fearful to camp on sand bars that could be accessed at night by unknown "cruisers" who could drive into our tents or perpetrate other crimes. Please favor policies that protect nature first. Users like myself will happily conform to them. Missourians who think rivers are places to get drunk and summer weekends abound with them -- have bars, swimming pools or the big fishing lakes in which to "party". Across the nation parks have rules to limit destructive and offensive behavior. Missouri rivers deserve no less. Sincerely yours, 4 C) rTh	7/29/2009	No		Missouri Parks Association/Sierra Club MO	63021
2815	Dear Sir/Madam: I am replying to the request for comments about plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. I am very concerned about what has happened and what is happening to that beautiful natural area, and am greatly in favor of a plan that limits the impact of people, severely limits the impact of horses, and completely outlaws any recreational vehicles (ATV's)! Answers to questions: 1. I choose Alternative A. CLOSE ALL ILLEGAL TRAILS! Limit or eliminate the use of motorboats!! Limit horses allowed here! Try to make the rivers natural, as they once were before so many people flooded the area! 2. Implement the parts of the plan that decreases the number of people on the rivers, and decreases the impact of people!!! 3. I think Plan A is fine, as it is written. 4. Alley Springs, Big Springs, Round Spring 5. Cut down the number of canoes and other floating devices that are allowed on the river. That will mean strong control of the commercial operators, those who rent canoes, and other devices for floating and deliver the "floaters" upstream! I would like to see the "Developed Zone" SMALL and the "Natural Zone" as LARGE as possible. My desire is to have the areas as natural as possible, with the visitors floating quietly down stream, with as little impact as possible on the environment. The floaters could stop to swim, or picnic on a sand bar, but would take ALL their trash out with them, leaving the area exactly as it was before they came!! NO IMPACT ON NATIVE ANIMALS AND PLANTS!! Sincerely yours,	6/11/2009	No		MO	63130
2816	To Whom It May Concern at the National park. Services, After reading information posted in the local newspapers concerning changes in the Current River and Jack Fork my vote is for NO CHANGE. My reasons for this decision are as follows. Firstly, I like many people in this area were either involved or can remember our parents stories form back over 340 to 40 years ago when the National Park Service decided to take farms from local families who made their livelihood from them, just to beautify this area and return it to what it once looked like. Have you seen this beautiful area lately? It is all grown up in thrones and briers. Is this what it used to look like? What about the families that were uprooted from their homes? Have you really ever given any more thought to them? I doubt it. Secondly, why should we, the locals, that live in this beautiful area surrender any or all of what is left of our few perishes rights that we have, in which one is to enjoy the Current River. I personally disagree with drinking while on the river. I also realize that there are a lot of conflicts between boaters, tubers, and canoers. I feel that drinking on the river is the majority of this problem. The river for many years has been shared between them and I feel that it can continue. Thirdly, there are several small communities that thrive off the summer tourism. There have been so many job cuts and companies closing that if the Current River and Jack's Fork	7/21/2009	No		MO	63638

	is banned from boating, tubing, and canoeing all of these little towns that are on the river will dry up. Once again my vote from all of the proposal choices is NO CHANGE. I realize that these proposals were formed by a minority group of 500 or so, in the past couple of year. The majority feels that this is ludicrous, that the National Park Service would consider making any of these changes from the minorities prospective instead of the majorities prospective. Sincerely,					
2817	I have grown up on Current River the best memories of my childhood are being on the river with family and friends. My children have also spent time on the river for their recreation. They both run a boat, fish, gig, hunt and my son also likes to trap on Current River. My daughter is 14 and my son is 20. I have always been thankful that we live here and are able to be on the river. Our vacations have always been spent on Current River. We spend the majority of our time in the gap area near Van Buren, as we live on the river in this area. I believe by limiting horse power it would ruin this area. It is already the most heavily used by tourist and boats. I think it would double or triple the amount of people through this area. This would be bad for the local economy. By putting these people in this area, it could cause a negative impact downstream. In regard to lewd behavior this is not being done by the boaters and locals. It is being done by the tourist. As long as we have our boats we can always find a place away from the tourist. During the off season the river is quiet and peaceful, and locals use the river year round for boat riding, gigging and camping. I pray the my grandchildren will also be able to enjoy the river as I have. We do not need any changes or new regulations on the Current River. It is as beautiful and clear today as it was 40 years ago. Anyone that comes to visit Current River has only to be on it to tell that it is one of the most clear and beautiful rivers to enjoy. I do not believe people are hurting the river in any way and cannot believe there are people that want change. I cannot imagine anyone that has lived in Carter county and has used the river would feel there is any need for change. The river has been used for many things for many years and has not changed for the worse in any way.	6/22/2009	No		MO	63965
2818	To Whom It May Concern: Although we moved from Missouri almost 11 years ago, we still have indelible memories of the extreme beauty of the Ozark forests and of its amazing springs and of the rivers which arise from them. When we were relative newcomers to the state, we joined more experienced "native" friends in enthusiastically endorsing the National Park System protection of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. It was thus very painful to learn that those rivers once again needed to be "saved" this time from degradation caused by careless and destructive usage. Large numbers of uncontrolled ATVs, unauthorized access points and horses are apparently the major culprits. While everyone is entitled to enjoy our natural areas, responsible use needs to be enforced by the National Park Service so that these areas will continue to be enjoyed by all in the future. Respectfully,	7/17/2009	No		MD	21218
2819	RE: Ozark National Scenic Riverways There is really nothing like the feel of the current and the opportunity to just pull over and camp on a sand bar that filled my weekends and satisfied the need for a quiet natural setting for me to relax and enjoy. I understand that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways has become a more heavily used and easily accessed park like many of our National Parks. Other parks have taken steps to control these issues and I just wanted you to know how important this little Missouri park is to me. What a gift Congress gave us when they preserved the boundary of the Current River; it is really a one-of-a-kind beauty. A fast (for our state) flowing stream, magnificent bluffs, springs, caves, clear waters and inviting sand bars. It is our Yellowstone or Yosemite, it truly is. Not just because it is a beautiful area, but because of how we can become a part of that nature in a way that is so protected and yet available due to the fact that someone came up with this unique riverways protection area idea. I wish motor vehicle access could be eliminated; that is how I remember the river. I can't even imagine that any motorized boat has any place on this riverway, this quiet, peaceful, magnificent riverway. And, I would ask that this park be given the prominent authority necessary to act to preserve and protect our Missouri treasure. The Congress was certainly in touch with the significance of this park when they declared it a National Scenic Riverway, and I hope they will recognize the need today to provide the support necessary to protect their investment and their commitment to this living park. I really love that river. Thanks,	9/8/2009	No		MO	63131
2820	Dear Superintendent: In regards to the General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I wanted to let you know my ideas as to the future of this wonderful park. I am in favor of Alternative A. I would like park managers to create conditions that recall earlier days and times along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I prefer slower-paced, family-friendly activities, as were common when I was a child in the 1960's, and my family originally started camping at Alley Springs State Park. I especially enjoy swimming and camping. I do not want motor boats on the rivers! I am very much in favor of protecting and restoring the environment and its plants and wildlife to the way it used to be. I agree with Kathleen Logan Smith, Director of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment, in her hopes for the future of the park 50 years from now, when she says, "I want the animals that live on the river to still be there. I want the springs to continue to flow. I want the water to be clear." Again, I am in favor of Alternative A. Thanks for the opportunity to state my views. Sincerely,	9/9/2009	No		MO	63144
2821	Re: Caring for The Ozark National Scenic Riverways To Whom It May Concern: It was not long ago that I was an assistant scout leader organizing a day down the Current River. Canoeing, swimming, and picnicking. Oh the organizing and preparation to get it done just right. What a special day this was going to be us all. The one issue that we did not prepare for was negotiating with the unexpected traffic on the river, i.e. ATVs and 4X4s. We had encountered a night mare! How do you prepare for that? Our day on the water was ruined. This I will not forget. I am originally from Minnesota. I moved to Missouri in 1994 with my work. I do recall the pristine waters that I had left behind. Since my arrival to Missouri, I have notice an entirely different attitude toward the preservation of its own natural resources. What a contrast to the attitude of Minnesota. Missouri has no regard for the resources that it was blessed with! The Lake of the Ozarks is a prime example. What a disaster our children will inherit. Please, please, please take into consideration the future of our grandest, irreplaceable assets that Missouri has to offer and protect them with any means that you can. This is not about you and me. It is about OUR children. Thank you.	7/24/2009	No		MO	63376

2822	RE: National Park Service's Preliminary General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Sir, Generally, I prefer Alternative A, with the following additions: -Horses and their excrement must be kept out of the Jacks Fork River. If that means banning horses, so be it. - Outboard motors due to noise, pollution and hazards should be prohibited on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. -There is little doubt that the sheer numbers of floaters canoe, kayak, tube and raft is having a negative effect on the aquatic resources of the Current River. The number of canoes, and canoeists, must be limited. The No Action alternative would "lock in place" current detrimental activities and practices. Alternative C would simply add to existing problems. Alternative B encompasses the worst aspects of Alternative C but in a more incremental fashion. Sincerely,	7/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2823	Dear Sir: We are writing to comment on the current situation and National Park Service management plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways -- specifically the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. The Current and Jack's Fork have historically been among America's finest free-flowing river resources. We spent many hours floating them. Sadly, we have not floated the rivers for a number of years now because of the physical degradation and pollution that has been allowed and also because of the numbers and behaviors of those using them. All of this has come about because of non-enforcement of the original rules and regulations outlined when the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established. We strongly urge the National Park Service to shut down the illegal accesses and uses of these beautiful rivers and restore them to the state which was originally intended. We understand that this will take political courage and be difficult to reverse and that there will be much screaming from those who have been allowed to abuse and misuse them for many years. But the longer it is delayed, the harder it will be to accomplish. "Alternative A" among your current proposed management plans comes closest to the original purposes and vision as established by Congress in 1964. These rivers are a unit of our great national park system. Please -- treat them as the treasures that they are. Sincerely, Copies: Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, Governor Jay Nixon, Representative Blaine Luetkemeyer	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2824	I have lived in Shannon County my entire 59 years of life. I have camped, fished and did boat riding up & down the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers for recreation. I don't think horse power needs to change & let it stay as is from Alley Springs to Two Rivers and from Round Springs down the Current River as a 40 HP at jet unit. I was camped at Two Rivers a few years ago with my family. One evening late some tourist came by wanting me to take my jet boat up Jacks Fork River to find & rescue a woman that had been with their group earlier in the day. She had gotten into an argument with another one of their group & decided to "get out" of the canoe she had been riding in. They were now concerned because it was almost dark & the woman just was wearing a swimsuit & it was beginning to get chilly now that the sun was going down. I wasn't too crazy about taking my brand new \$8,000.00 outfit up a river especially after dark & take a chance on knocking a hole in it. But I fixed up a light & went looking for her anyway. I did find her sitting on a bank crying, cold & scared to death. I didn't ask for pay but volunteered taking a risk of tearing up my own jet boat. I didn't see any N.P.S. Ranger coming to the rescue. I pay taxes, same as tourist so why stop me from running 40HP jet boat for fishing and family recreation. People need to be polite to each other. I've helped more than one canoeist. I have rescued coolers and personal items floating for people that have turned their canoes over. Local people take their trash to dumpsters, canoeist dumps trash in the rivers. I see beer and liquor being more of a problem than anything else. I see canoeist float into public landings instead of walking to restrooms & use the gravel bar for a restroom no matter who is there. Where is the N.P.S. Rangers in the evening when time of floaters arriving. I've seen N.P.S. Rangers run jet boats right through canoes not being polite or courteous. I don't recall any jet boats ever wrecking or crashing into canoes in my 59 years. Leave everything as is on Riverways. When O.N.S.R started they put a limit on the amount of canoes each canoe vendor could rent. What about all the tubes & rafts that create an overflow on the rivers, plus, over the years not thinking about more and more private canoes and tubes. I don't think NPS needs to close any roads or trails, landings that have been around forever. Hire more seasonal NPS Rangers to help in controlling the rivers instead of riding in air conditioned vehicles. One other suggestion I may add that I think might help, is to put informational brochure in all canoe rental and campgrounds about how jet boats have to run faster in shallow water. Maybe then they would be more understanding of the jet boaters. Thank you,	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
2825	Dear Mr. Detring: The following are comments on behalf of the St Louis Audubon Society regarding the preliminary alternatives for the Om& National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. The St. Louis Audubon Society has over 3,000 members in the greater St. Louis area. We are a local affiliate of the National Audubon Society whose mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, primarily birds and other wildlife and their habitats, for the benefit of humanity and the earth's biological diversity. We commend the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for its decision to review its management practices. The increased pressure of horses, mechanical vehicles, easement issues and lack of funding for enforcement is threatening the water quality and overall integrity of this superbly featured region. Many of our Missouri natural areas have been studied for bird habitat and conservation recommendations. The Riverways is within the Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA). This is one of 47 IBA's in the state, and is exceptional because it is one of the largest IBA's and overlaps with two of Missouri Department of Conservation's designated Conservation Opportunity Areas (COA). Since IBA's are important for migrating and breeding birds, the St Louis Audubon Society and other Audubon affiliates hope to assure that conservation goals for these areas are met. Of the general management proposals for ONSR, the St. Louis Audubon Society recommends Alternative A, opposing Alternatives B and C. Because of the conflicting nature of many of the current activities that are degrading the stream banks and water quality, firm action is definitely in order. We support stronger management with regard to access enforcement and habitat restoration. We oppose increased recreational use and development, particularly in the areas that ONSR states are to be preserved in an unimpaired condition. We agree with a policy to further restrict motorized watercraft, all-terrain vehicles, horse volumes and unauthorized access points. We support the proposal for wilderness designation of the Big Spring section. The enjoyment, beauty and benefit of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be dependent on it remaining as natural, undeveloped, remote and wildlife-diverse as possible. Sincerely,	8/4/2009	No		St. Louis Audubon Society	MO	63122

2826	Dear Sir: As a longtime friend of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and a member of an organization that fought for the preservation in the 1960's of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I am in favor of a management plan for the ONSR that achieves the following: * Substantially decreases the number of access points and close illegally developed roads/trails * Limits motorized vehicles to official roads and bans ATVs * Reduces motorboat horsepower size and limits usage areas for motorboats. Five horsepower is large enough for fishing and moving about while not disturbing wildlife and others enjoying peace and quiet of the outdoors. Motors not allowed in primitive areas. * Enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest-clearing violations and illegal gravel mining. * Limits numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and restriction of swimming due to E. Coli contamination * Designates the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area * Monitors and restores ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, riparian zones and native forest habitat * Reaffirms priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. I am strongly against the following: * Commercial operations and development that has any negative impact on the Current or Jacks Fork and tributaries Sincerely,	8/6/2009	No			KS	66206
2827	Re: Ozark Riverways There are key threats facing the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers. The National Park Service's process to develop a new General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should include the following provisions: Permanently close all unofficial and extraneous river access roads. This policy would help maintain important riparian habitat and help keep the rivers clean. Ban the operations of ATV's and dirt bikes in the Riverways except on the legally-designated state and country roads within the boundaries of the park. Improve management of horse trail riding on Riverway's lands so that the river's health comes first. Control the frequency and number of non motorized watercraft (canoes, rafts, tubes, etc.) on the rivers to alleviate crowding caused by large clusters of these watercraft closely spaced at the same time. As an avid outdoors person with children who also enjoy the rivers, my family and I want you to be aware of how important this resource is to our present and future. Many thanks for your consideration,	8/3/2009	No			UN	N/A
2828	1)The best alternative presented is the No-Action. This alternative is most near my ideal of the best management of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers and the surrounding land. Ideally the management agency would contribute in a meaningful way to the area school districts in as much as the poverty of the area is directly connected to the holding of the profitable land by the federal government and no taxes are then created. Payment in lieu of taxes is a pitiful program that is historically underfunded and even un-funded by Congress. 2)Management of the high traffic area from Waymeyer to the bridge in Van Buren should reflect intelligent, creative planning and distribution of all types of watercraft from inner tubes, kayaks,raft and john boats. 3)The concept of creating another Wilderness area in the region is wildly misguided. A wilderness area is readily available for those who seek such serenity in the nearby Irish Wilderness. The misguided creation of such an area would further delete what meager resources the community currently derives from visitors. Travelers have the luxury of visiting the area and relishing in it's untouched splendor and tranquility before returning to their own communities filled with modern schools, roads and services blithely unaware that a community impoverished by the existence of such beautiful surroundings struggles through four seasons each year attempting to provide the most basis services of protection and education to it's members. 4) The mile long stretch of the Current from Pin Oak Bluff to Rector Chute belonged to my family before smooth talking bureaucrats threatened them into surrendering the heart of the cherished family farm to the National Park Service for the creation of the river ways. Words fail to convey the meaning that stretch of the River holds for our family. It may be yours on paper but it will always remain ours in our hearts as it has been this past 100 years and shall remain so into the future so long as the river shall run. 5) Other national parks and areas of recreation exist through out our country that share and support their local community. Our family has visited many parks and seen communities flourish as visitors seek solace in their beautiful places. Provision must be put in place providing resources and opportunity that in some small way off sets the burden of the mixed blessing of having beauty worthy of preserving as your home town.	7/27/2009	No		The Dazey Ranch	MO	63965
2829	Dear Superintendent: I urge you to adopt option A as the new management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In my opinion, this unique area of Missouri is in danger of being irreparably (Imaged unless the prevailing conditions are reversed. ONSR is overcrowded, habitat is being recklessly destroyed and the behavior of many of the visitors is completely irresponsible. Additionally, the use of recreational vehicles and power boats must be restricted. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of a kind and preserving it should be a top priority of Missourians and the National Park Service. Please adopt option A.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65109
2830	Dear Mr. Detring, The Ellington Chamber of Commerce would like to take this opportunity to lend support to the "No Action" alternative being proposed to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. For many years, the Chamber has prided itself on the natural beauties here in the heart of the Ozarks. We have been instrumental in promoting the area and inviting visitors to explore and experience these awesome wonders. Visitors get the opportunity to sample the simple, laid back way of life that we are so fortunate to enjoy and in return our community experiences a substantial positive economic impact. It truly is a win-win situation. Having reviewed Alternatives "A", "B" and "C" being proposed by the ONSR, the Chamber is deeply concerned that these changes and restrictions will discourage visitors and invite situations that could otherwise be avoided. In addition, it goes without saying that the economic impact would be detrimental, thus resulting in a no-win situation. The Chamber's concern is not only for that of visitors and the economic impact these alternatives would have on our small community, but also for local residents. Current River is a way of life here, families have been raised along the banks of the Current River for generations and to restrict this part of the local heritage would be tragic. We ask that you please consider the "No Action' alternative. The riverways are a form of recreation that anyone in any tax bracket can enjoy. It would be a complete injustice to place restrictions on their usage as they are agreeably some of the most beautiful natural wonders that exist. We hope that this matter will be given serious consideration and that "No Action" will be taken. Sincerely, CC JC Kuessner,15nd State Representative Senator Kevin Engler Senator Christopher Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Jo Ann Emerson, 8th District Representative Van Huizen, National Park Service	7/3/2009	No		Ellington Chamber of Commerce	MO	63638

2831	Dear Superintendent, This letter is about the GMP - I am a member of the Stream Team so I care VERY much about the health of our wonderful waterways. To start I think every river in Missouri should have the protection that the Current & Jacks Fork has, like no beer bong, Jell-O shots, beads, etc. etc. I also think that "NO GLASS" should be enforced - maybe the outfitters could say it when people are on the bus. I also think that there should not be ANY jet boats on ANY rivers that are floated by canoe or kayak. It erodes the banks of the rivers and only 2 jet boats in the past 20 yrs that I have been floating have throttled down for canoes, kayaks or swimmers. But if it stays the same then you should lower the horsepower limit. I also think that if anyone has a personal boat, canoe or kayak they should have to pay a small fee to be able to use the rivers, the outfitters have to don't they? Collect the money when you buy and/or register your ski boat, pontoon, canoe, kayak, etc. In turn that would create revenue to pay for more water patrol which I think we need a lot more of. If you have coin operated showers there would be no wasted water and the money would help maintain them. I don't think that there should be more ATV or horse trails, there are enough! I have been on both sides of this coin, 25 yrs ago I went to my 1st CCTR there were about 300 horses there and the trail rides were 3 to 4 times a year. Now there are 3000 to 4000 horses every weekend. Can you tell me how that many horses crossing the rivers don't hurt the river? How could it not? Everyone that I have seen on horse back has a beer can in their hand and a cooler strapped on the horse I know it wasn't like that 25 yrs ago also were are all those beer cans? Did they really take them back out with them? So I know my letter said nothing about A, B, C or "no action" but I hope you will count it. Please keep the rivers protected and clean so that our kids, kids can enjoy the beauty! "ONSR finest canoeing rivers in the Midwest" lets keep it that way!! Thank you for your time	6/20/2009	No			MO	63129
2832	Dear Superintendent Detring: I am writing about the Current River and the Jack's Fork. Motorboats should be kept off these rivers. The noise disturbs the enjoyment of nature and the waves can turn over canoes. Besides there must be better law enforcement to keep people on the regular roads and at the regular access spots so the area isn't degraded. Trail rides with horses need to be kept to a small number in each ride Off-road vehicles should be kept out of the park. If nothing is done, we won't have a scenic riverway, only a junked-up mess. Thank you for your attention to this. Sincerely,	9/11/2009	No			MO	65775
2833	Dear Mr. Detring: I have canoed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers for nearly forty years. In the 1970s, the rivers were much closer to being authentic wilderness than they are today. I recall being able to float the 18 miles from Round Spring to Two Rivers while passing only one access point, Jerktail Landing. A float on the Current was the perfect way for a Missourian to savor God's creation and truly get away from it all. Nowadays, one cannot float the rivers without wondering when one is going to be visited by a motorhead on an ATV or a team of horses eroding the riverbanks. The wilderness is disappearing under the nose of the National Park Service. I implore you to preserve these rivers in their natural states to the fullest extent of your powers, so that future generations can be inspired by their awesome quietness and profound scenic beauty. Sincerely,	9/10/2009	No			MO	63021
2834	To: Reed Dietring, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Rivers P.O. Box Copies to Senator Kit Bond, Senator Claire McCaskill, Governor Jay Nixon Mr. Dietring, I now live in Columbia but I used to live near the Current River in Southern Missouri. I know the local people and I understand that they feel that they should be allowed to use the river in the ways that they want. However, it is not always the locals that bring motorized boats and build illegally on the banks. It is often people from outside the area who take advantage of the rules not being enforced. However, this is not about who owns the river. This is about preserving the life of that river. If it continues to be misused, it will no longer be a beautiful spot for any of us. -We need to eliminate illegal wildcat motor access. -Motorized vehicles should not be allowed off legal roads. Otherwise, campsite and gravel bars will be ruined and the wilderness destroyed. -Commercial trail rides must be controlled in numbers and locations. Horses tend to tear up trails and cause erosion and pollution. -Motorized boats, especially jet boats, need to be more strictly controlled. -We need to qualify the wild lands in the backcountry hills near Big Spring as a wilderness. We need to propose to Congress that it is protected. Please Save the Current River, again. It is a state and national treasure. Sincerely,	9/10/2009	No			MO	65202
2835	Dear Superintendent. When congress established the Ozark National Scenic Riverway it was with the understanding that it would provide for uses and enjoyment for outdoor recreational opportunities consistent with the preservation of those natural resources and the river themselves. Preservation is the key word in this statement; it is the letter and the spirit of what National Parks is all about. As an ardent conservationist I also work hard to preserve nature, especially the Ozarks, which I call home. Everyone loves a float trip and the camping experience along the river overnight can be a life time of memories, no place for ATV's, jet boats, loud noise, and other unwelcome human pastimes. My family and thousands like us love and respect the Ozarks especially those really unique places like Montauk Springs, Alley Springs, Round Springs, Big Springs, Owl's Bend, etc, etc, etc. To think that National Parks management would even consider allowing off-road, loud, polluting ATV vehicles is beyond my comprehension. Let America have fun while enjoying our great rivers and all they have to offer, but keep it limited to the rivers Protecting this natural wonder including the rivers bank and shore lines with their natural and unique karst topography and most of all the wildlife and plants that call the Ozark National Scenic Riverway home must be your first priority. As past president of the Audubon Society of Missouri I am very knowledgeable of the many species of birds and other wildlife that call the Ozark National Scenic Riverway home, I have birded the park many times over the past twenty years and know it well. Species like the declining in number Cerulean Warbler and the almost impossible to locate due to habitat destruction Swainson's Warbler both find refuge along the scenic riverways as do many other birds including the Bald Eagle and Osprey which are both nesting on the high bluffs above the rivers. Remember, we are guest in nature's home, let's treat our host with respect. Keep it natural, keep it beautiful. Respectfully yours in conservation. Cc. Senators Bond and McCaskill	9/9/2009	No			MO	65401
2836	Dear Sir, As an Eagle Scout and a member of the Boy Scouts of America for most of my life, I have enjoyed and appreciated the great outdoors. In the early 1970's I was introduced to the natural, free flowing, quiet and pure waters of the Current River and the Jacks Fork. I enjoyed many a float including a 95 mile float from Montauk to Big Spring which took 5 days. In those days, there were few canoes and plenty of places to camp on quiet gravel bars. Unfortunately, the river system is in crisis today. I urge those who can affect change to limit the number of horses who are	7/31/2009	No			MO	63050

	polluting the river, to eliminate all unauthorized access points which are polluting the river, to restrict motor boating to below Big Spring and to limit the number of canoes which can be rented on the rivers. We have a national treasure here in Missouri. Let us keep it natural and open for those who enjoy the solitude and purity of the great outdoors. Yours very truly, cc: Senator Kit Bond Governor jay Nixon Senator Claire McCaskill						
2837	Dear Superintendent Detring: I am writing to express my concerns and suggestions regarding the Park Service's future General Management Plan for Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Ozark Riverways is truly a National Park in crisis, enduring numerous assaults: overdevelopment, off-road vehicle trespassing, huge motor and jet boats, illegal roads, uncontrolled trail ride exploitation, and general overcrowding and abuse. As a result, wildlife has suffered and been depleted, vegetation is uprooted, banks are eroded, and the waters polluted. As you formulate a General Management Plan, please keep in mind: -ATVs and ORVs should not be permitted at all. -Vehicles of any sort should be allowed only on legally designated roads. -Commercial trail rides should be strictly controlled both in number and location. -Motor boats, especially jet boats, must be very strictly controlled; the best scenario would be to allow no motorized boats at all. -The Big Spring remnant wilderness qualifies for the Wilderness System; the Park Service should propose this to Congress. This area deserves the greatest protection. Again, I strongly urge you to protect the Current and Jacks Fork. This National Scenic Riverways provides a home for flora and fauna, members of the Earth community deserving adequate and safe habitat. The river itself deserves to run free and clean, respected and cared for by humans, who are only "one strand on the web of life." Sincerely, Cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Representative Russ Carnahan Governor Jay Nixon	6/26/2009	No		School Sisters of Norte Dame	MO	63125-2897
2838	Dear Mr. Detring: I appreciate this opportunity to respond to the alternatives proposed for a new General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We have friends who own property in Shannon County on the Jacks Fork River, and we have visited and enjoyed their "paradise" many times. I'll be brief. Please do NOT implement the provision within Alternative C that would allow boats with 25 MPH motors to operate on the river, not even seasonally. Such motorized traffic would introduce disruptive mechanical noise to human and other nearby inhabitants; erode fragile river banks; result in a loss of habitat; reduce populations of amphibians, fish, insects, birds, and mammals that live and feed on the banks and neighboring land; introduce pollutants such as motor oils to the river. Please keep motorized traffic off this section of the Jacks Fork River. Thank you. Sincerely,	6/30/2009	No			MO	63117
2839	My first visit to the Ozark National Scenic Riverway was in 1971. I went on an organized trip with a group of UMSL students to float the Current River from Akres Ferry. I didn't know how to paddle a canoe and almost drowned when we tipped our canoe and got pinned between it and a downed tree. My fear vanished as I fell in love with the crystal clear water, the tree topped bluffs, and beautiful bubbling springs. I have been back to the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers many times. Each an interesting adventure making many pleasant memories. The degradation of the river banks is very distressing. People have found too many ways to drive down to the river. The noise of the ATVs and cars and the clouding of the water from the erosion should not be allowed. Silence is an important part of the experience. Motorized boats should not be allowed in the entire scenic river way. More of the area surrounding the rivers should be wilderness like. I am not opposed to horses as a form of nonmotorized transportation but these large beasts need to be restrained from polluting the river. If the only way to do this is eliminate them then it should be done. These rivers are true gems and should be treated this way. When we travel and people from other states ask us what is special in Missouri I always start by telling them about these rivers. Please return our rivers to a wild scenic riverway worthy of this recommendation.	9/11/2009	No			MO	63143
2840	Subject From NPS.gov: Public hearings on Ozark Nat'l Riverway My family of four no longer float the rivers out of Steeleville due to the excessive use of 'john boats'. I commend you for your efforts in cutting back on the wild parties, I'm told by friends that things have gotten much better. It is my understanding that some of these folks want to fish. With the numerous ramps along the river there is no need for engines that provide them with such speed to get from point A to point B. Most that we have seen don't even have fishing gear.	6/22/2009	No			UN	N/A
2841	Re: comment on new management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways There are too many access points on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, which causes the rivers to be overdeveloped, lowering the quality of the rivers. Off-road vehicles are illegally trespassing, degrading the rivers and destroying the quiet. The National Park Service needs to stop ignoring easement violations. Commercial horseback riding, resulting in horse manure and urine, degrades the streams and needs to be reduced. The Big Spring Wilderness area should be protected to support it's recognition as wilderness by Congress. We need our National Park Service to truly protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for our and future generations. Sincerely, cc: Senator Kit Bond Senator Claire McCaskill Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer	6/19/2009	No			MO	65203
2842	The abuse and consequent degradation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is disheartening. Please take every step that you can to continue the policies and practices that will sustain this natural resource, including: -Substantially decrease the number of access points and illegally developed roads/trails -Limit motorized vehicles to official roads -Ban ATVs -Reduce motorboat HP size and limit usage areas for motorboats -Enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest clearing violations -Limit numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and swimming restricted due to e coli contamination -Designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area -Monitor and restore ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat -Reaffirm priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations Thank you for your consideration, dedication, and diligence. Sincerely	7/20/2009	No			KS	66208
2843	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: All--No Road Closings - No Action Response to Question 5: No Road Closings - No Horsepower Restrictions	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466

2844	Response to Question 1: None. All alternatives farther restrict h.p. with no evidence that current restrictions have helped/hurt the river. Leave the boaters alone. They provide a valuable service for trash pick-up, rescue of tubers and canoers etc. Response to Question 2: Your need to regulate has nothing to do with improving my recreation. Leave us alone. Response to Question 3: All those that restrict me from enjoying the river. You do not need to restrict our actions you need to involve us with caring for our river. Response to Question 4: We use from Weymeyer to Two Rivers because of access and less tubes/canoes to contend with, however I do not want more restrictions for them or us. Response to Question 5: Why don't you get us to help you instead of making us feel like unwanted visitors to our river	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
2845	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION. Response to Question 2: IN ALTERNATIVE A, IT IS STATED THAT THE PARK WOULD CLOSE ROADS AND TRAILS THAT HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED ILLEGALLY. IF THEY ARE ILLEGAL, SHOULD THEY NOT BE CLOSED ALREADY? Response to Question 3: THE TOTAL ELIMINATION OF BOATS WITH MOTORS EXCEEDING 40 HP. OUT OF 134 MILES, THERE SHOULD BE SOME PLACE FOR BOATERS IN THIS GROUP. Response to Question 4: VAN BUREN AREA. THE DIFFERENCE IN THE CHARACTER OF THE RIVER NATURALLY SHAPES THE USAGE FOR BOATING, FISHING, HUNTING, ETC. TECHNOLOGY, NOT NATURE, CHANGED PEOPLE'S USE OF THE RIVER. IT IS NOT REALISTIC TO FORCE THEM BACK. Response to Question 5: MANAGE FOR THE BENEFIT OF EVERY INTERST. DIVIDE THE 134 MILES INTO STAGES TO ACCOMODATE ALL. FOR EXAMPLE, BUILD A BOAT RAMP AT THE UPPER END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO ALLOW BOAT ACCESS ABOVE THE GAP, WHICH IS HEAVILY USED BY FLOATERS.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
2846	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: Wilderness Designations Scenic Easements	8/4/2009	No			IL	62278
2847	Response to Question 1: No action. I feel more restrictions will only limit the enjoyment of the ONSR. Response to Question 2: The ability to run 40 hp (at the jet) boats on Current River. Response to Question 3: The downsizing of boat motor size. Response to Question 4: From Round Springs south to Loy Yard. I feel limiting motor size will only be a detriment to our rivers. Response to Question 5: Increase law enforcement to limit boater/floater conflict. Allow local residents to use the river as they have in the past.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
2848	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: We run our boats from Powder Mill down to Van Buren and the no-action is the alternative that is best alternative. A family could not safely run with a limitation of 25 hp. Response to Question 5: Current river is a place to see, anyone that comes to the area, we take to Blue Springs, Big Springs and for rides on the river to see the beautiful scenery. We take pride in the river by picking up the trash and making it a nice place to go and enjoy.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
2849	Response to Question 1: No Action! Lift Moter Restrictions Response to Question 2: No Action! Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: All 134 miles No Action Leave us Alone! Response to Question 5: Rate HP. At the Pump	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
2850	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: Current River Response to Question 5: Take the horsepower restriction off the boat motors	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
2851	Response to Question 1: No Action Left Moter Restrictions Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B and C. Response to Question 4: All 134 Miles No Action Response to Question 5: Rate H.P. At the Pump	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
2852	Response to Question 1: A. Expand primitive areas & prohibitions of motorized water craft Response to Question 2: See above in #1. Any and all prohibition possible on flotilla's of canoes full of drunk, screaming people. Response to Question 3: Status quo & any alternative that allows or increases use by horses, motirized vehicles, and large contingents of floaters. Response to Question 5: Ban from using area if arrested & convicted of DUI, DWI, or drugs, etc. Same for other criminal behavior relating to destruction of area or rowdiness on river.	7/1/2009	No			MO	Unknown
2853	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Keep boat motor size and usage areas the same. If your not going to allow 4x4's and ATV's to cross the River Don't Let the Horse's! Response to Question 3: Restricting usage and access Response to Question 4: I use the area between Montauk and Two Rivers. The motor size change would hurt me. I would like to keep my motor the way it is now 40 HP At the pump Response to Question 5: Get rid of all the horse's! Trucks, Jeeps, 4wheelers etc. can't cross the river anymore so don't let the horses. I have camped and floated the current river for almost 20 years and have had more problems with people on horses than anyone else.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2854	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Retrict usage & access Response to Question 4: We love taking our boat out with the family & wwe want to continue doing so wihtout Restrictions! (We have a 40 HP At The Pump) Response to Question 5: Better sanitation services - debris removal and more restrooms	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2855	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & access. Response to Question 3: Restrict Usage & Access. Response to Question 4: No certain areas of concern, just concerned of too many restrictions. Response to Question 5: mile markers & public facilities @ more locations.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2856	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict usage & Access Response to Question 4: Concerns would be the restrictions: some of which will limit my primary activities such as motor use, etc. Response to Question 5: Continuing to update/maintain restroom facilities, etc.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560

2857	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free access and usage Response to Question 3: Restriction of access and usage. Response to Question 4: I would like 40 hp motors to continue to be allowed. Response to Question 5: Additional restrooms.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2858	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access. Response to Question 3: Restrict usage & access. Response to Question 4: Usage of my motor (40 HP at the pump) is very important to me and I would like to continue. Response to Question 5: More trash cans & restroom facilities.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2859	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE Response to Question 2: FREE ACCESS Response to Question 3: RESTIRCT USAGE & ACCESS Response to Question 4: I WANT MY JET BOAT	7/1/2009	No			MO	65559
2860	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict Usage of Access Response to Question 4: I would still like to enjoy boatridding with 40 hp. Response to Question 5: More trash cans, picnic tables & restrooms.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2861	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict Usage & Access Response to Question 4: I want to continue to use my motor I have now which is 40 HP Response to Question 5: picnic tables	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2862	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restriction of Usage & Access Response to Question 4: People who own boats with a 40 HP motor should be able to enjoy the river also. Response to Question 5: More trashcans & rest rooms would be very helpful.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65542
2863	Response to Question 1: No Action Leav it Alone	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937-9414
2864	Response to Question 1: No Action Ratings at the jet 40 HP Response to Question 2: No Action Ratings at the jet 40 HP Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C Response to Question 4: No action with ratings at the Jet are the best Response to Question 5: Ramps, Roads, Bathrooms at Camp sites	7/1/2009	No			MO	63637
2865	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Do not Limil access Response to Question 3: Limiting public access Response to Question 4: Dont have a special place, all nature is special we just need to in force the laws we have now, and keep the drug users out growing pot and making meth. Response to Question 5: I think people should just be carefull and not destroy the grounds, and pick up after each other, let mother nature take care of her self.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
2866	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: upper and lower log yard Response to Question 4: No aciton, boats and H.P. limit should not be reduced. Response to Question 5: should be no change	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
2867	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action because we as local People would like to use the river as in the Past, such as fishing & hunting. Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Yes, Powder Mill to logyard, but we want to be able to enjoy other parts as well, there is only one Alternative that as someone who enjoys the river & surrounding Propertie can address is the No-Action.	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2868	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action - we the local people would like to use the river as we have in the past and our families before us. For fishing and enjoying our surroundings. Response to Question 3: A, B & C	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2869	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: We take extra gas with us we put in at the 40 hp limit sign and boat all the way to Arkansas at least once a year we start early and it takes all day to do it but it's a tradition I don't want to lose Response to Question 5: Better ramp access points	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2870	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION: I do not think the ONSR should regulate any motorized limitations on the Current River. At anytime. The people that live by or hear the river are the people that work to keep our rivers clean of pollution. Response to Question 2: Keep all roads & trails open to public. Do not restrict or remove any public use of our rivers. The ONSR should clean out roads & rivers from any debri from blocking the rivers & roads. Response to Question 3: No limits on public access to our roads going to the rivers. I strongly do not want any restricts on motor limitations to Current river. Response to Question 4: The Current & Jack's Fork Rivers mean a great deal to me & my family. I have always enjoyed going to the river in our boat & floating. Please choose the No-Action Plan so me & my kids will continue to enjoy the rivers Response to Question 5: Don't take away our rights to enjoy what the local people do by using trails & roads. Don't make any limitation for motorized boats. If people are breaking laws then ticket them.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438

2871	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. PROVIDE MORE RESOURCES & ACCESSES FOR RECREATIONISTS. Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS. Response to Question 3: RESTRICTED RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS. Response to Question 4: I USE THE UPPER CURRENT AREA, AND WANT IT TO REMAIN FREE FOR RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS. (BAPTIST CAMP TO ROUND SPRING) Response to Question 5: PROVIDE RESTROOM FACILITIES WHERE FEASIBLE.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2872	Response to Question 1: No action to provide more resources to take care of the people Response to Question 2: free recreational and access usage Response to Question 3: do not limit anything other than what they are. Response to Question 4: I like to be able to get in my 60/40 motor pump go up the river to the mouth of big creek and sit and talk with people or play games like washers or horseshoes Response to Question 5: Keep the restrooms accessible and noticeable also the landings. Also keep the roads clear and kept up where people can drive on them without problems.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2873	Response to Question 1: I feel that the No Action plan is the best way to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I enjoy being able to swim, hike, fish, gig, camp, float and canoe the river. I do NOT believe that there need to be more restrictions on my use of the area. Response to Question 2: I feel that I should have unlimited access & recreational use of the area. As a 51 year old widow, my being able to drive my Jeep, bike, hike are rights I do not wish to be denied. My 81 year old father should be able to continue trot lining & limb lining on the river he loves. Response to Question 3: No further restrictions should be included. My father at 80 would not have the strength to canoe, but he can motor his 25 HP boat. Single females, such as myself, already have difficulties enjoying nature without having rights & access further limiting us. Response to Question 4: All of Current River is dear to my heart. I feel that all of us that enjoy her natural beauty should not have any further limits or restrictions to access or recreational use. Some of us are limited physically to enjoy the river if motorized vehicle usage is taken away. Please continue to let me enjoy my love! Response to Question 5: Education, education, education! Teach our youngsters to appreciate nature by having nature centers in the park. Use park resources to go to schools, plan activities (such as the ones at Sam A. Baker to help clean up the park. Help the people from metropolitan areas respect the area--which may mean limiting alcohol use instead of HP. Alcohol use contributes to the trash that I have picked up and the floaters/canoers that my friends (boaters) have rescued from logs, jams, etc.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
2874	Response to Question 1: The choice closest to my idea would be No-Action or Plan C. I do not see need for horsepower above 40 HP anywhere on Current River. Anything above a 40 HP is unnecessary to navigate the river. Response to Question 2: I feel strongly that alternatives should allow the public the right to enjoy the riverways in the many variety of ways that are traditional and part of the heritage. -- boating, floating, camping, picnicing Response to Question 3: I feel strongly alternatives should not restrict the use of motorized transportation. Boaters should be allowed to enjoy the riverways as well as canoers or tubers. Horsepower limits below 40 HP should NOT be included. Response to Question 4: Asking someone that truly loves this river and area to name one particular place that is special demeans the deep feelings associated with Current River. My ability to hike, boat, canoe, float, fish, gig or just "breathe in" the beauty of the river is a privilege and right that I do not wish to be restricted further! Response to Question 5: An approach to protect resources and improve visitor experiences would be to limit alcohol more than HP. More accidents, trash, foul language, public urination, fights, etc. are created due to alcohol use than any other item.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
2875	Response to Question 1: I feel that no action should be taken in regulating or changing the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is already a great place for all kinds of recreation and adding regulations or changing the way it is managed would only hamper the way we use it. Response to Question 2: Free recreational areas such as boat ramps should be included in the future. Response to Question 3: Restricting or limiting any type of usage of any of the national riverways. Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Two Rivers. There are already an overabundance of restrictions and regulations. There is no need to change anything that would be more restrictive. Response to Question 5: Add toilets and other conveniences so that people enjoy their visit even more. Do more wildlife management such as food plots, more enriched hunting/fishing areas. Continue to allow motorized boats rated at 40 horsepower rated at the output shaft.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2876	Response to Question 1: No Action Provide more Resources for People who use the River Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: We go to Round Spring and Below at Different Accesses with 40 H.P. Boat Response to Question 5: We go to the River with 4 - people and Need 40 H.P. at output shaft to go	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2877	Response to Question 1: No Action.. Provide more Resources Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage and Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage and Access Response to Question 4: Cedar Grove, Flying @, Akers and All the roads connecting them.. I run my Jet Boat From Round Spring and I Haul my Family, I need my 40 h.p. to Be rated at the Jet.. Response to Question 5: Add more facilities, Boat Ramps, Bathrooms, Keep trails and Roads open.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2878	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational use and access to the river Response to Question 3: restricted use and access Response to Question 4: Pretty much all areas are special. I love going to Big Creek and the Taylor hole where our cabin is. Driving and riding in jet boats every weekend of the summer. Response to Question 5: Keep power at the pump on motorboats	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2879	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage and access Response to Question 3: Don't limit or change anything Response to Question 4: We unload our boat at Round Spings and we run down with our 40 hp. We always have a few family members ride with us and if the hp limit gets changed a smaller hp motor will not Push the weight of my family. Response to Question 5: all accesses to river stay open we enjoy riding several people in a boat and we need to keep 40 hp at Jet	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2880	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE PROVIDE MORE RESOURCES FOR THE AMOUNT OF RECREATIONISTS THAT USE THE RIVERWAYS NOW. Response to Question 2: KEEP OPEN ACCESS FOR RECREATION Response to Question 3: RESTRICTED ACCESS AND RESTRICTED RECREATION OPTIONS. Response to Question 4: THE UPPER RIVER IS MY FAVORITE PART. BEING CLOSE TO HOME, I CAN GO DOWN FOR THE EVENING AND FISH OR JUST HANG OUT. THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE BEST	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560

	ADDRESSES THIS ADEQUATELY Response to Question 5: PIT TOILETS AT SEVERAL PLACES FOR FLOATERS AT FLYING 2, WALTER LIPPS, AND OTHER PLACES PEOPLE STOP AT.						
2881	Response to Question 1: No-Action Leave 40 hp @ the Jet pump Response to Question 2: Free recreational use & Access to the River. Response to Question 3: Restricted use & Access to the river Response to Question 4: The whole 134 miles Response to Question 5: Leave it as it is don't change anything. Keep all roads open. My Father in-law is unable to walk to his favorit spots on the river.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2882	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION (Keep it the same) Provide more resources to take care of the people that use the Riverway Response to Question 2: Free use and access to the riverway Response to Question 3: Any restrictions to usage and access to the river. Response to Question 4: I think it's important to have nice access areas to load & unload the jet boats. I'm more interested in the Round Spring Area. I want to be able to use my motor which is a 40 HP at the output shaft. Response to Question 5: You need to have adequate restroom facilities at various points along the river with signs on the river saying so.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2883	Response to Question 1: No Action Better access into the river Response to Question 2: Free recrecational usage and access Response to Question 3: Don't limit or change any thing Response to Question 4: I don't want to see bluff acsess shut down and camping Response to Question 5: Better Road's into the river's	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2884	Response to Question 1: No Action Provide more resources for people that use them Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access Response to Question 4: I like to take my 40 horse motorboat to the Round Spring access & boat ride all day and all other accesses below that point with at least a 40 hp. Response to Question 5: We need the rating of 40 hp at the pump so we can carry a load of people or our family up river	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2885	Response to Question 1: No action Provide more resources for people that use them Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access Response to Question 4: I like to take my 40 Horse to Round Spring and boat ride all day plus all other accesses below that point with at least a 40 Horsepower. Response to Question 5: We want the rating of 40 hp to be at the output shaft because we want to be able to carry 4 or 5 people or a family upriver.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2886	Response to Question 1: No action rate horse power at pump Response to Question 2: No atcion Response to Question 3: No atcion Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: more roads and access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2887	Response to Question 1: No action Horsepower should be rated at Pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: All of it leave it how it is Response to Question 5: We need more roads opened More access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2888	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A IS MY PREFERENCE FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE O.N.S.R. Response to Question 2: 1) CLOSING OF THE MANY ROAD & ATV TRAILS THAT HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED WITHIN THE O.N.S.R. MOST OF THESE ROADS/TRAILS SEEM TO BE UNAUTHORIZED; AND THEY GREATLY REDUCE THE PRIMITIVE CHARACTER OF THE RIVERWAY THRU NOISE & VEHICULAR ACCESS TO MOST GRAVEL BARS 2) CURTAIL THE AMOUNT OF HORSEBACK RIDING ON O.N.S.R. THE LARGE NUMBER OF HORSES ARE NOT GOOD FOR WATER QUALITY & LEAD TO SEVERE EROSION OF TRAILS 3) PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TOILET FACILITIES ALONG THE RIVER. THESE COULD BE TEMPORARY THRU THE SUMMER MONTHS 4) REDUCE THE NUMBER OF CANOES/BOATS THAT CAN BE ON THE RIVER AT ANY ONE TIME. Response to Question 5: DEVELOP A CAMPGROUND AT AKERS FERRY. A CAMPGROUND WAS THERE ORIGINALLY, BUT IT HAS BEEN CLOSED FOR MANY EYARS. AKERS FERRY IS THE CLOSEST PUT IN POINT FOR MANY PEOPLE & A CAMPGROUND THERE WOULD BE MUCH USED.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65063
2889	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: NO-Action Response to Question 3: to many laws and regulations that negatively impact OUR National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 4: Lived Here all my life fishing Jacks Fork & Current River. These proposed actions will end all of that! Response to Question 5: People think Jet boats are the problem when that is not the total problem.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2890	Response to Question 1: No-Action Plan: Do not make any changes to the existing plan. Response to Question 2: No Part - No Action Plan only. Do not take away Public access to our roads & Rivers Response to Question 3: No limitation for all recreational vehicles & Boats No Horse-Power limitations Response to Question 4: No Action Plan: Only. My family & I enjoy going to our local rivers. We boat, float & camp. I want my kids & their kids to be able to continue to enjoy these recreational Activities. Response to Question 5: Do not punish everyone for a few hundred people that dont appreciate & that dont take care of our local Rivers. If people Break the law, give them tickets. Hire more law enforcement to contol littering, illegal drugs being used.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
2891	Response to Question 1: No-Action Plan: Do not make any changes to the existing plan. Response to Question 2: No Part - No Action Plan only. Do not take away Public access to our roads & Rivers Response to Question 3: No limitation for all recreational vehicles & Boats No Horse-Power limitations Response to Question 4: No Action Plan: Only. My family & I enjoy going to our local rivers. We boat, float & camp. I want my kids & their kids to Be able to continue to enjoy these recreational Activities. Response to Question 5: Do not punish everyone for a few hundred people that dont appreciate & that dont take care of our local Rivers. If people Break the law, give them tickets. Hire more law enforcement to contol littering, illegal drugs being used.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965

2892	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horsepower at Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: More road access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2893	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No action All of it is important to me & my family. Response to Question 5: limit number of canoes allowed.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2894	Response to Question 1: No action - horsepower should be rated at pump. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: ALL OF IT! Response to Question 5: Limit number of canoes allowed to access river.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2895	Response to Question 1: No Action. The river is fine as is. The river is near vacant 75% of the year. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: No Action. Response to Question 4: The gap at Van Buren is the busiest and the Park Service has no control of it. Littering by visitors is the biggest threat. All the boaters I know are the ones picking up the trash. Response to Question 5: Make rangers more visible.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63801
2896	Response to Question 1: I prefer the no action. I have been coming to the river since the 60's. The only changes I've seen are made by the river (ie - floods) Smaller motors (25 hp) make bigger wakes and disturb the banks and floaters. Also the busy season is so short lived being the river is near vacant 85% of the year. Response to Question 2: Again things are fine like they are. Response to Question 3: None of them should be considered. I live on the river and again I see 6 busy weekends per year. From July 1 - Aug 15th is busy. After that the river is pretty tranquil. Response to Question 4: Again no action. Response to Question 5: If anything put the rangers in view more. Focus more on fining people for littering.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63801
2897	Response to Question 1: I have to say no action because the other 3 are not in line with the legislation that formed ONSR. 16 USC 460 in. Response to Question 2: More helpful workers. More trash cans. More guided tours of caves and springs. Response to Question 3: Do not shut people off the river by closing access points & roads and banning motorized boats. Response to Question 4: Current River. No. The alternatives forgets its purpose of recreation. They attempt to shut people out to preserve it. Response to Question 5: Keep in mind ONSR was formed for a dual purpose: Conservation AND Recreation.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
2898	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Useage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict Recreational usage ^ Access Response to Question 4: Personal Comment Response to Question 5: More Recreational Facilities 40 HP Threw Output Shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
2899	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action - Alternatives Response to Question 3: A; B - and C Response to Question 4: All of the Jacks fork and Current River Only the No-Action does. Response to Question 5: NO	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
2900	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Change nothing from how it is today. Response to Question 3: Usage of roads or access to the river.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
2901	Response to Question 1: No-Action, Alternative Response to Question 2: The No-Action Alternative Response to Question 3: Alternatives, A, B & C Response to Question 4: Alternative - NO - Action All, Both, rivers, the Jacks Fork and the Current are special to me. Response to Question 5: Not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
2902	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp. to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65446
2903	Response to Question 1: The No-Action Alternative. Response to Question 2: The No-Action Alternative. Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of the Jacks Fork & Current River are special to me and my family. I think and believe that things should be left alone about the motor sizes on our boats. The No-Action Alternative.	7/20/2009	No		Presiding Commissioner - Shannon County	MO	65466
2904	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: I love all the Scenic Riverways Response to Question 5: Not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MS	65466
2905	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: nothing should change as it is today Response to Question 3: limiting usage on the riverways or roads. Response to Question 4: any swimming spots. access to use when I wish.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
2906	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: leave 40 hp limit alone Response to Question 3: Don't change the hp limit Response to Question 4: Rounds Springs, B Bluff Response to Question 5: let 40 hp run below Round Springs and make canoes stay above. Boats should be allowed Fall-Spring above	7/20/2009	No			UN	Unknown

2907	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: We enjoy the Riverways year round Response to Question 5: not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
2908	Response to Question 1: No-Action-Alternative Response to Question 2: The first Alternative No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Every Inch of Every mile of the Jacks fork and the Current are very special to me and my family and to all those who live here Response to Question 5: None at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
2909	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: We enjoy the Riverways year round. Response to Question 5: Not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
2910	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp. to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65438
2911	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no limitation on raods & rivers. Response to Question 3: Any limiting on riverways, roads or camping sites. Response to Question 4: would allow camping @ Roberts Field for hunting @ deer season.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
2912	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65438
2913	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no limitation. Leave things as they are today. Response to Question 3: things that does not allow me to go to the river or roads that I can't hunt or ride ATV's on. Response to Question 4: Blue Springs on Current River. The "No Action" alternative would benefit the most. I can still camp and boat with a 40 horse-power motor.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
2914	Response to Question 1: No Action. Leave Horse Power Rating 40 Hp at the pump of motor. Response to Question 2: (No Action) Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B and C Response to Question 4: No Action There is more fish and wildlife then ever! Response to Question 5: Improve & maintain Boat Ramps open Fields No Closed No Boat Ramps Fees No Fees for Primtive Camping, like Gravel Bars.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
2915	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: Do not change the motor size on the river. If there is a problem enforce the issue. A more pleasant approach to water patrol would help the river situation.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63937
2916	Response to Question 1: No Action Keep the horsepower rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action. Leave the whole river as it is now. Response to Question 5: Boat ramps	7/24/2009	No			MO	63628
2917	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative. Response to Question 2: Education Response to Question 3: No restiction to Boater's or Horseback ridig Response to Question 4: The Current & Jacks Fork River Area. We have been camping, Boating, & Horseback ridigfor years. Want our children & grandchildren to be able to do the same. Response to Question 5: Better inforcement of the laws. Better Education. Also have designated water crossing to Horse's, Vehicle & motor Bikes. These things could help.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63028
2918	Response to Question 1: No Action I would like to keep the hp rating forty hp at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action. The whole river is great just the way it is now.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63937
2919	Response to Question 1: No-Action. In our town we do not trash the Log Yard or any other part of the River. We always clean u/p after self. We love to take our boat out, and enjoy our self. Do not take this away from everyone. (my Grandchildens) We can not run our boat on 25 hp because of the current of the River. 25 HP. isn't Good for boat or the people who are in the boat. We are willing to help out in the cost of maintaining the River. "If you need it" Response to Question 5: We live here, they don't, visitors come once a year. They also should clean up after thire self, like we do. Visitor are welcome but don't take are River away. Thank you	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
2920	Response to Question 1: No Action Continue to allow 40 hp at the pump for boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action. The entire river should be left as it is now	7/24/2009	No			MO	63601
2921	Response to Question 1: no action - remove motor restrictions on watercraft Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: a, b and c - to restrict the people who live and and breathe the river everyday, for the people who never been on current river in their life is offensive. Response to Question 4: from Montauk to Arkansas Response to Question 5: Stop those who have never been here from making decisions for us who live here	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638

2922	Response to Question 1: No Action Keep HP rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action I love the whole river, please leave it alone.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63601
2923	Response to Question 1: Either A or no-action. Response to Question 2: Protection of natural plants and animals in the area, while allowing many people to enjoy them.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63937
2924	Response to Question 1: No Action. I am a supporter of the ONSR and its current system. I feel that the limitations on horsepower is due to performance, therefore horsepower should be measured at the lower unit. Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: Alternative A, Alternative B & Alternative C. I feel that the wilderness area additions should not be added. I feel that wilderness status is too restrictive on the management of these areas. Response to Question 4: I feel that the horsepower limits on Alternative A, B, C are too restrictive. I feel that the entire Current River is special to me, but if these Alternatives A, B, or C are passed my family and I will not be able to enjoy the Current River at all; due to the fact that my current boat would not comply to any of the alternatives A, B, or C. Response to Question 5: I support the current management system of the ONSR. I feel that no changes to the current system are needed. I feel that the lewd behavior on the river has decrease tremendously due to the Park Rangers involvement. I feel that the No Action alternative is the best alternative.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63965
2925	Response to Question 1: A. no motorboats at all! Canoes, kayaks, inner tubes only. The less commercial activity, the better. NO development Response to Question 2: preserve natural flora and fauna at all costs. preserve quiet interaction w/ and enjoyment of nature. Response to Question 3: NO motorized boats or recreational vehicles. Response to Question 4: Baptist Camp down to Akers - leave it as is Res	7/13/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2926	Response to Question 1: No Aciton. Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage and access. Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage and access Response to Question 4: i live no more than 3 miles from either river and i can not stand to hear more regulation about outboards on the river. if you want to drop the number do it on the canoe numbers. Response to Question 5: more recreational usage facilities. more accesses to rivers. 40 h.p. at the output shaft.	7/13/2009	No			MO	65466
2927	Response to Question 1: Need more ATV & UTV Trails/should be able to drive on Gravel Bars & Exsiting Trails that have been established for years that should be opened have now been restricted/Add to River Designation & Recreation	7/13/2009	No			MO	63645
2928	Response to Question 1: No Aciton. As a former resident and now visitor, I like it the way it is.	7/31/2009	No			IL	62025
2929	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Ceder Springs, panther spring, Grubbs Hollow should be left along for campers & Boaters Response to Question 5: The Locals use these places year around If the pencile pushers had any knowledge of the area	7/31/2009	No			MO	63849
2930	Response to Question 1: No Action - I would improve it by adding better boat access in the upper current like the Rocky Creek area. I also think we should allow the 60 HP engines rated at the powerhead these engines provide power to plane a boat with a normal family without going to fast to creat a concern with the park service Response to Question 2: No comment Response to Question 3: Any decrease in the horsepower should not be included. This plan should be about increasing opportunities with reasonable protections for the park I don't any land should be given to the Wilderness Status. It should be for the people to enjoy. Response to Question 4: My biggest concern, That is not address by any alternative, is the lack of adequate and developed boat access points on the Winona side of the Upper Current - Lower Segment (Rocky Creek area) and the west side of the Lower Current Segment (Ceder Springs area). Additional access in these areas would allow boaters an alternative to the landings at Two Rivers, Watercress, Van Buren Bridge and Big Spring's, all of which see high concentrations of canoes and tubes. Response to Question 5: The Park Service should always keep in mind that while it is your job to manage and protect the Park, It is the people of the area who will always be the one's who feel a true ownership of the river. It is a part of our daily live's, our history and our heritage	7/10/2009	No			MO	65588
2931	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVE A Response to Question 4: ALL OF JACKS FORK & CURRENT. NO Response to Question 5: NO	7/10/2009	No			KS	67037
2932	Response to Question 1: No-Action The history of the ONSR has been "take" from the local people. Land, river access, river and hunting rights. The Park Service took my families farm, my fathers boat and motor in 1984, and are trying to take my 40 hp from me and my family. Response to Question 2: More developed access and boat ramp access. The MO dept of Conservation works to provide for local use, while the Park Service seems to want to keep taking away the rights of the local people. Response to Question 3: Please be a partner to the area. Support the locals as well as the visitors. We need all the financial support we can have in these hard times. Response to Question 4: They are all important to me. I haved helped people in danger, picked up trash, and have tried to keep the riverway's special. Don't take anymore of my rights. Response to Question 5: Have rangers be visable to the Public. also provide written awareness of boating and canoieng/tubbing to river users.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65588

2933	Response to Question 1: Need More ATV Trails & UTV Trails/Should be able to drive on gravel bars/Add to River Designation & Recreation	7/10/2009	No			MO	65583
2934	Response to Question 1: No action - Motors to Remain 40 HP At Jet Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: Take No Action - Open 40 HP limit from the Bridge to Big Springs to No Restrictions	7/31/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2935	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: No limits on Motors Response to Question 4: More Boat ramps are needed so the local traffic can be seprated from tubers. Response to Question 5: Additional law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63533
2936	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NONE	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2937	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: No limits on Motors Response to Question 4: The Areas need more parking and Boat ramps. Response to Question 5: Additional law enforcement during high traffic weekends.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63546
2938	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Big Spring to Goose Neck	7/31/2009	No			MO	65804
2939	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Leave as is Response to Question 3: Everyone should be able to use river and land as it is now Response to Question 4: Left as is with no limitations Response to Question 5: Park Service should be visible at all times	7/31/2009	No			MO	63601
2940	Response to Question 1: No Action & Motors to Remain 40 HP at the jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take no Action and open 40 hp limit area to no HP Restriction in the Gap Between Bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2941	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: None	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2942	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: Primitive Response to Question 4: NO ACTION Response to Question 5: NO	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2943	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Horse Power on Motors Response to Question 4: The four mile gap Response to Question 5: more law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501
2944	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE - LEAVE ALONE Response to Question 3: THE WAY IT IS NOW IS FINE LEAVE ALONE Response to Question 4: NO RESTRICTIONS ARE NEEDED Response to Question 5: RIVER CLEAN UP PROGRAMS SHOULD BE IMIPLEMENTED	7/31/2009	No			MO	63601
2945	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: The River should be left alone and everyone should be able to use the land and River as is. Response to Question 4: The entire River is special; and it should be left alone, and there should be no limitations Response to Question 5: There should be tougher and stricter penalties against polluting and littering the River	7/31/2009	No			LA	70403
2946	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Leave everything as is now No Action Response to Question 3: Everyone should be able to use the river and land as it is now. Response to Question 4: Everything should be left as it is now and there should be no limitations. Response to Question 5: The park service should be visible at all times to prevent people from trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			LA	70403
2947	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: Everything is fine as is! No Action! Response to Question 3: We should be able to use ALL the river & land as it is. Response to Question 4: All of it is unique & changing any of it will limit it for everyone else leave the river as it is. Response to Question 5: Every one on the park service should be on the river to prevent trash dumping in the river.	7/31/2009	No			LA	70401
2948	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: None No-Action! Response to Question 3: The River should stay as is! Response to Question 4: The entire 134 miles of the River is special to my Family to Boat - swimming in. Response to Question 5: Having Park Rangers out on the River in plain sight and stop people throwing trash in it.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65742

2949	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: None No-Action! Response to Question 3: The river should stay the way it is. Response to Question 4: My family uses this river (all 134 miles) for boating, swimming etc. Response to Question 5: Put the Park Rangers in plain sight (no hiding) and put more energy on people trashing it.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2950	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the horse power on the Boats and Motors Response to Question 4: The four mile area where there is little or no law enforcement. Response to Question 5: need more law enforcement patrolling during high usage weekends.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501
2951	Response to Question 1: C - Remove H.P. limits in off season. Response to Question 2: More boat ramps. Response to Question 3: Wilderness. Response to Question 4: From Powder Mill Down should have access added on both sides of river for more convenience and less cengestion. Response to Question 5: What I see is the main problem on Current River is the number of tubes and canoes. They are grouped together, 95% are put in the river at the same boat ramp. The boats should be patrolled & not limit H.P. Alchol needs to be prohibited on the water.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2952	Response to Question 1: No-Action Make more campsites along the river. Waymeyer used to be a campsite. I feel it should still be available for camping purposes. Response to Question 2: More boat ramps available. Stricter limits on the number of tubes & canoes floating on the river daily. Remove downed trees in the river. Response to Question 3: No more limitations on the horse power of the boat motors. Response to Question 4: Paint Rock Area to Big Springs Park. Response to Question 5: More Boat ramps where access is not available to tubes & canoes.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2953	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: Leave all the rules the same, don't change anything. Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Leave grubb Holler, Cedar Spring Alone so we can put a boats in the river, and go Camping	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2954	Response to Question 1: No-action!!! Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: The whole 134 miles not just for me & my Famly But For all Local Response to Question 5: I Don't Have a Boat But the Boater will have to go to Van Buren to put in which will be wrong. That is not safe For the Boater to be there with all the crazy Floater From the city that drink and dont know how to monuver around to start out with so the park sevice need to do more work on floater trashing the river and leave the Boaters alone thay take there trash home!!!!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2955	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Cedar Springs, Panther Spring, Grubbs Hollow such be left along for camping and Boat launching Response to Question 5: People in is Area use this places All year Round if not they drive 12 to 20 miles Just to use the River.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2956	Response to Question 1: C remove H.P. limits, for sure in off season Response to Question 2: more Boat ramps Response to Question 3: wilderness Response to Question 4: from Powder Mill down should have access added on Both Sides of River for more convience & less congestion Response to Question 5: What I see is the main Problem on Curent River is the No of tubes & canoes are grouped together. 95% are put in the River at the same boat ramp. The boats should be Patrolled & not limited H.P. and alchol need to be Prohibited on the water.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63941
2957	Response to Question 1: "A" is my First Choice but Reality Dictates "B" Response to Question 2: Knowing the National condition of our Rivers, This is an opportunity to Perserve the Gem of Gems in the Ozark Watershed. Having just been down the Colorado/Grand Canyon limited use is key Response to Question 3: Must Not Build Big Budget Numbers for oversight in Future Years This Will Hurt the Objectives. Need Locals Donating Their Efforts Because They Care About Preserving Their Treassure - Education Very Import Response to Question 4: Upper Jack is so so special. Anyone who Has Had An Opportunity to Float It From the "Prong" to "Bay Creek" Have Experienced one of the great wonders of the United States. Response to Question 5: I Think your Idea About hire guides on wilderness parts is Awesome! The get Paid By Clients to Look After the River and give Tourist A great Peek Into Missouri.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63124
2958	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No Limit on Horse Power Response to Question 4: Limit amount of Tubers on Current River Response to Question 5: Limit amount of Tubers. Tubes Needs to be mark for Identification	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
2959	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternatives Response to Question 2: 1st of all, the horse power rating should ALWAYS be at the Power Shaft! Also No restrictions or Limitations on River Access or on ALL N.P.S. Property. the 40 horse power restriction should Not be changed or Altered. Response to Question 3: Any changes or restrictions to use of N.P.S. Property. The river is constantly Patrolled or Cared for By local Citizens. This is a Continual year round Activity. Not just 3 monhs a year. We help Canoes & Hikers, and Vistiors that have or need help. The Point is Keeping the river Accesable to local People is Important. Response to Question 4: All River Points from Two River, Jacks Fork and the Complete Current River system. These areas are very special to me. I use these areas several times a year. I fish, hunt, hike and eagle watch all along the river system. I also think more Public Access would be better. Response to Question 5: A constant Greater Law enforcement Presence in and Arould problem areas including canoes, boats or Party Areas. Mile Marking System Signs on the river. Emergency Phone call boxes at river Access Points. A trash Pick up boat to Patrol river.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
2960	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: Two rivers to Northern edge of Van Buren gap. Response to Question 4: Two rivers to goose neck. Response to Question 5: --Open more trails to ATV's, Dual Rider ATV's & side by side vehicles. --More open exposure of water patrol on the river. --Equal respect & responsibility of tubers, canoers and boaters. --More concrete access points.	7/28/2009	No			UN	Unknown

2961	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: The whole 134 miles is important just the way it is. Response to Question 5: Maybe control the alcohol parties on the float trips.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63023
2962	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 5: Riverway should be open to the public for full recreation use. Boating, Camping, horse back riding, four wheeling, hunting in limited areas. Free enterpise for bussiness investors.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63353
2963	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Place more help for canoers Along waterways. Response to Question 3: The removal of engines on boats, as I've seen river rescues made by private boats in the past. Many lives are saved yearly by privately owned boats. Human lives are more important than what is being recognized in this Area. Response to Question 4: All 134 miles should be important as they provide getaways for people all over the U.S. Not only in Mo.. All areas should be treated as if they are A showplace for our Naturural beauty in this state.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63459
2964	Response to Question 1: No-action! Let the people that live here. Help out on making decisions! Not the city people! Response to Question 2: No-action! Response to Question 3: A, B, & C! Response to Question 4: All campgrounds, river ways & hunting access. Response to Question 5: Only ticket people who act unreasonable. Not the people who enjoy and respect the riverways. Such as crossings, boating, swimming & camping.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65571
2965	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: MOTORS SHOULD NOT BE LESS THAN 40 H.P. FROM ROUND SPRINGS DOWN Response to Question 4: GRASSY & BAY BRANCH NO ACTION	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
2966	Response to Question 1: The No-Action is the best suited alternative to me. Response to Question 2: the No-Aciton alternative Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C should not be included in the future. Response to Question 4: I feel the No-Action alternative will be the most adequete for the Van Buren area. Response to Question 5: A better boat landing should be put in Weyemeyer.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63965
2967	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE Response to Question 2: LEAVE AS IS Response to Question 4: NO CHANGE	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
2968	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Boats should not be excluded from the riverways and horse power should not be lowered. Response to Question 4: We enjoy boating and camping at the Log Yard/Cardareva area of Current River.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
2969	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: All Areas Are the Same Response to Question 5: Leave As is	6/30/2009	No			MO	63629
2970	Response to Question 1: No change From Now Response to Question 3: LEAVE IT AS IS. Response to Question 4: All the River is the Same Response to Question 5: NONE	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
2971	Response to Question 1: - No-Action - The horsepower Limit should Be From Two Rivers to Goose Neck 100 HP Response to Question 2: - Nothing - No Change The HP limit should Be INCREASED! Response to Question 3: Hp Lilimits should Not Be Reduced But Raised Response to Question 4: The River is a special Place We All Can Use it however some people will have problems No matter what. Response to Question 5: We should Keep All Acess open, the River is there for us to use so Let us use it.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
2972	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternitive Response to Question 2: No Restrictions on Any user's Response to Question 3: No Natural Area's No motor more motor Restricktions Response to Question 4: They Are All the same for Visitors to use Response to Question 5: NONE	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
2973	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternate Response to Question 2: Leave it As it is Response to Question 3: No Limits or Restrictions on Any user's Response to Question 4: The River is All the same And is for All of us to Enjoy Response to Question 5: NONE	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
2974	Response to Question 1: No Aciton. Response to Question 2: Current Regulations are Already Overmanagement and there should Be No changes to Current Regulations Response to Question 3: A, B, and C. Response to Question 4: Citizens should Be Allowed to Enjoy this Area and your Alternatives Are Intrusive to me and other citizens Response to Question 5: Alcohol Intake should be Limited to Canoers, Boaters, and Campers. Current Laws and Regulations should Be strictly Enforced. Dogs should Be maintained on Leashes and Primitive Camping should Be Free.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63023
2975	Response to Question 1: Probably A is closest. I'd like better maps of the historic & natural features of the Natl Scenic Rivers land areas. Walking trails would be welcome to these areas (ALT. C) Response to Question 2: I would like more scenic access points to the River as a semi-serious amateur photographer (nature, flowers, mammals). I'd like brochures guiding visitors to more remote habitats (beaver dams & lodges, heron	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown

	habitat, guides to LOCAL flora and fauna. Response to Question 3: Current motor HP limits should be reduced: 40 HP to 25 HP for example. ATVs can be used lots of places outside Park near Van Buren. Prohibit commercial gravel mining in Current & Jacks Fork, increase enforcement Response to Question 4: Van Buren, Big Spring area & esp. Natl Park along rte 103, on Hwy Z to Big Tree and at C: Gooseneck area. Hwy M boat access at Wahmeyer needs help - 2nd areas to launch causes & motorized craft. Current situation is dangerous! Response to Question 5: ATVs and 40 HP motors interfere with my enjoyment of the Current at Van Buren where I live. Strongly increase scenic access, lessen boat access, prohibit horses & ATVs, & HP limits on outboudards.						
2976	Response to Question 1: I USE THE RIVER A LOT FOR CANOEING - NEXT MONTH, JULY, I PLAN TO CANOE SOLO FROM UPPER PUT-IN TO ARKANSAS STATE LINE - 140 MILES, 14 DAYS - I WANT THE PART STAY MUCH THE WAY IT IS EXCEPT - I WANT TO GET RID OF ALL THE JOHNBOATS AND HORSEBACK RIDING - EXCEPT FOR PARK WORK & RESCUE- Response to Question 2: THE PARK SERVICE SHOULD JUST RELAX AND LET THE RIVER BE THE RIVER - THE INDIANS SURELY ENJOYED IT WIHTOUT IMPROVEMENT - IF IT IS NOT BROKE-, DON'T FIX IT. ITS ONLY BROKE BY JOHNBOATS AND HORSE SHIT- Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: THEY ARE ALL SPECIAL - WHICH ONE OF YOUR KIDS OR WHICH OF YOUR PARENTS DO YOU WANT TO GET RID OF??? Response to Question 5: KEEP THE PLACE AS NATURAL AS POSSIBLE!! HIKING IN THE PARK AND FLOATING IN THE PARK SHOULD BE ENOUGH FOR ALL - JOHNBOATERS AND HORSES SHOULD GO TO DONWTON CLAYTON - NOBODY WILL NOTICE THEM THERE	6/26/2009	No			MO	63125
2977	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS. Response to Question 3: RESTRIC USAGE & ACCESS Response to Question 4: I WANT TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE USING MY MOTOR WHICH IS 40 HP AT THE PUMP. Response to Question 5: MAYBE A FEW MORE TRASH CANS & RESTROOM FACILITIES.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2978	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restric access & usage Response to Question 4: I enjoy boating w/ my family and if restrictions are made the boats won't have enough horsepower to go over some of the shoals. I want to be able to continue using my motor which is 40 hp at the pump. Response to Question 5: possibly more trash bins and restroom facilities	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
2979	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usge & acess Response to Question 3: Restric usage & acess Response to Question 4: Jet boating	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2980	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restrict usage & access. Response to Question 4: Continue to allow 40 HP at the pump. Response to Question 5: Restroom facilities and more trash bins.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2981	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE PLAN C I WOULD LIMIT HORSE POWER ON THE LOWER CURRENT RIVER FROM THE SOUTH BOUNDRY. (GOOSENECK) TO TWO RIVERS 40 HP AND UNDER FROM TWO RIVERS UP 25 HP OR LESS. PUT A SPEED LIMIT OF 30 M.P.H. ON BOATS. Response to Question 5: I SUGGEST ALL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES BE BANED TO FLOATERS. INTOXICATED PEOPLE ARE THE ROWDY OR TROUBLE MAKERS, LITTERS ECT. IT IS SUCH AN EYE SORE TO SEE THOUSANDS OF CANS SUNK IN CURRENT RIVER. LET THEM DRINK AT HOME OR IN BARS. MOST BOATERS AND CANOEIST TAKE CARE OF THEIR LITTER. BUT NOT THE TUBERS -	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
2982	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: Lower Current, below Big Springs. No Action would be OK here as it Joins the part of the river that is not in the Riverways. It makes no sense to regulate this part so closly when it joins the part of the river that has no rules at all. Response to Question 5: I wish it would be understood that the lower part of Current River is not at all crowded, has almost no tube or canoe traffic, and is used mostly by local people. I, like many others, was raised on that river. I raised my children there. I means more to me than I can say. Please do not take it away.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
2983	Response to Question 1: YES. THE 'NO-ACTION' ALTERNATIVE. Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL USAGE Response to Question 3: THE EXCESSIVE RESTRICTIONS WITH REGARD TO 25+ HP MOTORS. Response to Question 4: THE NORTH SECTION OF THE UPPER CURRENT. NO. ALL ALTERNATIVES PLACE EXCESSIVE RESTRICTIONS ON BOAT USERS, EXCEPT THE 'NO-ACTION' ALTERNATIVE. Response to Question 5: MORE RESTROOM FACILITIES.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
2984	Response to Question 1: No Change Response to Question 2: No Change Response to Question 3: No Change Response to Question 4: No Change Response to Question 5: No Change	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
2985	Response to Question 1: no action motors remain 40 HP at Jet Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: no Response to Question 5: take no action - no HP restriction on outboard motors below 40 HP at jet	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
2986	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the Boat Motor Horse power Response to Question 4: The Boat Ramp at Waymeyer Response to Question 5: Additional law enforcement.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63549

2987	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: limiting the size of the motors Response to Question 4: The four mile gap Response to Question 5: Additional Law Enforcement on all parts of the River.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63546
2988	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the Motor Size Response to Question 4: The Four Mile Gap Response to Question 5: More law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	65203
2989	Response to Question 1: No Action The way ONSR Has Everything Now is Fine	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2990	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: DO NOT WANT CHANGE. NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION IS BEST PLAN. Response to Question 5: WANT PARK RANGERS TO BE VISIBLE.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
2991	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Eliminate motor access to gravel bars - if any motor access Provide latrines at high us gravel bars Keep horses out of water - because of contamination Response to Question 3: Development along the river Eliminate motor access Akers - Round Spring Response to Question 4: Akers - Round Spring	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203
2992	Response to Question 1: A is closest. I would consider privys at heavily used camp sites. set back from the rives, possible using the Bounday Waters Canoe Area Wildernes model. Walking trails (non-motorized) could be allowed in some areas Better control of alchohol; I see nothing wrong with some interpretive signs or managing the land to make up for lack of fire or to weed out invasive species Response to Question 2: Protection of natural habitat Motorized boat restrictions year round. Elimination of vehicle access except at set bar(?) parking lots at non-motorized launch sites. Closing of unnecesary roads and other motorized access routes Response to Question 3: Development along river Any increase in motorized use, on water of land Continued access to gravel bars by moterized vehicles Response to Question 4: The upper river Response to Question 5: Stress the natural experience. The undisturbed sounds and qualities of the natural area. These experiences are far too rare for the public.	6/24/2009	No			MO	65203-2317
2993	Response to Question 1: No-Action. This is the best alternative. The River is a place for everyone to enjoy. You have no right to limmit my access. Response to Question 2: No-change Response to Question 3: Priliminary A. They want to take away all access, and limmit my rights to enjoy the way I was raised. I want my kids to have the same chance to enjoy the things that I did when I was young Response to Question 4: The whole river is special to me, more specifically the log-yard up through Blue Springs it my right to be able to enjoy it and it's not your right to take it away	6/24/2009	No			MO	65201
2994	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: The park service shouldn't be there, they cause more problems than they fix! Response to Question 3: Boats arn't hurting the river any, zones are by forcing people in a smaller area. Response to Question 4: The log yard and area around is a local boating place, all alternatives make it where we lose that. Response to Question 5: Take out zones, take out park service, those things are not helping anything and people that have never been there won't know that. Let locals decide! It's our river!	6/24/2009	No			MO	63638
2995	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Closeing the Land and Limiting the HP on the motors Response to Question 4: the Whole River Response to Question 5: Na	7/31/2009	No			MO	63546
2996	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is close. I would emphasize restoration & preservation of wilderness areas (no humans allowed) and allow no motorized boats Response to Question 2: --wilderness areas (Natural zones & primitive) as priorities --Quiet activities only --Education about flora, fauna, & whole bioregion Response to Question 3: --No motor boats, ATVs, or horseback riding --No new "development" (buildings) Response to Question 5: Not a strategy but a GOAL: allow people to engage directly & simply with the rest of the natural world so they know, love, & preserve it	6/26/2009	No			UN	Unknown
2997	Response to Question 1: No-Action - I think that there should be an alternative in place that has an increase in horsepower as an option. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 5: more visible law-enforcement, instead of co-vert hiding in the weeds	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
2998	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: to many Laws and regulations that negatively impact OUR National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 4: Lived Here all my life Fishing Jacks Fork & Current River. These proposed actions will end all of that! Response to Question 5: People think Jet boats are the problem when that is not the total problem.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
2999	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: To Restrict the Usage & Access Response to Question 4: I want to be able to continue to use the river with my boat & motor. My boat is 40 HP at the pump. Response to Question 5: Please provide more trash bins & possibly add some more Restroom facilities	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560

3000	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restrict access & usage Response to Question 4: I enjoy boating w/ my family and if restrictions are made the boats won't have enough horsepower to go over some of the shoals. I want to be able to continue using my motor which is 40 hp at the pump. Response to Question 5: possibly more trash bins and restroom facilities	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
3001	Response to Question 1: The No-Action Plan 40 hp Boats have work so far, so leaving the limit would work best Response to Question 2: The No-Action Plan and level the limit the way it currently is. Response to Question 3: Plan A, B, & C should not even be considered Response to Question 4: I use the section from Two-Rivers to Blue Springs 40 hp motors work best for this area if limit is lower our family won't be able to go up the river Response to Question 5: More or Better boat landings, & camp sites	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3002	Response to Question 1: No-Action is my idea on best way to manage the ONSR. Keeping 40 hp at Jet on boats would be, and has always worked. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, & C Response to Question 4: From Blue Spring to Two-Rivers Response to Question 5: Better River Access, Boat Landings, Better Trails	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3003	Response to Question 1: No-Action Keep to boats the way they are. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternative ABC. Response to Question 4: Van - Buren To Two Rivers. Response to Question 5: --Measure 40 HP at the jet. --Better boat Ramp. --Better Roads so I can get to my recreation site.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63939
3004	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION NO CHANGE ON BOAT MOTORS. KEEP 40 HP AT THE JET. Response to Question 2: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, C Response to Question 4: EVERY MILE OF IT. Response to Question 5: HAVE RANGERS DO THEIR JOB. WE ARE PEACEFUL PEOPLE. WANTING TO GET ALONG.	7/6/2009	No			MT	63939
3005	Response to Question 1: No-Action. No Changes Sounds Like we are losing our freedom. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives a, b, c. Response to Question 4: All Parts of the NPC Response to Question 5: Keep 40 HP at the jet alive.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3006	Response to Question 1: THESE RIVERS ARE NEAR & DEAR TO MY HEART & ALWAYS HAVE BEEN. I LIVE ON CURRENT RIVERS SO I HAVE PARTICULAR INTEREST IN THIS MATTER. I BELIEVE AS A AMERICAN I SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO AS I PLEASE ON A RIVER AS LONG AS IT DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH ANYBODY'S FREEDOMS SO REMOVE ALL RIVERWAYS RESTRICTION. (MY VOTE) Response to Question 2: NONE. REMOVE THEM ALL Response to Question 3: ALL OF THEM Response to Question 4: FROM ONE END TO THE OTHER REMOVE THEM THIS IS THE LAND OF THE FREE & THE HOME OF THE BRAVE Response to Question 5: I THINK I ALREADY ANSWERED THAT!	7/6/2009	No			MO	63935
3007	Response to Question 1: THESE RIVERS WERE HERE LONG BEFORE O.N.S.R. AND WERE DOING JUST FINE BEFORE THEY MADE UP ALL OF THEIR RULES, SO I THINK ALL THE RULES NEED REMOVED AND WE CAN GO BACK TO BEING FREE AMERICANS. Response to Question 2: NONE OF THEM Response to Question 3: ALL SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED FREE AMERICAN Response to Question 4: ALL OF IT IS DEAR TO ME FREE AMERICAN Response to Question 5: I ALL READY HAVE SUGGESTED WHAT I FEEL IMPORTANT STRATEGIES FREE AMERICAN	7/6/2009	No			MO	63935
3008	Response to Question 1: (No-Action) No limit on boat motor's Response to Question 2: more family activities Response to Question 3: limit's on horsepower closing any part of the O.N.S.R to certain people or Group. Response to Question 4: I have been on All 134 miles of the O.N.S.R. hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, boating, it is all special to me. (No Action) would best address me and my family. Response to Question 5: Ban all Alcohol on the O.N.S.R that way you would have more family's enjoying All that the ONSR has to offer.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63965
3009	Response to Question 1: "C" Response to Question 2: MOTOR LIMIT ON LOWER CURRENT AND MORE PARK RANGER PRESENCE WOULD HELP - STOP SHOAL RUNNERS Response to Question 4: LOWER CURRENT - BIG SPRINGS TO GOOSE NECK Response to Question 5: I'VE LIVED ON THE LOWER CURRENT FOR 72 YRS. EACH YR. IT GETS WORSE. DRUG & ALCOHOL PARTIES MAKE IT UNFIT FOR FAMILY USE.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63937
3010	Response to Question 1: My best choice would be Alternative B. This is because I believe in preserving the Ozark National Riverways. However, Alternative A's proposal of fixing areas of park overuse and restoring illegal roads and trails would be a great addition to it. Of course, Big Spring should be proposed as a wilderness area. Response to Question 2: 1) Close and restore illegal roads and trails to their natural state. 2) Proposal of Big Spring area for wilderness designation. 3) Restoration of the park to earlier days along those rivers. 4) Increasing the public's access to outdoor recreation and opportunities Response to Question 3: "Business as usual" Response to Question 4: All of the alternatives except No-Action would be fantastic. All 134 miles of that area is important to me and it should ALL be protected and preserved. Big Spring and its surrounding area should also be designated as a wilderness area. Response to Question 5: Purchase more lands surrounding the park to increase outdoor opportunities for the public. A lot of areas could benefit from this. The designation of not only Big Spring but falling springs and Rocky falls would be great for wilderness Areas.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63301-4746
3011	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Restrictions Response to Question 3: The Right to Camp and use River for Recreation Response to Question 4: All	7/6/2009	No			MO	63301

3012	Response to Question 1: Alt. A. Response to Question 3: No ATV's, motor boats, horseback Riding Response to Question 5: Allow canoes only in River	7/6/2009	No			MO	63005
3013	Response to Question 1: Alt. A. Response to Question 2: Keep area free of noise pollution. Horse feces contaminate the water and RUIN TRAILS Response to Question 3: Do not allow ATV's, horseback RIDING, or any motorboats Response to Question 5: No ATV's, horseback RIDING or motorboats-	7/6/2009	No			MO	63119
3014	Response to Question 1: Alternative - No-Action Response to Question 2: The No-Action-Alternative Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I Love All of Both Rivers and would like to see them left the way they are. But if I have to chose one. It would be the No-Action Alternative Response to Question 5: None At this time.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3015	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp. to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65535
3016	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no limitations on any roads, rivers or camp sites. Response to Question 3: limitations to boat motors, access to river, roads for riding ATVs or hunting. Response to Question 4: Blue Springs on the Current. If you shut down access this could be included. Also the limitations on boats will be restricted to 25.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
3017	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: Personal comment Response to Question 5: More Recreational Facilities 40 HP Threw out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
3018	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: no action on riverways, camping, hiking or roads. Response to Question 3: any limitations to the river or access to camping, hiking, boat riding or swimming	7/20/2009	No			MO	63960
3019	Response to Question 1: The no action plan is best. Motor Boats should not be restricted. Response to Question 3: Do not restrict horse power of motor boats or where they can be used. If you all think they are so bad why do Rangers use them? Response to Question 4: We use jet boats for the same reasons the Park Rangers use them, to get to places along the River that you can't drive or float to in a day. Response to Question 5: Don't take this away from my kids & grand kids.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3020	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: First Alternative No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of Both Rivers are special to me. Response to Question 5: NONE	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3021	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Changing the horsepower restrictions	7/20/2009	No			MO	63016
3022	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: leaving things as they are today. Response to Question 3: any limiting on roads or riverways	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
3023	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no shutting down roads or access to any hunting fields Response to Question 3: Limitations on roads, river, boats, and tubing or access to any of these.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
3024	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: no limiting of usage or horse power on boats Response to Question 3: Limiting horsepower limits on boats, access to camping or swimming. Usage of roads Response to Question 4: Blue Springs on the Current River and Roberts Landing. My family was raised, and even owned @ one time. Taking access and limiting my use of these areas would really be upsetting. Response to Question 5: Leave things as they. Everyone has access to different areas. Boating, tubing, canoeing, hunting or riding on road.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
3025	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp to out put shaft.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65535
3026	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65559
3027	Written on front of Park Form: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638

3028	Response to Question 1: Leave the motorboats alone 40 HP at the pump is barely adiqute Response to Question 2: Reclaim the old Farm sites Response to Question 3: I say no to any wilderness area on the Current River Response to Question 4: Powder Mill & cotoriver access points need to be improved Response to Question 5: All canoes should be numbered and the name of the concessioner	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3029	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No	7/31/2009	No			MO	63629
3030	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All parts of A, B, C Response to Question 4: The concern is all 134 miles of it, that eventually we will be forced to stay off of it. Response to Question 5: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3031	Response to Question 1: No Action, 40 hp rated at the Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Rocky Falls, Powder Mill Response to Question 5: Canoe parties should not be more than 20 canoes.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63633
3032	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate horsepower at pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: More boat ramps more camping leave roads open	7/8/2009	No			MO	65588
3033	Response to Question 1: No Action No Hp Limit Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Leave as is. Response to Question 5: Don't overmanage leave motorboats alone limit the number of canoes allowed	7/8/2009	No			MO	63650
3034	Response to Question 1: A - I would request non motorized for the entire Current River A - Jacks fork is perfect Response to Question 2: Alternative A is closest to meet my preference *Non motorized as much as possible please when the boats go by tubers & canoes/kayaks the water comes into the craft. The smell lingers for 1/4 mile at times the fumes are nauseating & the noise pollution ruins the peacefulness Response to Question 3: Prefer no development except the new Pressley Property which would enhance opportunities for camp, cabins & tube/canoe/kayak pleasure. *Please ban ATV's/dirt bikes etc. they are destroying the rivers Response to Question 4: Akers to Round - georgus keep it as natural as you can I am noticing less wildlife & waterlife with each visit and I am concerned about the causes. Alley to below Eminence - same as above. Limit horse pollution please. Response to Question 5: Minimize large groups of drunk floaters. Foul language & disrespect for other floaters occurs more frequently. Really appreciate law enforcement presence on the River!	7/30/2009	No			MO	65203
3035	Response to Question 1: No Aciton Better - Roads. I like to fish so I would like to keep my 40 HP at they jet. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: Their is enough Room for every body. Powder Mill - To - Roud Spring. Response to Question 5: --More Trash Cans. --More Fish Tourns. --Open more parts of the Vier to bigger boats.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3036	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Return to natural environment - quiet environment to enjoy nature & water Response to Question 3: any increase of motorized vehicles, boats or increase horse use Response to Question 4: Big Springs	8/5/2009	No			MO	63090
3037	Response to Question 1: PLAN A 1) Ban ATV's & dirt bikes from Jacks-Fork and Current above Rd. Springs. 2) Limit HORSES (trail rides) to groups of 20 or less and keep down-stream of Alley Springs and Round Springs Response to Question 2: Restrict jet boats to lower rivers so canoe campers can once again experience nature. Please Ban all ATVs/dirt bikes/and Large trail Rides. Response to Question 3: Do Not allow ANY TRAIL RIDES above Alley Springs (on Jacks Fork)and above Round Springs (on Current). Response to Question 4: Upper Jacks-Fork and Current River above Round Springs. Need to be protected from MEGA-HORSSE OPERATIONS, and off-road vehicles. Response to Question 5: PLEASE SHUT DOWN THE MEGA-HORSE OPERATIONS - ESPECIALLY ON THE UPPER JACK'S FORK.	7/30/2009	No			KS	66208
3038	Response to Question 1: The best alternative that I feel is No Action. The Riverways are the pride and joy of the Ozarks Response to Question 2: No Action alternative is the best. ONSR is currently available to all public who wish to enjoy them. We should not restrict people access to the wonderful Riverways Response to Question 3: I strongly feel alternative A will NOT benefit anyone and that ONSR should not be deemed a wilderness area Response to Question 4: No action alternative Response to Question 5: There should be No Action to the management of the Riverways. The Riverways are here to be enjoyed and shared by all public, and no one should be able to take that away, the Riverways should be Freely accessible to all pubic	7/30/2009	No			MO	65066
3039	Response to Question 1: We want more resources added with NO ACTION taken Response to Question 2: free access and usage Response to Question 3: RESTRICTED recreational usage and access Response to Question 4: I would like Bay Creek to be open to the public without restrictions on numbers of people, tents or cars. more access Response to Question 5: more recreational usage and access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63052
3040	Response to Question 1: No action is better then the proposed alternatives. Current regulations have pretty well been accepted and are in use. There has been some proppress in controlling the obnoxious drinking rowdy crowds. This needs continued improvement. I support a Total ban on alcohol would help - leave current boating regulations as they are. Response to Question 5: 1. listen to local people. They have to live with park service more than anyone else, especially idealistic people from away. 2. Ban alcohol to help control behavior and litter 3. allow as much general use in all areas as possible.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65560

3041	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION!!! Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL Response to Question 4: NO	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
3042	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: (No Action) Need to enforce existing laws re: alcohol, nudity & profanity. If you enforce the no alcohol-you won't have nudity, profanity or problems w/boats & canoes. (Concerned previous resident.)	7/31/2009	No			TN	38059
3043	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: No action 40 HP Boats be allowed on River below Round Springs ResResponse to Question 4: I currently live in Ottawa, KS. I'm from Ellington, Mo. and married a woman from Van Buren, Mo. We have bought a lot to build our retirement home on. It is located in Van Buren. We dicided to Retire here because of Current River. We have bought a boat & motor to enjoy Current River during our retirement. If the A, B, or C alternatives is chosen we will sell our lot & retire someplace else. My family has enjoyed this River for over 60 years and hope to continue as is. Response to Question 5: There should be less people floating the river. Sometimes I've seen a 100 people in an area where their just bumping into each other. It is dangerous for them, they cannot properly float to avoid obstacles with so many people. By the way the first week I was in my boat I rescued a lady was was 8 1/2 mos. pregnant (2 wks from due date) Her canoe had overturned and she hit a tree with her stomach. I took her in my boat to Van Buren so she could get to hospital.	7/31/2009	No			KS	66067
3044	Dear Superintendent Detring: The Department of Conservation (Department) welcomes the opportunity to consider the preliminary alternatives proposed for the next Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) General Management Plan (GMP). The Missouri Conservation Commission (Commission) is constitutionally charged with "The control, management, restoration, conservation, and regulation of the bird, fish, game, forestry and all wildlife resources of the state, including hatcheries, sanctuaries, refuges, reservations and all other property owned, acquired or used for such purposes." The Commission oversees the policies, management, and operations of the Department. It is the Department's mission to serve the public and facilitate their participation in resources management activities and to provide opportunity for all citizens to use, enjoy, and learn about fish, forest, and wildlife resources. The Commission discussed the preliminary alternatives for the ONSR GMP at their September, 2009 meeting. They reviewed and approved this letter and I am pleased to convey the following on their behalf. The Department recognizes that there are various and diverse users of the ONSR. The challenge is to focus adequate staffing and funding toward natural resources management and protection and provide a quality experience for all citizens who enjoy and use the ONSR. The Department recommends hunting, fishing, and trapping to continue to be allowed throughout the ONSR except in highly developed areas where a reasonable safety zone for public protection may be required. Giggling is a very popular sport on the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. Trout fishing is also popular within the ONSR. Specific language in the 1985 GMP stated, "The program proposes to continue present fisheries activities, including the cooperative trout management program with the state on the upper reaches of the Current River." This statement should be carried over into the new GMP. Any discussion of boat motor horsepower limits would be incomplete without consideration of the impacts proposed changes on angler access and fish communities. Zoning based on horsepower dictates where certain boats can gig or fish. Some areas of the river will receive more or less harvest pressure and a corresponding shift in fish community dependent upon boat access to a particular section of the river. Further restriction of horsepower could impact our ability to complete fish management activities and enforce the Wildlife Code within the ONSR. The ONSR has significant natural and cultural resources in its trust. There is a need during the development of the GMP to have a comprehensive review and complete assessment of resources, management options for those resources, recreational uses (past, present and future) and infrastructure in order to make an informed decision on any proposed management alternatives. The planning process will need to identify current and future recreational activities and user groups. A balance between resource protection and use is needed to minimize any short-term degradation and eliminate any long-term impacts. Flexibility in the GMP will be needed to provide opportunity for creative solutions for future resources and recreation concerns. Recognizing ONSR's need to control unauthorized access points and undesignated public use areas, the Department has some initial suggestions. Develop a system of streamside trails to accommodate fishing access and other uses. Upgrade the existing camping facilities and day-use facilities to attract and encourage families and children to experience nature in the great outdoors. Construct a visitor's center for interpretation of ONSR natural, cultural, and recreational features. Improve access at Waymeyer to decrease user conflicts be providing a way for boaters to access the river and travel upstream. Consider using Welsh Springs, in place of Akers, as a boundary for horsepower limits. There may be partnership opportunities available for at least some of the suggested infrastructure improvements. Other opportunities for resources and user management will likely be identified during the GMP development process. The Department is not in favor of a "Wilderness" designation for the Big Springs area. Instead, we propose a "Primitive" designation with certain enhancements found within a "Wilderness" prescription. The Big Springs area can be protected with this approach from activities which might diminish its natural, primitive character. Given the impacts of necessary fire protection, drought and insect damage, climate change and invasive species, a "Wilderness" designation would limit access and eliminate many of the management tools needed to address these and future concerns. The Department is a neighbor with significant ownership adjacent to the ONSR (Blue Springs Natural Area, Sunklands Conservation Area (CA), Angelina CA, Rocky Creek CA, Current River CA, and Peck Ranch CA). Consideration of the impact of the GMP to adjacent ownerships and resources to the ONSR should be part of the review and assessment. The enabling federal legislation created two gaps within the ONSR. While the GMP does not regulate with the gaps, it does have potential to impact it through displacement of previously allowed activities within the ONSR. Conversely, the gaps are recreational entry points for the ONSR. The GMP would be incomplete without a consideration of the plan's impacts on natural resources, water quality, and recreational use on/from the gaps and adjacent neighbors. We support the "No Action" GMP alternative with provisions. Alternative A, B, and C are either too restrictive or permissive for practical management considerations. While others have characterized "No Action" alternative as the "Do Nothing" approach, we disagree. The "No	9/21/2009	No		Missouri Department of Conservation	MO	65102-0180

	<p>Action" alternative provides the best opportunity to balance competing uses and resource protection with the necessary flexibility to meet current and future needs. This alternative recognizes the various and diverse users of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and is consistent with the federal legislation establishing the ONSR. Full implementation of the GMP is needed. The challenge is to focus adequate staffing and funding toward natural resource management and protection and provide a quality experience for ONSR visitors. In closing, the Department has been involved with the ONSR from the beginning. A special news release issued by the Conservation Commission and the Department on February 10, 1961 expressed support for a program for protecting the Current River and against exploitation and destruction of its scenic value. However, the Department did have concerns. At that time, a large deer herd was present and wild turkeys were being restored to the area. The National Park Service had proposed no hunting or management of timber resources. We made it clear that wildlife resources should be available to sportsmen through hunting. We also stated that certain forest improvement techniques would benefit wildlife and local economy without endangering the purposes of the park. The release concluded with, "We believe the National Park Service, in cooperation with this Department...can protect this region against unwise exploitation while recognizing a wider use of the recreational potential in the best interest of both visitors and residents in the region." Fifty-eight years later, the current Commission and Department believes this is still the case. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p>						
3045	<p>Dear Superintendent Detring: The Department of Conservation (Department) welcomes the opportunity to consider the preliminary alternatives proposed for the next Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) General Management Plan (GMP). The Missouri Conservation Commission (Commission) is constitutionally charged with "The control, management, restoration, conservation, and regulation of the bird, fish, game, forestry and all wildlife resources of the state, including hatcheries, sanctuaries, refuges, reservations and all other property owned, acquired or used for such purposes." The Commission oversees the policies, management, and operations of the Department. It is the Department's mission to serve the public and facilitate their participation in resources management activities and to provide opportunity for all citizens to use, enjoy, and learn about fish, forest, and wildlife resources. The Commission discussed the preliminary alternatives for the ONSR GMP at their September, 2009 meeting. They reviewed and approved this letter and I am pleased to convey the following on their behalf. The Department recognizes that there are various and diverse users of the ONSR. The challenge is to focus adequate staffing and funding toward natural resources management and protection and provide a quality experience for all citizens who enjoy and use the ONSR. The Department recommends hunting, fishing, and trapping to continue to be allowed throughout the ONSR except in highly developed areas where a reasonable safety zone for public protection may be required. Giggling is a very popular sport on the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. Trout fishing is also popular within the ONSR. Specific language in the 1985 GMP stated, "The program proposes to continue present fisheries activities, including the cooperative trout management program with the state on the upper reaches of the Current River." This statement should be carried over into the new GMP. Any discussion of boat motor horsepower limits would be incomplete without consideration of the impacts proposed changes on angler access and fish communities. Zoning based on horsepower dictates where certain boats can gig or fish. Some areas of the river will receive more or less harvest pressure and a corresponding shift in fish community dependent upon boat access to a particular section of the river. Further restriction of horsepower could impact our ability to complete fish management activities and enforce the Wildlife Code within the ONSR. The ONSR has significant natural and cultural resources in its trust. There is a need during the development of the GMP to have a comprehensive review and complete assessment of resources, management options for those resources, recreational uses (past, present and future) and infrastructure in order to make an informed decision on any proposed management alternatives. The planning process will need to identify current and future recreational activities and user groups. A balance between resource protection and use is needed to minimize any short-term degradation and eliminate any long-term impacts. Flexibility in the GMP will be needed to provide opportunity for creative solutions for future resources and recreation concerns. Recognizing ONSR's need to control unauthorized access points and undesignated public use areas, the Department has some initial suggestions. Develop a system of streamside trails to accommodate fishing access and other uses. Upgrade the existing camping facilities and day-use facilities to attract and encourage families and children to experience nature in the great outdoors. Construct a visitor's center for interpretation of ONSR natural, cultural, and recreational features. Improve access at Waymeyer to decrease user conflicts by providing a way for boaters to access the river and travel upstream. Consider using Welsh Springs, in place of Akers, as a boundary for horsepower limits. There may be partnership opportunities available for at least some of the suggested infrastructure improvements. Other opportunities for resources and user management will likely be identified during the GMP development process. The Department is not in favor of a "Wilderness" designation for the Big Springs area. Instead, we propose a "Primitive" designation with certain enhancements found within a "Wilderness" prescription. The Big Springs area can be protected with this approach from activities which might diminish its natural, primitive character. Given the impacts of necessary fire protection, drought and insect damage, climate change and invasive species, a "Wilderness" designation would limit access and eliminate many of the management tools needed to address these and future concerns. The Department is a neighbor with significant ownership adjacent to the ONSR (Blue Springs Natural Area, Sunklands Conservation Area (CA), Angelina CA, Rocky Creek CA, Current River CA, and Peck Ranch CA). Consideration of the impact of the GMP to adjacent ownerships and resources to the ONSR should be part of the review and assessment. The enabling federal legislation created two gaps within the ONSR. While the GMP does not regulate with the gaps, it does have potential to impact it through displacement of previously allowed activities within the ONSR. Conversely, the gaps are recreational entry points for the ONSR. The GMP would be incomplete without a consideration of the plan's impacts on natural resources, water quality, and recreational use on/from the gaps and adjacent neighbors. We support the "No Action" GMP alternative with provisions. Alternative A, B, and C are either too restrictive or permissive for practical management considerations. While others have characterized "No Action" alternative as the "Do Nothing" approach, we disagree. The "No Action" alternative provides the best opportunity to balance competing uses and resource protection with the necessary flexibility to meet current and future needs. This alternative recognizes the various and diverse users of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and is consistent with the federal legislation establishing the ONSR. Full implementation of the GMP is needed. The challenge is to focus adequate staffing and funding</p>	9/21/2009	No		Missouri Department of Conservation	MO	65102- 0180

	<p>toward natural resource management and protection and provide a quality experience for ONSR visitors. In closing, the Department has been involved with the ONSR from the beginning. A special news release issued by the Conservation Commission and the Department on February 10, 1961 expressed support for a program for protecting the Current River and against exploitation and destruction of its scenic value. However, the Department did have concerns. At that time, a large deer herd was present and wild turkeys were being restored to the area. The National Park Service had proposed no hunting or management of timber resources. We made it clear that wildlife resources should be available to sportsmen through hunting. We also stated that certain forest improvement techniques would benefit wildlife and local economy without endangering the purposes of the park. The release concluded with, "We believe the National Park Service, in cooperation with this Department...can protect this region against unwise exploitation while recognizing a wider use of the recreational potential in the best interest of both visitors and residents in the region." Fifty-eight years later, the current Commission and Department believes this is still the case. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p>						
3046	<p>Dear Superintendent Detring: The Department of Conservation (Department) welcomes the opportunity to consider the preliminary alternatives proposed for the next Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) General Management Plan (GMP). The Missouri Conservation Commission (Commission) is constitutionally charged with "The control, management, restoration, conservation, and regulation of the bird, fish, game, forestry and all wildlife resources of the state, including hatcheries, sanctuaries, refuges, reservations and all other property owned, acquired or used for such purposes." The Commission oversees the policies, management, and operations of the Department. It is the Department's mission to serve the public and facilitate their participation in resources management activities and to provide opportunity for all citizens to use, enjoy, and learn about fish, forest, and wildlife resources. The Commission discussed the preliminary alternatives for the ONSR GMP at their September, 2009 meeting. They reviewed and approved this letter and I am pleased to convey the following on their behalf. The Department recognizes that there are various and diverse users of the ONSR. The challenge is to focus adequate staffing and funding toward natural resources management and protection and provide a quality experience for all citizens who enjoy and use the ONSR. The Department recommends hunting, fishing, and trapping to continue to be allowed throughout the ONSR except in highly developed areas where a reasonable safety zone for public protection may be required. Giggling is a very popular sport on the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. Trout fishing is also popular within the ONSR. Specific language in the 1985 GMP stated, "The program proposes to continue present fisheries activities, including the cooperative trout management program with the state on the upper reaches of the Current River." This statement should be carried over into the new GMP. Any discussion of boat motor horsepower limits would be incomplete without consideration of the impacts proposed changes on angler access and fish communities. Zoning based on horsepower dictates where certain boats can gig or fish. Some areas of the river will receive more or less harvest pressure and a corresponding shift in fish community dependent upon boat access to a particular section of the river. Further restriction of horsepower could impact our ability to complete fish management activities and enforce the Wildlife Code within the ONSR. The ONSR has significant natural and cultural resources in its trust. There is a need during the development of the GMP to have a comprehensive review and complete assessment of resources, management options for those resources, recreational uses (past, present and future) and infrastructure in order to make an informed decision on any proposed management alternatives. The planning process will need to identify current and future recreational activities and user groups. A balance between resource protection and use is needed to minimize any short-term degradation and eliminate any long-term impacts. Flexibility in the GMP will be needed to provide opportunity for creative solutions for future resources and recreation concerns. Recognizing ONSR's need to control unauthorized access points and undesignated public use areas, the Department has some initial suggestions. Develop a system of streamside trails to accommodate fishing access and other uses. Upgrade the existing camping facilities and day-use facilities to attract and encourage families and children to experience nature in the great outdoors. Construct a visitor's center for interpretation of ONSR natural, cultural, and recreational features. Improve access at Waymeyer to decrease user conflicts by providing a way for boaters to access the river and travel upstream. Consider using Welsh Springs, in place of Akers, as a boundary for horsepower limits. There may be partnership opportunities available for at least some of the suggested infrastructure improvements. Other opportunities for resources and user management will likely be identified during the GMP development process. The Department is not in favor of a "Wilderness" designation for the Big Springs area. Instead, we propose a "Primitive" designation with certain enhancements found within a "Wilderness" prescription. The Big Springs area can be protected with this approach from activities which might diminish its natural, primitive character. Given the impacts of necessary fire protection, drought and insect damage, climate change and invasive species, a "Wilderness" designation would limit access and eliminate many of the management tools needed to address these and future concerns. The Department is a neighbor with significant ownership adjacent to the ONSR (Blue Springs Natural Area, Sunklands Conservation Area (CA), Angelina CA, Rocky Creek CA, Current River CA, and Peck Ranch CA). Consideration of the impact of the GMP to adjacent ownerships and resources to the ONSR should be part of the review and assessment. The enabling federal legislation created two gaps within the ONSR. While the GMP does not regulate with the gaps, it does have potential to impact it through displacement of previously allowed activities within the ONSR. Conversely, the gaps are recreational entry points for the ONSR. The GMP would be incomplete without a consideration of the plan's impacts on natural resources, water quality, and recreational use on/from the gaps and adjacent neighbors. We support the "No Action" GMP alternative with provisions. Alternative A, B, and C are either too restrictive or permissive for practical management considerations. While others have characterized "No Action" alternative as the "Do Nothing" approach, we disagree. The "No Action" alternative provides the best opportunity to balance competing uses and resource protection with the necessary flexibility to meet current and future needs. This alternative recognizes the various and diverse users of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and is consistent with the federal legislation establishing the ONSR. Full implementation of the GMP is needed. The challenge is to focus adequate staffing and funding toward natural resource management and protection and provide a quality experience for ONSR visitors. In closing, the Department has been involved with the ONSR from the beginning. A special news release issued by the Conservation Commission and the Department on February 10, 1961 expressed support for a program for protecting the Current River and against exploitation and destruction of its scenic value. However, the</p>	9/21/2009	No		Missouri Department of Conservation	MO	65102-0180

	Department did have concerns. At that time, a large deer herd was present and wild turkeys were being restored to the area. The National Park Service had proposed no hunting or management of timber resources. We made it clear that wildlife resources should be available to sportsmen through hunting. We also stated that certain forest improvement techniques would benefit wildlife and local economy without endangering the purposes of the park. The release concluded with, "We believe the National Park Service, in cooperation with this Department...can protect this region against unwise exploitation while recognizing a wider use of the recreational potential in the best interest of both visitors and residents in the region." Fifty-eight years later, the current Commission and Department believes this is still the case. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.						
3047	Our extended family own property on the lower current and we have lived there off and on since the 1970's. Our family and friends love the Current River and still spend a lot of time floating and camping on all the Ozark streams. The Current will always be our first love. We've seen many negative changes in thirty years, more and bigger power boats, more canoes and the trail rides. The increased traffic has generated a lot of trash, high levels of noise from the big boats and worst of all the human waste on the gravel bays. The access points and popular gravel bars are filthy with diapers, toilet paper and human and animal waste. The canoes are not compatible with the power boats and there is bound to be a collision some day. I don't believe there should be any power boats above Blue Spring to keep the river quiet and safe for canoes and fishing. We camp often at Powder Mill. At one time it was the most quiet of campgrounds. In recent years R.V.s with generators and boats have spoiled it. Cars park right on the rivers edge and blast thier radios. I have tried to talk to Park Service employees about these things and have been told we must camp and float during the week. Why must we camp during the week just to find the quiet we should expect in the park. Surely you know the locals contribute a lot of trash at the access poinls and gravel bars. They put up extended camps and leave a lot of debris behind. There is a camp of permanent trailers across from Blue Spring, there is a lot of noise and boat traffic there. Is this not part of the Scenic Riverways. The Buffalo River area seems to be doing a much better job of preserving what Arkansas has. Please be very conservative planning for the next twenty years. Please limit canoes, limit engine size with no boats or very small engines above Blue Spring. Please close access points and keep campgrounds primitive.	7/23/2009	No			MO	N/A
3048	Please take all possible measures to preserve the wilderness character of these areas for us as well as for future generations. Once opened to noisy and otherwise disruptive activities these areas will be lost to all of us for a quiet enjoyment.	9/14/2009	No			MO	63130
3049	Mr. Superintendent, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Alternatives for your new management plan. Alternative A is the choice I believe is the best for the future direction for the Park. This is mainly because of its treatment of motorboats. They just are so loud, they can be heard, it seems, for miles. They allow are person or groop to disturb everone around. Why are they allowed to disturb others? It seems very selfish My other major concern is water quality. It seems to me that should be the bottom line concern for a park based on rivers. The amount of horse use is unsustainable at this point. Again, it seems that are persons recreation (or several thousands!) is impinging on the abilities of others to enjoy the park, and the quality of the resource. I realize these views are not always the same of a vocal minority of local users. As the National Park Service I see your job as maintaing there resource and making and enforcing rules that allow an appropriate amount of enjoyment/use that allows all to enjoy it, not just those with the largest engines. Thanks again.	9/14/2009	No			MO	65464
3050	Dear Mr. Detring: It saddens me to read in the Post-Dispatch and Sierra Club reports of the damage from misuse of Missouri's Ozark Nat'l Scenic Riverways. My children attended summer camp in the area, and with their families now enjoy float trips there. Changes are needed to save this rare and wonderful wilderness. I believe these steps are crucial: a. Elimination of wildcat motor access and vehicle use off legal roads. b. control of number and location of commercial trail rides to prevent more erosion and pollution c. stricter control of motorized boats –especially jet boats- to maintain peace and natural serenity of the rivers. I am asking Congress to qualify the pocket of original wild land in the backcountry hills near Blue Spring for the Wilderness System and hope you are giving that your support.	8/10/2009	No			MO	63105-3707
3051	Re: General Mgmt Plan To whom it may concern: I trust that by having this letter postmarked on the 11th will suffice for your deadline acceptance. First, a short bio of my background to justify my comments, I am recently retired from the Missouri Department of Conservation following 32 years of service as an environmental liason with state, federal and private entities. In this capacity, I worked to achieve the Department's concerns with activities affecting the Constitutional mandate to protect and restore the state's natural resources. My experience includes many activities directly and indirectly impacting the Scenic Riverways. During my retirement, my travels have precluded involvement in your planning efforts. Fortunately, I arrived in Missouri in time to catch your deadline extension only to find that my computer had crashed, but only after I was able to give a cursory review of your documents on line. Thus, this handwritten note before I resume my travels. Please add my name and address to your mailing list for future planning documents and, if possible, include past documents for my indepth review. I became a Missouri resident and Department official in time to become well acquainted with the pre-riverways federal history and the private citizens who fought impoundment and created the National Park. I did not see any reference to this important part of history in my short review. Also missing was the citizen input that led to the Congressional mandate that should be the planning touchstone for your undertaking and the test for any alternatives. The following comments are within the context of those mandates. The first of these mandates significantly reads as follows: Preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes and unspoiled settings derived from the clean free flowing Current and Jack Forks Rivers and the springs and caves and their Karst origins. (emphasis added). Missing, perhaps for political purposes but certainly implied are the terms "protect" and "restore". Also implied are the watersheds that make up the river basin and the recharge areas. I have frequently faulted the Park Service for administratively looking beyond the present park boundaries. Not the least of which has been the reluctance to work with the Little Rock District, COE in their adjudication of Section 404 activities affecting said watersheds or recharge areas. Their have been other potential cooperative efforts lost in land use matters that fall under this mandate. As these forms of activities inimical to Mandate No. 1	9/10/2009	No			MO	65043

	increase within the next 15-20 years, or your planning horizon, such involvement will be as important or more so than your present planning parameters. Also written this Mandate is a recommendation I have twice made in the past concerning the establishment of a research facility at the present Welch Lodge complex. This facility, under a cooperative arrangement with the university at Columbia, the Departments of Conservation and Natural Resources and the Missouri STREAM TEAM project would compliment the planning effort by providing the metrics for testing Park achievement planning goals. The second Mandate encompasses what I gathered to be the thrust of your present planning efforts: recreation. One portion of this mandate reads: consistent with the preservation of the natural riverways resources. While the congressional emphasis is on natural resources, the professional recreation manager also focuses on user values. Here the Service I believe has dropped the ball in the past by not providing the wildland manpower to curb early in that which has become a source of user conflict, both on and off the rivers. Managing this conflict now will be compounded by past negligence. The more that participants now desire more primitive experiences, the higher the Service's resolve to meet that expectation will become. To do other wise is to further depart from the mandate and public expectations and the greater dissatisfaction the public's view of Service efforts. Planning efforts therefore should meet head on at this early stage the quid pro quo to test public acceptance of the trade offs. I hope to be in Missouri more frequently in 2010 therefore I should be able to review your draft Plan. If you wish to discuss my views further, I should be available for a trip to Van Buren this fall. Please pardon this (draft quality) letter, but under my present circumstances it is better than nothing.						
3052	Dear people, I want to protect the Current and Jack's Fork rivers before they are overused or abused. I don't want illegal roads or accesses on our national river treasures. I know the local people cling to the belief that they are near and It should be theirs but you know we have to share our other state and city parks with everyone else that uses them. I do not support motorized vehikles (ATV's) over runing the river banks. Jet boats are rediculous on these narrow streams. This is a wilderness area and those are not in tune with the nature experience we initially protected. I think the upper regions of these rivers should be motor free and only paddle type craft should be allowed. Horses near the river may be fine but manure is unwelcome. I have drunk from these rivers and springs and pollution (e coli) is not acceptable anymore than open sewers in town are. Thank you for reading Keep it wild There are other places for the other activities	9/10/2009	No			MO	65202
3053	Keep Missouri's Water ways Free of pollution – Protect the water, the Big Spring Wilderness, & all animal life that depends on a Clean environment. Protect Ozark National Scenic Riverways!	8/3/2009	No		Earth Savers	MO	65772
3054	Dear Mr. Detring The illegal wildcat motor accesses to the Jack Forks and Current River Senic areas must be eliminated. These accesses create a fragmentation of habitat used by riparian birds, mammals, insects and unique vegetative communities. The loss of natural bank vegetation also degrades the senic quality of the river and increases the vulnerability of river bands to erosion, particularly during floods Finally, they create opportunities for illegal river access by land vehicles, especially ATV's. Otherwise the "Riverways" will be downgraded to "motorways." The vehicle use of off legal roads must be eliminated. Otherwise, no campsite is safe, no gravel bar can avoid being ruined Two important conservation goals on the riverways are the maintenance of vegetative closure on the banks and the restoration of flood plain forests. Both provide vital habitat for native riparian communities of birds, mammals, insects and amphibians and the cover itself is an important natural community. The native biodiversity on the riverways depends largely on the integrity of these natural riparian communities. Allowing mobile campers on an open field is an anathema to the restoration and protection of the natural landscape. Also commercial trail rides must be controlled in numbers and locations. Otherwise erosion and pollution will get even worse. In 1998, a 5 river-mile section of the Jack Forks was listed as impaired due to the high fecal coliform level. This was expanded to 7 river miles in 2002. In order to determine the source of the contamination a joint US.GS/NPS study was carried out in 2003 and 2004. It was determined that the primary source of fecal coliform was horses and that the significant increases in densities in the Jack Forks were associated with cross-country horse-back-riding events. We feel that what should have happened at this point was the closing of the National Riverways to horses with the putting in place of a program to study the problem and to seek a solution. –Instead trail riding continued unabated. One of the stated purposes of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is to preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes and unspoiled settings. The National Park Service would need to consider the impacts of further development of recreation areas and/or opening areas to mixed use, and the location of structures and trails to prevent further degradation of water quality in the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. E coli remains an issue to be addressed on the Jacks Fork. There are several problems to be addressed by the National Park Service. 1) The rowdy-party-like behavior of large groups of floaters 2) The small number of access points to the river has increased to more than 100. 3) The network of roads linking access points has resulted in an attack on the river valley from all sorts of motorized vehicles. This comes day and night, year round. The sad commentary from many observers is that there may no longer be a riverside spot to provide a peaceful camp at night. 4) The open access even to otherwise remote areas has stimulated an escalating development of river resources. Too often the National Park Service to small areas of overuse has been to sanction the activity with official grills, trash cans, etc. rather than fix the damage and restore the park. 5) The Ozark National Scenic Riverways (identified as a globally-significant important Bird Area) needs to e protected. The land and waters of the riverways (comprised of two of the finest free-flowing river systems in the country) the Current River and its tributary Jacks Fork – are threatened by overuse, development, and illegal access. These riverways are within the globally-significant Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area designated by the National Audubon Society to identify, monitor, and conserve areas that are most important to migrating and breeding birds. Various sources of comment and advice come from: Jerry D. Vineyard – Mo Asst State Geologist National Audubon Society Robert Cross - Ozark Society Missouri Dept of National Resources National Parks Association Friends of Ozark Riverways Missouri Wilderness Coalition Sierra Club – Missouri Chapter Please promote a new management plan that focuses on controlling – and reversing – the proliferation of access points. Access points require facilities – maintenance policing - so in times when National Park Service	9/8/2009	No			MO	63111

	is limited, it should be evident that fewer access points are not only cost effective, but more importantly essential to good resource management. Sincerely yours,						
3055	Dear Superintendent Detring, I am writing to you about the plan for ONSR. As one of its stated purposes is to "preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled settings," I would like the National Park Service to take the following actions: • designate Big Spring as a Wilderness Area • eliminate illegal access points • control the number and location of commercial trail rides • eliminate vehicle use off of legal roads • control motorized boats I believe these steps will help maintain a healthy ONSR. The National Park Service must balance meeting the needs of present visitors while responsibly managing ONSR for the future. I want people to visit and enjoy the area, but some activities must be prohibited or strictly controlled. Otherwise, the water and land will be severely degraded. Please, protect ONSR, for today and tomorrow. Thank you for your time. Sincerely,	9/9/2009	No			MO	63116
3056	Dear Sir, I understand you are going to look at a new General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. What has developed since 1964 has been completely ridiculous. This is not "the Traditional way of life" as some of these people try to tell us. It used to be a place where wildlife and humans could take a deep breath. Now you can hardly get away from the noise. People with ATV's, jet skis, power boats are not enjoying the river and its surroundings, They are oblivious to the natural area. Also the people who congregate in giant horse trail rides don't care about the area. We like to hike and tent camp, paddle a canoe, swim, fish. We appreciate a peaceful, natural, quiet spot to do these things. Thank you.	9/9/2009	No			MS	65203-9143
3057	to whom it may concern, My husband,, and I have been fortunate to own a river cabin, in the Van Buren area. We have owned it for 22 years. We do not, and have not had any problems, such as we have read about in the papers. We do hope there will not be any changes on the river - We feel everything is fine – Why change it if its not broke!	9/8/2009	No			MO	63901
3058	The National Park Service re: General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways In 1951 my parents, _____ purchased 257.25 acres (more or less) lying North of the Current River in Shannon County, MO. They loved the Ozarks, the river and the wooded land. My dad loved to hunt and fish and planned to retire and move to the area. They eventually moved to Salem, MO. In 1970 when the "3 Rivers Bill" was passed, my parents were forced to sell their riverfront acreage on the Current as the Federal Government designated this to be the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This bill was to ensure the land and the riverfront would be kept as natural as possible and a park for all people to enjoy. The government bought 96.04 acres (more or less) bordering the river. It reduced my parents property and was and is now 161.21 acres (more or less) total. This land was always protected and kept in the original pristine conditions by my parents, and now by my sister and me. We don't intend to sell the land or the trees. (We have been approached several times for the timber.) After inheriting the property in 1985 at the death of our mother, we have continued to enjoy the property in its natural state. We and our extended families have had many fishing trips, camping and gatherings spanning over 50 years. We consider our families to be environmentalists supporting Alternative A which ensures the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be protected for future generations in as much like it was when established. Sincerely, Enclosed was a map of their property and a picture	7/8/2009	No			MO	63122
3059	Re: Riverways Current and Jacks Fork Rivers Please let's preserve these great riverways by either eliminating or restricting very heavily: 1- wildcat motor accesses 2- vehicle use off legal roads 3- control commercial trail rides in numbers and location 4- Control motorized boats especially the jet boats on the noise level. 5- Preserve the Big Spring wilderness and propose this to Congress Noise –constant loud noise is a very disturbing, disruptive factor for our health. We need the quieter, calming, natural noises found in these Riverways away from motorized noises and stress of the cities. Sincerely,	9/14/2009	No			MO	63130
3060	Reed Detring: I start this letter with the statement "Nothing can ruin an area like too many people" We used to camp around the Current River and Big Springs 40 years ago & the intense quiet was one of the marvels of the place. I can still hear the boy selling wood as evening approached singing "Wood for Sale" in a lovely voice. I fondly recall the local residents who made those delectable boysenberry pies & came up to the camp site to sell them for a pittance. Such a peaceful pastime camping was, then. Now every time I see one of those mud splattered vehicles I can only picture the ruin he has done to a field of grass & soil; it's awful, not to mention the noise he made doing it! I think horse back riding by streams should not be allowed, canoes the only boats on the Ozark rivers & limited number of float trips be enforced Creating bank openings should not be allowed or at least the number limited. Last but not least get the ATVs out of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. They are noisy, they tear up turf & disturb campers & wildlife day & night. Also the drinking of alcohol does not mix with water activity if they want to party go to a bar. We must save Big Spring its an awesome waterway like no other. Please vote no on any more exploitation of our beloved Ozark Riverways. Sincerely,	9/10/2009	No			MO	64014
3061	Dear Mr. Detring, I am saddened to see what is happening to the ONSR. This has been a wonderful natural resource in the past, but is now being abused an overused. As an avid tent camper and hiker, I am hoping you can do something to turn this deteriorating situation around. Perhaps you need to start controlling the number of users at one time, and have more law enforcement in view to let visitors know they will not be allowed to abuse this beautiful riverway and surroundings. Sincerely,	9/4/2009	No			MO	63130
3062	Dear Mr. Detring, It has come to my attention that the NPS is asking for comments about planning for & problems with the National Scenic Riverways. I first went to the Current River when I was 13 years old in 1972. I had read about the NSR and convinced my best friend to go camping with me & convinced my Dad to drive us down there & stay with us while we explored. It is one of my most cherished memories. My older sister later went to SMS & I often went with her & her friends in years to come; followed by other relative & friend groups that have gone down there from the St Joseph/Kansas City area at least once a year for the past 30 years. I love the Riverways. I am concerned about the ATVs I have seen coming out of the woods & crossing the rivers, the last several years. I was shocked; it is so obviously destructive to wildlife habitat, scenic beauty	9/8/2009	No			MO	64507

	& legitimate park visitors, I could not believe that the NPS was allowing it. Please, please stop the ATVs – everyone can see the destruction they leave in their path - the ruts, the new roads, the mess, the noise. Also, I have read that trail rides are allowed along the rivers. This makes no sense to me; again the potential for destruction from just one trail riding business is enormous. However, I have seen some wild horses down there one evening about 2-3 yrs ago; I loved seeing them. Please don't remove the wild ones & definitely don't kill them or sell them off – Protect them. This summer I spent 2 nights at Big Spring Campground. I would be much in favor of designating the area "a wilderness area. As to the motor boats, keep them to a minimum. A few are fine & can be very helpful. My sister and I swamped our canoe 20+ years ago and I'll never forget the nice gentleman & his younger relative who helped us gather up all our possessions. This was after a lot of rain; the river was high & we were just about the only ones on the river. We were mighty glad to see those guys. Well, good luck in finding ways to keep these gorgeous areas as pristine & quiet as they were when we first went there 1974. They are a true Missouri treasure – one of the best. Sincerely,						
3063	I feel it is extremely important that Missouri has a management plan for the riverways. These rivers are a treasure, provide quality recreation for all citizens & therefore must be protected. The illegal wildcat motor access is destroying rivers. Vehicle use off of legal roads must be eliminated. If this is not done campsites & gravel bars will be destroyed. Commercial trailrides should be controlled otherwise erosion & pollution will get worse. Motorized boats & especially jet boats should be restricted in numbers otherwise the tranquility of the rivers will continue to deteriorate. There is one authentic pocket of original wildland in the back country hills near Big Spring. The Big Spring remnant is qualified for the wilderness system & the Park Service must protect & propose this to congress. It will save some of the finest strands of old growth pine & oak in the state. Sincerely,	9/14/2009	No			MO	63105
3064	Dear Superintendent, There was a time when conservationists were conservative. If we are going to turn our Ozark National Riverways into sewer creeks then lets remove them from National Park status. Save taxpayers the expense of subsidizing destruction of what is starting to become worthless to me anyhow. Or let the National Park Service be empowered to conserve a world treasure that God gave us. Yours Truly,	9/8/2009	No			MO	63143
3065	Dear Mr Detring, For most of my adult life I have traveled to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers to float with my family, Boy Scouts, and friends. I have fond memories of a clear, quiet, pristine watercourse. Now, I understand that the river has been degraded by illegal and exploitive users. Please take action to control motor boat use, limit horse riding use, both commercial & recreational, ban vehicles off legal roads, and A.T.V.s on trails. I want to see this scenic treasure returned to beautiful and peaceful place it was before unauthorized development. Also, we need to find a way to remediate the results of erosion. Sincerely yours,	9/10/2009	No		Missouri stream team, Sierran & Auduboner	MO	64804
3066	Dear Supt Detring, These comments are not for publication but are personal. We met yesterday with ..., She gave us much information and answered our questions. We were concerned about a continuation of CCC information and display in the Park. We are very satisfied to know this will continue. We did not go to the meetings or would not speak if due to harassment we have had by area people, so we keep a low profile. We greatly support the Park Service and all the wonderful people who work for it and us. We hope to meet with you soon for further discussion. Sincerely,	8/10/2009	No			MO	65588
3067	Dear Superintendent: I have canoed the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers many times with my family – they are truly lovely rivers. These are some of the best memories of my life. The clear, cold water and the wildlife in it. The sounds and sights of wildlife on the shore and overhead, the beauty of the trees and other plants and flowers that abound. It is heart breaking that all of this is at risk!! My suggestions for helping to remedy the situation are: 1. Limit the amount of traffic on the river. This may mean having to plan ahead and make reservations but this is expected in most recreation areas. 2. Enforcing rules that are already in place and passing more that are needed. If this is a budget problem – use volunteers. 3. Have areas for ATVs in other locations NOT on the river!! Participants can have fun without the use of a river!! 4. Have horseback trails in scenic areas NOT on the river. I love horseback riding (and have done a lot of it) but it doesn't have to be by or crossing a river to be an enjoyable and satisfying activity. 5. Restrict the use of radios and loud music as it drowns out the beautiful sounds of nature. These rivers are our states treasures - they must be saved, again, and have the damage done to them repaired BEFORE its too late forever!! As a citizen of this great state I will be so grateful for your efforts in this endeavor to save these fabulous rivers. Sincerely,	8/8/2009	No			MO	64735
3068	Dear Mr Superintendent. My name is ... and I've just read about the GMP alternatives. I strongly believe in choice A. or the strickist of plans. Current and Jacks Fork a National Parks. The rules at other parks are very strick. At other parks fees a charged and permits a needed for everything. You even get in trouble if one leaves food in thier car (bears). I have seen the destruction caused by hundreds of horses and canoes. If the people want to destroy the outdoors let them go to Party Cove at Lake Ozark or the zoo at Huzzuh Valley on Huzzuh Creek. I'm 44 years old and have studied herpetology since 1975 I used to go to the "Herp" Club meetings in the 1970s when Tom Johnson held them in the basement of the Monkey House at the St. Sts. Louis Zoo. Im telling you this because the years I've spent watching the Hellbender and Ozark Hellbender (Cryptobranchus alleganiensis bishopi) in the current and (C. A. alleganiensis) in other Ozark streams. I have alot more to say on this if anyone wants to know. But we must protect the O.N.S.R. to the fullest extent. Thank you. I hope I'm not to late thats why I scribilled this down to get it in by the 31st P.S. no motors!!!	8/3/2009	No			MO	63028
3069	To the Superintendent, I am writing this because I am concerned about what is happening to the Current and Jack Fork Rivers. They are part of Missouris largest park, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. These rivers are being degraded from man made bank openings and erosion caused by ATVs, dirt bikes and other recreational vehicles. Improperly planned horse trails are causing pollution problems and damage to at risk aquatic habitats on river and creek bottoms. Abuse of the river has occurred from many years. It's time to restore our beautiful waterways. Sincerely,	7/30/2009	No			MO	63141-8428
3070	Dear Supt. Reed Detring: My letter writing today concerns the future alternative plans for the Ozark National Riverway Park System. I am an avid small mouth, trout fisherman and kayaker. I have been doing these activities for over 25 yrs. & have fished & floated practical every creek & river in the state & some in other states. My main concerns is the water quality of these two rivers in your – our area; Current & Jacks Fork. They as you	7/27/2009	No			MO	63028-1211

	know are two of the best in the state and probably two of the better rivers in the U.S. I do stream team work in my area in Jefferson Co. Mo. On Joachim Creek where we own a family farm & I know how water quality impacts enjoyment of the river as well as quality of fishing; they go hand & hand. If these waters (Current and Jacks Fork) are allowed to be degraded by overuse & abuse you will be destroying the main reason for being there in the 1st place, the beauty of it & its quality. Every river has its own identity some for the better some unfortunately for the worse. I would like to see the Current & Jacks Fork for the better. I am not opposed to usage but frankly as a person who has been around horses & cattle all my life on our farm, they don't belong in the water in rivers; period. especially in large numbers, as you know horse & cattle manure produces excess nitrogen in the water & poor water quality, as well as disturbing fishing life & as well as effecting other aquatic species. Keep the horses on the trails. In conclusion I would have to say I prefer Alternative A in the General Management Plan. Keep the Rivers preserved for future generations. Thank you.					
3071	Dear Mr. Detring, As lifelong MO. residents we are writing to express our concern over the gross misuse of our beautiful Riverways. We used to canoe the Current and the Jacks Fork but quit about 10 years ago because they had gotten too crowded and noisy. The beauty, the peace and serenity were what drew us to the area to begin with but that is gone. It's been taken over by trail riders, both horse & motor. Motorized boats have no place on these rivers. They are dangerous and they completely destroy the peace & quiet of the canoeing experience. We live in a society that becomes increasingly noisy, faster, rude & irritating. I thought the reason for creating the National Parks was to preserve places of natural beauty as places of escape for us. What good are they if the park board allows them to be overtaken by noisy, rude, party people? Surely, you have the authority to stop all this pollution. Please do so. Sincerely,	8/10/2009	No		MO	64701
3075	Sir: Please help save the Current River – again – The management plan for the Ozark Natl Scenic Riverways should: • Permanently close all unofficial river access roads • Bar ATV's and dirt bikes • Improve management of horse trails • Control frequency and numbers of non-motorized watercraft • Support NOTHING that would undermine the natural character of the area – Missouri's gift to the Natl. Park system In memory of many hours spent in this management area – Thank you	7/27/2009	No		MO	63131
3076	Dear Sir, I have been floating on the Current & Jack's Fork Rivers since 1970. I am saddened by the decline in quality of the experience due to overuse & illegal use of these rivers. The practice of turning a blind eye to easement violations and allowing special interests to abuse the area for their own proffit must stop!! It is time to return to the orriginol plan for the Scenic Riverway & enforce the laws to protect it. No more special interests, no more allowing more horses, boaters, etc. than the resource can handle! Keep it SCENIC!	7/15/2009	No		MO	N/A
3077	Dear Superintendent It's no longer enjoyable floating the Ozark Scenic Riverways. I favor Alternative A proposed by the National Park Service, restricting or prohibiting public river access, large crowds in summer, ATVs, illegal camping, power boats, horse trails near water. Please help. Sincerely,	7/28/2009	No		MO	63122
3078	Please please protect the Ozark Riverways by REJECTING alternatives C & B which would degrade the beauty of the Big Spring Wilderness. The Scenic River ways is the best of the Ozarks please, please protect the Wilderness Riverways.	7/27/2009	No		MO	n/a
3079	Newsletter May I please have a copy of your 20-page newsletter on alternatives for management of Ozark Riverways. Secondly, how may I be placed on your mailing list? Thank you.	7/27/2009	No		MO	63122-2518
3080	Dear Superintendent Reed Detrind, I need to take this opportunity to ask you for your support of protecting the Ozark National Scenic River ways. If there is a paradise it must be much like these river miracles of nature. The wildlife fish and flora must be protected for future generations to enjoy. I am respectfully requesting that no motor boats be allowed above the Two Rivers area to Protect the Jack's fork and the upper Current river. The horse trails need to be moved away from the rivers – Jacks Fork & Current river flood plain as all that E-coli from the horse dung will surely be washed into the delicate ecosystem. One or Two horse crossings on the river should be sufficient for the horse back travelers to enjoy. Please consider banning ATV's from the area – they erode the land and no one enjoys hearing them. This is the National Ozark scenic river way & deserves protection now. It is NOT a local Business Profiting Few - but a National Treasure. Thank you. SAVE OUR HERITAGE RIVERS!	7/26/2009	No		MO	64055
3081	As a long-time member of both the . I write express my concern about the future of the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers. Like the two grps I belong to and support, I write to ask you to give preference to Trial Alternative A as the new management policy over much less acceptable plans B and C. T Thank you for considering my views on this matter.	7/23/2009	No		MO Coalition for the Environment, MO Parks Assn	63109
3082	Dear Sir, Please Protect our water! We love our "Wild Horses"! The tame ones are doing too much damage already, the 4-wheelers are seen from the water on the Upper Section on gravel bars & head water creeks! Campers need Showers w/hot water! No shower Curtains or hot water at Round Spring (no dry clothes) Would it hurt to clean the showers? You either get scalded or no Hot water at Alley Springs! Do you want Visitors to come back? Thank you.	7/22/2009	No		MO	65689
3083	Dear Superintendent Dearing, Missouri is a very beautiful state. We have conserved areas that people and nature enjoy. Please eliminate motor vehicles from (ONSR) access ways, trails and water. Please we only have this time on earth to conserve. Thank you.	9/10/2009	No		MO	64132-1165

3084	Dear Mr. Detring, It seems that protecting our scenic waterways & surrounding habitats is both a duty and a privilege. Public use is a wonderful opportunity but should also involve common sense practices. Motorized vehicle whether for land or water should be contralled with limited access and horsepower to preserve the peace for all the public. The primitive areas should remain under supervision of Park service. It would be great if the Big Springs remnant wilderness be recommended for the National Wilderness area designation. Damage from illegal uses needs to be repaired & returned to as natural a state as possible. The biodiversity of the riverways needs to be maintained now so that future generations can benefit from a unique ecological habitat. Sincerely,	9/9/2009	No			MO	63023
3085	Dear Sir: I'm writing this to urge the continued preservation of the pristine quality Ozark Natl Scenic Riverways is famous for and the elimination of all forms of motorization & illegal accesses and limiting trail rides (a huge pollution problem) that degrades the habitat and pollutes the riverways in one of Missouri's most treasured gems. There is not another place in the U.S. like Missouri's Ozarks and its crystal clear spring fed streams. Shame on us if we don't recognize this and preserve it in the pristine condition it was meant to be. Thank you.	9/9/2009	No		Nature Conservancy & Sierra club, Audubon Society	UN	N/A
3086	Dear Park Supt., I'm very interested in what happens in the park; our family has a cabin at Rattify and I spend a lot of time there. My vote is no-change. Continue in the direction you've been going. You'll always be welcome to visit, the Mountain View Chamber of Commerce just to visit, or to speak. It meets every Tuesday at noon. Stop in and talk to at Brown's Downtown Hardware or contact, Supt. of MV-Birch Tree schools and they'll connect you for the C of C program if youd like to. Theyre my son-in-law. Sincerely,	7/2/2009	No			MO	65548
3087	Dear Supt. Detring, We live in the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways area. We are very concerned about the problems that have been occuring. We support Alternative A. We believe the original purpose of establishing these riverways is primary. We are opposed to excessive horse use, and ATV use, and loud, too fast boats, and too many people on the river whose behavior is questionable. We do not use the river directly, but we often visit Big Spring. We are in favor of wilderness designation. We always take our out of state company to the river. We know local people who do not take their families to the river anymore. The trail ride is a factor, and exposure of the children to unseemly behavior. We believe as ... stated "Preservation is first and foremost." We moved here in 1984 because we saw that destroyed in 20 years where we came from. Sincerely,	8/3/2009	No			MO	N/A
3088	Superintendent We must save the Current and Jacks Fork rivers from being over used in inappropriate ways - the rivers need to be managed so they will be preserved so everyone now and in the future can enjoy the beauty of these rivers and the surrounding forest and steep hollows. Missouri is blessed to have such beautiful scenic riverways. It is up to us to keep them safe, healthy and protected.	7/29/2009	No			MO	63052
3089	Dear Sir: I read that the National Park Service held meetings to find out what people want done to the National Park in Missouri. I assume it's the Current River – Etc they are talking about. I couldn't attend the meetings but wanted to put in my 2 cents. I think the area should be left undeveloped and preserved and protected. I would only allow bicycle trails & hiking trails. Also I would limit the number of horses allowed in the park. If you know the person this should be sent to please forward. Thank you.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63385
3090	Dear Superintendent: The Current & Jacks Fork Rivers are near & dear to my heart; over 35 years ago these rivers are where I learned to canoe & as a young boy many years before learning to float I often swam in the Jacks Fork with my grandfather. My sons grew up swimming, fishing, floating, and tubing on these rivers, therefore I believe a management plan that best preserves the qualities of clean water, wilderness, & health of the river ecosystem is the plan most desirable for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Illegal roads & trails should be closed, scenic & conservation easement restrictions must be enforced, river crossings of horses need to be limited & horse trails moved back from the river to stop E. coli contamination, motorboat horsepower size should be limited, ATVs should be banned from the park, access roads should be limited to every 6 to 8 miles to increase the wilderness experience, and the plan should study & monitor the health of the river ecosystem. These rivers are the crown jewels of the Ozarks and must be managed for future generations. Sincerely,	7/30/2009	No			MO	65336
3091	I've lived about a mile from the Jacks Fork River for 35 years. I am a retired school teacher from Eminence. When I first moved to the area I used and enjoyed the Park Facilities a great deal. Now I rarely visit the park. There seem to be so many rules and regulations that I am always concerned about breaking a rule. It seems that many of the park rangers are out to "get" the local people. The last time I went canoeing on the river about three years ago, a park ranger pulled his gun out to arrest a tourist who had been smoking pot. The man offered no resistance. This event was by a friend and his eight year old daughter as well by several other adults and children on the river. This even made us uncomfortable the rest of the day. I would never condone the use of drugs but his was an extreme overreaction. Park rangers hiding in the bushes along the side of the river is kinda creepy. To this day I try to avoid the Park. As a teacher over the years I learned that fewer rules and regulations and concentration on what is really important makes people happier and things go better. I want no additional action.	6/23/2009	No			MO	N/A
3092	Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways: It has been called to my attention that the Jacks Fork & Current Rivers are not being attended to in a way that I thought would keep the Riverways in a pristine condition. When I voted to have the Federal Park Service take possession of the waterways, I thought the Rivers would be better managed by the Federal Park Service. I am not pleased that the Friends of the Ozark Riverways is coming out with a ... of the way the Federal Government is treating our river. I hope you can remedy this situation. Sincerely in Christ Jesus,	7/23/2009	No		St. Simon Church	MO	63123
3093	Balance 1. Create a division of the NPS or contract out to local groups a monitoring & discussing program. Have humans on the river to openly discuss & help mediate the views of the park users. Don't lay in wait. Stop the problem before it hapens! Prevention! leanyancy in respect 2. Give the option to the Nps to when an agreement with the park visitors is aproched to decide to remove gravel or other materials from the main chanel. To be used in the park boundaries to maintain trails or create safer boating conditions. 3. Pay larger attention to run of and polution from all human activity 4. apply green technologies to improve already existing bussinesses & Parks Buildings. 5. Create a forum to discuss & monitor the foot print of Gov, private, & Park land owners in and around these National Sceinic River ways.	6/24/2009	No			UN	n/a

3094	Motor craft (water & land) should prohibited! Rowdy beer outings should also be prohibited! (not sure how?) It may be that a permit system should be required. Semes like we are about to "love it to death." This area is a pristine gem that must be preserved for generations to come.	6/24/2009	No			UN	N/A
3095	Thank you all for taking you time away from your life to listen and answer so many different aspects of the american public. Our country, our land, in our hands.	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3096	Create some ATV trails (large ones) it would help cut down on complaints. Boat H.p. is fine the way it is!	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3097	1. Restricting outboard motors and closing roads creates tension between the local community and the park, no action on the rivers and re-opening recently closed roads would prevent this! 2. High tension between locals and tourists would result from river restrictions also!	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3098	My Comment! Give us back our land! You came & took the land from my parents and grandparents! What right did you have to do that? We always camped, went fishing, hiked & enjoyed our land & rivers. We didn't need anyone telling us how to take care of it! It was in better shape now that it is now!! Do we try to come to St. Louis, etc. & tell you what to do with your river & joining lands? NO! So we don't need you here. Give the land back to the state! You have no right to come & tell us how to use our own land, our river! Stay & take care of your own back yard & we will take care of ours! My grand children are the 5th generation to live here. We love our land & river. AND we take care of it, Because it is our home. We own this land! NOT YOU! So back to all the areas you are from. Concentrate on improving your own area. LEAVE US ALONE!!!!	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3099	Leave things the way they are Now Quit Bothering the local people This not is short Maybe it will be looked at	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
3100	My dad stopped going camping & fishing when he was 80 years old. He was still able to go, but the Park Rangers harassed him and he said he was just too old to fight them. He grew up in the community and was an avid fisherman and hunter. I grows up here and also love to fish and hunt. I was away from here many years, but retired and come bake to what I grew up with. I am 74 yrs. Old and don't want to give up the things I like, as did my Dad. I am still able to camp and handle my boat. I have helped many people on the rivers, especially canoers in trouble. Don't close our access points and don't take our boats and motors.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
3101	River restrictions will hurt local economy. Past park decisions are allready hard felt by locals, this whole "Gmp" is a very bad idea.	6/23/2009	No			WY	N/A
3102	Please Leave everything as is, let local people take care of things they care about, lands & River.	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3103	1968 eminent domain Must work more with local forces - Introduce incentive plans for bussinesses & locals to monitor their own rivers o Water quality o Debree natural or otherwise o Visitors their behavior - Visitors could be monitored by listing groups by canoe number & people could - Debree find out what can be removed for safety & what needs to be left for habitat Balance	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3104	How were the complaints from tubers about boaters acquired? Was it by survey? Was it by letters? Was it by Email? I heard it was by survey. If so what was the alterier motive? Evidently dissatisfied tubers – at the end (?) of their float. If surveys are made then make them available to boaters at the end of their trip.	6/22/2009	No			MO	n/a
3105	I am Cherokee, and according to the 1817 & 1819 treaties I shall not have any restrictions on the river ways.	6/22/2009	No		Lost Cherokee of AR. & MO.	UN	N/A
3106	This meeting is a Joke – TOTAL CAOIS!!!!	6/23/2009	No			UN	N/A
3107	Leave it like it is	6/22/2009	No			UN	N/A
3108	ONSR continues to not recognize/authorize horse trails from Akers Ferry to the North Boundary. These trails don't cost a dime. We do not need help as we police up after ourselves, maintain trails, and local businesses sponsor annual clean up rides every year. All we ask is that ONSR acknowledge our trails as developed in the original documentation which states all trails & roads are to be retained.	6/22/2009	No			UN	N/A

3109	To: The National Park Service Ref: Management Plans Reference: Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri, Shannon Co., Tract 306, Sec. 2, T30N, R5W, 5th p.m., In Park Acres, 97.55 Among the primary reasons for the public acquisition of property adjoining the Current River in order to create the National Park, was to "preserve and maintain the river, and its environs, in its natural state". Natural does not include motor powered boats of any kind, or, additional roads that contribute runoff of soil or other contaminants into this treasured waterway. For those individuals who support use of power boats in the park, be reminded that our state excels in providing thousands and thousands of miles of flat water, in large lakes and reservous spread all across ther great state. Power boating in these waters does not disturb or destroy nesting water foul, spawning, fish or delicate aquatic plants. For these reasons, along with the obvious safety concerns of power boats running next to canoes in a narrow water confinement. For all these reasons, we urge action to prevent use of any power boats in the park	6/26/2009	No			MO	63011
3110	Very Poor location – Should have been better located.	6/26/2009	No			UN	N/A
3111	Dear Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, It's the bottom of the Great Depression. It's the early 1930's and the Civilian Conservation Corps has a camp at Big Springs. An aunt and an uncle, childless, took me a 14-year-old boy with them on a camping trip. We pitched our wall tent within sight of the burbling, rushing Spring. Slept on cots, cooked 3 meals aday, and embellished our meals with water cress that I retrieved from the cold spring water. A friendly local person from the Van Buren area took us on a motor-powered canoe ride down and up the Current River. We didn't meet or see another person on the trip. The only night noises were the cries of the whip-poor-wills reinforced by a chorus of cicades. Now I know we can't turn the clock back nor can I be a boy again "just for tonight." However, suggestions for improvement are offered for consideration, perhaps adoption. 1. Enforce control of ATV's. (This takes military courage, since you will affect the profits of seller, supplies, repairs, and upkeep. In turn, ATV's destroy aquatic life, cause erosion, pollute the atmosphere, and provide the operator with destructive "fun.") 2. Enforce better management of horses and their riders. 3. Enforce closing of unapproved roads and access points. As recent history dramatically illustrates, unenforced laws eventually destroy the very institutions they were designed to protect. In brief, Mr. Superintendent, it is my belief that many in this generation and most in future generations will thank you for whatever improvement and enforcement of rules you implement now. Sincerely,	9/26/2009	No			MO	63122-2518
3112	Dear Sir: I have been canoeing the Current River since the early '60's. There is nothing like it. As it leaves the state over half its volume is spring water – Montauk, Welch, Cave, Pull-tight, Round, Big, Blue, and many smaller springs. Peace, quiet, beauty, tranquility. These are qualities the scenic riverway was set aside to preserve and protect. Officially sanctioned anarchy is destroying the qualities the law requires it to protect. Law protectors are allowing law breakers to oporate illegally with impunity. Responsible people need to do their job. We cannot afford incompetence or criminal neglect on the part of officials. Illegal access needs to be eliminated. Jet boats need to be severely restricted. ATV's need to be eliminated. Horses (trail riders) need to be severely restricted. A canoeist recently was stopped by a mass of horses in front of him, An ATV was coming behind him in the river, and a jet boat was coming up stream. Clearly, not saving and preserving the qualities intended, but destroying them. Do the right thing. Sincerely,	7/31/2009	No		Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club	MO	64123
3113	This letter is intended to ask for your protection of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers from being so heavily used. Please consider keeping these beautiful rivers clean for generations of families to come. Thank you for your attention to this matter.	8/2/2009	No			MO	64015
3114	Dear Sir: The Current River that I came to love nearly 50 years ago is in serious trouble. When it was designated by Congress as a wild and scenic river in 1964, the intent was to preserve its unique qualities for future generations to enjoy. Instead, saving of illegal access points, motorized vehicles, equestrian activities, and excessive use in general have marred this beautiful stream. These activities have a rightful place elsewhere, but cannot exist together with the concept of wild and scenic. The Park Service needs to take steps to undo damage and prevent further damage. Illegal access points should be closed. Motorized use should be banned. Access by pedestrians, canoes, and horses should be regulated. The Current River is a national treasure that we have an obligation to preserve. It can be enjoyed for years to come, but only if we take steps to ensure its care. Sincerely,	7/31/2009	No			MO	64123
3115	To: Reed Detring As a person in the country, me and many more people feel that the river can and always be safe and clean environment. Without all the limit restrictions. National Park Service is wanting to take our rights, recreations and heritage away from us. In the 60's my Great Grand Father and family got push off his farm, home which is now National Park Service. Forty some years later now I am losing my rights to be in the same area. The National Park Service was set up for recreation use. The recreation use is becoming no longer there. Thank you.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3116	The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers need more management to preserve their beauty & vitality. Please restrict ATV& Commercial Horses – these two things destroy the river. Please reduce access points & eliminate cars & trucks driving in the water. We want people to enjoy this wilderness but in ways that don't harm it. Thanks.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63122
3117	Dear Mr. Detring This letter is to comment and express my concerns with the Scenic River ways management plan. I am quite concerned that the management plan should be improved to better protect the scenic riverway. Among my concerns are illegal use of off-road vehicles, high power motor boats (and jet boats) and commecial trail rides. Clearly these are damaging to the river. Off-road vehicles must be banned. A strong statement have can have a strong effect, even for other areas. I have see the harmful effects of ATV's, so please make that strong statement here- Large commercial trail rides must be diminished. I know that this is a livelihood, but the huge trail rides are too damaging, and need to be cut back. Finally, the Current and Jack Fork are beuatifut floating rivers, and high-power and jet boats have no place in these relatively shallow rivers. I hope you can incorporate my comments into the plan. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.	9/10/2009	No			MO	65085

3118	To Whom it may concern: I am writing about my concern for the future management plan of the Ozark Riverways. Please protect this irreplaceable state asset (the Current River & Jack's Fork among others). Here are the issues I am most concerned about and I hope you are to: -illegal access & off-road vehicles. These dirt roads destroy vegetation, wildlife, and are ugly. Off-road vehicles are noisy and disturb any peace for hikers, fishing, camping. -motorized boats/jet boats need to be controlled, again, for noise pollution & over crowding of the waterways. -commercial trail rides need to be limited/controlled to prevent erosion & littering. -Let's protect the Big Spring remnant wilderness for future generations to enjoy. Thank you!	9/13/2009	No			MO	65203-2851
3119	Dear Mr. Detring: I'm writing you to ask you to do whatever you can to protect the future of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and to designate the back country part of Big Spring State Park as a national wilderness area. Illegal roads need to be removed and access points closed, to prevent natural resources from destruction. Horse riding is causing e coli to show up in the waters, and should be stopped. ATV's are endangering the biodiversity of the riverways & threatening the migrating & breeding birds. Mobile campers should not be allowed. River access points need to be seriously reduced. The quest for oil will be replaced by the need for water. This vital resource must be protected. Please enforce the original vision for this great resource & restore its natural beauty. Sincerely, Copies to Senators Bond & McCaskill & Govr. Nixon	9/11/2009	No			MO	64050
3120	Dear Sir, Please try to help on the following Subjects: 1. Stop access of ATV motorized vehicles from trespassing into, Sand Bars, River Bed and Shoreline – 2. Same with Horses 3. The surrounding watershed and tree lined shores are important to Migrating Birds. 4. Some way of limiting the use of motorized and Jet Boats on the river. 5. Police the rivers on weekends, holidays and during the Summer. 6. Limit the amount of People on the rivers possibly by reservations. Thank you	9/9/2009	No		Red Cedar Farm	MO	63144
3121	Subject: Save the Currant & Jacks Fork Rivers Reed Detring It is sad to read about the deterioration of Missouri Scenic Waterways. It is like our local global warning, but more preventable. I was lucky to have my canoeing days in the 70s and 80s, with a few trips in the 90's thru an outdoor club. My last experience was a positive one, staying in cabin overlooking the Currant River, and wading around on rainy days, with not much river traffic. My days on a dairy farm, and a number of visits to riding clubs, has shown me what a mess hooved animals make of soft ground. ATVs either make a mess, or create roads. None of this creates a wilderness experience. Please do all that you can to limit access to the scenic waterways, and control all forms of motorized vehicles that would enter the area. I will be retiring in a few years, and was hoping to take some weekday trips on the Ozark Streams. I hope it will be a pleasure to "wade in the water" while portaging the shallow areas (only) to the sounds of the canoe and rushing water.	9/10/2009	No			MO	63139
3122	To Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Reed Detring, I wish to add my voice (and that of my wife) to the growing number of citizens, Missourians, and National Park users who want to share the Current River experience with their kids, their kids' kids, great grand kids etc. I grew up in the fifties when National Parks were amazing destinations. We had not over used or abused. We did not run into signs of contaminated rivers no wading or swimming in this clear cold river water. I have floated the Current and Jacks Fork in inner tubes and canoes; I got wet; it was a float trip. The water can not be contaminated in a float stream. How do we keep our little kids out of the water when we came to play in the water? This sick water will not heal itself until we limit and restrict horses, ATV's, and trailers and their use. If we had started to limit and to control in 2004 when we recognized the problem, the river may have cleaned itself by now. Now it will take longer. But let's start now. Limit horse, ATV, Jet Boats Plan & limit river access Save the Big Spring Wilderness area LET QUIET RULE THE RIVER AGAIN Thank you	9/10/2009	No			MO	63110-4023
3123	Dear Mr. Detring, I am writing to you today to encourage everything that can be done to save and protect Missouri's scenic riverways. I would hope that a bill could be brought forth to add the Big Spring additional land to the Wilderness System. It would be wonderful to add this land, to save it. We must also protect our riverways. I have lived in this beautiful state of Missouri for over twenty years and have enjoyed hiking, camping, canoeing in and around the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mark Twain National Forest and many state parks and rivers. When I first moved here, my first canoe trip here had me competing with 4-wheeler's going on this small river. I was so shocked to see these 4-wheelers zooming across gravel bars; saw someone changing their oil right on the gravel bar. That should have never happened, it wasn't on our Ozark National Scenic Riverways, but on the Black River. Still people sometimes think the land and rivers are not hurt by what we do to them. I hope we can educate people to what is happening by their actions. We need to restore these scenic riverways by eliminating so many access points to the river that are illegal, also on our legal access roads to the rivers all vehicles must stay on the roads. This will eliminate 4-wheelers & ATV's from ruining the area. Motorized boats, like jet boats need to be strictly controlled and or eliminated. I was on a canoe trip when a jet boat came by and the noise was so loud and the wake it made was pounding the shore of the river and all the time I was on the canoe trip that's what these jet boats do is fly up and down the river. I would like these jet boats limited to only large lakes and off our scenic rivers. Finally, horse back rides are fun but the waste gets in the rivers from these commercial rides. This is another thing that needs to be controlled in where and how many these commercial rides are allowed. Thank you. Sincerely,	9/14/2009	No			MO	63034
3124	Dear Mr. Detring- We need stronger enforcement of our waterways –particularly the Current & Jacks Fork. There is too much access to remote areas, ATV's are disruptive to campers and pathways. At all cost, our precious environment is endangered. We must protect our beautiful natural land from people who are not good stewards. Please be tough, set rules & enforce them	9/14/2009	No			MO	64114
3125	Dear Superintendent Detring, I am writing to let you know how I feel about our Ozark National Scenic Riverways area. I definitely feel the N.P.S. should better protect and severely limit developement, motorized vehicles, jet boats, ATV's, trailriding, and access areas. Three of my favorite pastimes are floating, trailriding, and camping. Even if stricter regulations would curtail my activities in the Ozark Scenic Riverways I would gladly give them up to protect and save this beautiful, fragile, pristine area. I also would like to encourage you to see that the Big Spring Wilderness area become part of the Wilderness System. I have informed my senators, Kit Bond and Clair McCaskill, Govenor Jay Nixon and Rep. Ike Skelton my views and concerns for our beautiful Ozark Riverways. Thank you for your consideration on this issue and your years of public service. Sincerely,	9/8/2009	No			UN	N/A

3126	Dear Mr. Detring, Please provide the means and funding to protect the Current River from motor vehicles, trail rides, boats and limit the number of vistors to a reasonable amount. This would ensure that it would be in good condition for future generations. Thanks,	9/8/2009	No			MO	65263-2120
3127	To Whom Can Make a Difference, Reed Detring, Superintendent, I have been one of the lucky ones to enjoy the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers years ago and I am blessed for it. I believe it is our responsibility to protect these precious waterways and niches against exploitation and downright abuse! There is to much illegal trespasses going on! Wildcat motor accesses must be eliminated! And only legal roads used; vechicle use off legal roads has to be stopped & people fined! Business' making \$ with horse trail rides absolutely need to be controlled by the numbers and locations! Strictly controlling motorized boats & especially jet skiis is an absolute necessity. And please the piece of wilderness in the hills near Big Spring is qualified for the Wilderness System, and we must employ and help the Park Service to protect and perserve this land; Congress needs this proposed to them immediately before regretful neglect! Sincerely & Respectively,	9/8/2009	No			MO	64068
3128	Dear Sir, I support the Sierra Club position to defend the Missouri Ozark National Scenic Riverways. There is no place for overcrowding, monster horse-powered motor and jet boats, wildcat illegal roads and overdevelopment. Make sure we preserve the beauty of our rivers	9/14/2009	No			MO	63130
3129	Dear Sir This letter is in response to one I received from the Mo. Parks Assoc. Its been almost forty years since my first canoe trip on the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. What a paradise! The beauty of the rivers, Alley Springs, Big Springs and the pristine forests was breath-taking. In recent years I understand the whole area is being destroyed by ATVs, horse trails, power boats, bank openings and too many people in the area at the same time. The information I received validates all the horrible stories I have heard. Please use your authority to help preserve one of Missouri's treasures. Thank you. Sincerely,	7/24/2009	No			MO	63021
3130	The Current and Jack Forks Rivers are national and Missouri treasures which you must do a better job of protecting. We support Alterative A of the three alternatives under consideration. Our family and a friends' family from St. Louis have been spending a week every summer at Montauk State Park for over 20 years. Montauk is the beginning of the Current River. The Ozark Riverways must be conserved, so that when my grandchildren are adults can enjoy them.	7/27/2009	No			MO	64114-1220
3131	The Current and Jack Forks Rivers are national and Missouri treasures which you must do a better job of protecting. We support Alterative A of the three alternatives under consideration. Our family and a friends' family from St. Louis have been spending a week every summer at Montauk State Park for over 20 years. Montauk is the beginning of the Current River. The Ozark Riverways must be conserved, so that when my grandchildren are adults can enjoy them.	7/27/2009	No			MO	64114-1220
3132	Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways I support plan A of the General Management Plan of the National Park Service and support____ of the Missouri Parks Association. I would like to see the 3400 acres of the Big Spring Wilderness area protected and preserved. Thank you.	7/23/2009	No			MO	63134-4006
3133	GMP Administrators I am 60 years old and have had the pleasure of enjoying our streams and rivers since childhood. In this period of time, however I have seen the quality of our riverways in continued decline. Too many float operators dumping too many, uncaring boaters, river overcrowding, trash, noise, all with adverse effects on the environment as well as ruining a quiet day on the river. The rivers need less horse and livestock impact on water quality also – I have floated different streams that smelled like a feedlot and the water conditions were terrible. I hate to be so critical and negative on this matter – however I believe real changes need to be made to save our waterways. I strongly support Alternative A by your GMP, believing this can be the only plan to reverse the decline in riverway conditions. Sincerely,	7/22/2009	No			MO	63110
3134	Dear Superintendent, As a user of the Current & Jacks Fork for over 30 years & a resident of the Jacks Fork watershed, I prefer alternative A for the 2012 Management Plan – with the following modifications: 1. More non-motorized sections & lower horsepower limits for powerboats. Their noise, lingering fumes, & roiling wakes seriously detrmet from a quality river experience. 2. Horses, including the so-called wild horses, are a damaging, non-native species & should be excluded from the park. 3. Throughout the boating season, piles of toilet paper & exposed human waste accumulate around many gravel bars. Some solutions to this problem should be included in the plan. Thank you,	7/27/2009	No			MO	65793
3135	Dear Sir: I am mindful of the reduced budgets that make proper oversite of the National Park Service natural treasure difficult. (Thus undermining the N.P.S.'s proper mission.) Nevertheless, I urge you to restore the Current and Jack Forks rivers, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, to their natural conditions to the greatest extent possible. To accomplish this goal, the following needs to be done: (1) Excess - - and illegal - - river access points must be closed and restored. (2) New horse trails - - where they are necessary - - must be set back from rivers, creeks, etc. The current number of equestrian river crossings should be reduced. (3) I object to the use of motorized recreational vehicles off-road in this park. This must be completely banned (except on state and county roads. (4) Mobile campers should be restricted to official park campgrounds. The gift from the State of Missouri (in 1964) to the DNR of 3 state parks (Alley Spring, Big Spring, Round Spring) ought still to be respected and cherished. Above all, the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park should be preserved in the wildest and most pristine condition possible. Sincerely, c.c: Sen. Bond; Sen. McCaskill	7/27/2009	No			MO	65203
3136	Dear Superintendent, Stop the illegal uses on the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. ATV's are crossing on hundreds of gravel bars, making mud ruts and distressing river banks & leaving trash. These ATV's and dirt bikes should be banned from access. Overdevelopment is ruining bank vegetation, polluting water and destroying the environment. Bring back the pristine waters of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. Get tough. Sincerely, The Nat'l Park Ser. is working on a new General Management Plan now –	7/26/2009	No			MO	64093

3137	Dear Superintendent: Please make it a top priority of yours to protect our scenic waterways, particularly the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. They are endangered by overdevelopment, overuse of horse rides, and especially by the exploding invasion of all kinds of motorized vehicles: ATV, four-wheel drives and motorized bikes. I don't need to tell you of the importance of trees and water to life on this planet. I do enclose a further description of what must be done to preserve them. Please get behind this action. Sincerely,	7/27/2009	No			MO	63108
3138	We need to clean up our Missouri Ozark National Scenic Riverways NOW. Too many accesses are bad, 2-track roads are bad, horse trails too close to the river are bad and parking motorhomes too close to the riverway are bad for our Natural Environment. NOW	7/27/2009	No			MO	65020
3139	Dear Sir/Madam: The Current River (which I float yearly – and have since my 1st float in 1958 is becoming degraded. Please tighten the rules on access, horse use & motors on the river. If anything I can say or write more concisely – will help accomplish this please let me know. Sincerely, P.S. We own land on the Black River and W. Shannon Co – have spent several weekends on the ... property below Turn River	7/27/2009	No			MO	63017
3140	Superintendent – Freedom to Ride I am very much against shutting the horse riding access on the 'Jack's Fork' – the equine allowed area's are getting fewer and fewer and it is not fair to pick on the riders! There is no mention about regulating or closing the thousands of open septic systems running into the lakes, rivers and streams – give us a break please! Sincerely,	7/27/2009	No			MO	65055
3141	I am writing in response to concerns of "Friends of Ozark Waterways" regarding the future health and wellbeing of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We visit this area of Missouri periodically, and really enjoy its natural beauty. We would very much like to see this preserved, for all visitors. Regarding the "alternatives for management" of this area, which has been developed by the Park Service, I hope you would reject trial alternatives "B" and "C", and adopt alternative "A", and also, the management policies suggested by "Friends of Ozark Riverways". We are presently Kansas residents, but my wife and I were each born and raised in Missouri, and have much affection for these beautiful areas of the state. We would very much like to see them preserved. Sincerely,	7/27/2009	No			KS	66221
3142	Dear Sir: I'm completely opposed to any limits on our horses crossing or drinking from the Jacks Fork river. Steams always erode when flooded and horses don't cause it. Surely we wouldn't be considering having wilderness areas that are closed to all motors of any kind including chain saws?	7/28/2009	No			MO	63080
3143	Dear Sir: I am writing in support of restoring the natural conditions on the Ozark Riverways. I have been fortunate to live in Missouri and enjoin the Ozarks. I have heard the complaints about too much abuse of the Riverways, namely too much access by ATV's, dirt bikes, and RV's. I support restoring natural conditions to the Riveways. I reject alternatives C and B as outlined in the management alternatives which have been developed by the Park Service. Thank you the chance to comment. Sincerely, P.S. I appreciate the work of the Park Service	7/27/2009	No			MO	64804
3144	Dear Sir or Madam: Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion as to the future plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative A is my favorite plan where slower-paced family activities would be enjoyed. Camping and swimming are our favorite activities. I believe motor boats, ATV's & motorcycles take away from the peaceful surroundings and should not be allowed. The number of horses should be limited. When my children were young in the 60's and through the years we have enjoyed camping & swimming at Alley Springs. For the last three years my children, their families & I have enjoyed the group tent camping area at Alley Springs Alternative A is my choice! With many thanks,	7/27/2009	No			MO	63130
3145	Dear Sir, I am very much in favor of increased regulation over the Ozark Scenic Riverways. Opposed to ATVs on or bordering the rivers. Opposed to trail rides on or bordering the rivers. This only increases pollution & contamination of the rivers. Opposed to increasing access points. There needs to be increased ranger Patrols to control the excessive use of alcohol on the river. Thank you,	7/29/2009	No			MO	65775
3146	Dear Superintendant: Although I am an "out-of-stater", I would like to express my view about the O. National Scenic Riverway / Current & Jacks Fork Rivers. I am concerned that all-terrain vehicles are eroding banks and degrading the river bottoms. Also, I believe there needs to be fewer access points. Respectfully –	7/19/2009	No			KS	66202
3147	I am writing in regards to development of a new general management plan. I write with great displeasure of what has and continues to degrade the riverways. You have more access sites now than the fathers of the legislation ever dreamed of. And I will add still growing. God help us to see the vision. The N.P.S. must start enforcing obligations of scenic, and conservation easements. Reform – Reform. The big commercial horse trail rides are out of control. Exploding net works of ATV's illegal trails and driveways need to be permanently closed. No other park unit tolerates abuse like this. My preference is alternative A and I support the citizens "Big Spring Wilderness of no less than 3,500 acres. Kind regards,	7/20/2009	No			FL	33884
3148	To Whom it May Concern, My husband and I have probably canoed the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers 6 times over the years, and my father and his brothers a few other times. We strongly believe that our Ozark rivers are the most beautiful natural resource in our state. When we travel and explain what is most beautiful about the land from which we come, we tell about our clear, cold rivers, and how we can navigate them, or just sit in them, enjoying the flowing waters. We wish you to know that we feel strongly about the preservation of these rivers, including the Jacks Fork and the Current, in their most pristene form. Please do not allow motor boats, a.t.v.s, or horses in our rivers! Sincerely,	7/15/2009	No			MO	63119
3149	Superintendent Detring, Thank you for coming all the way to Kansas City Saturday in support of the ONSR GMP. I think everyone left knowing more than they did before – and committed to finding solutions. Your openness and willingness to engage are much appreciated. Yours truly,	7/14/2009	No		Missouri Coalition for the Environment	MO	63130

3150	Dear Sir: My husband and I are 70 and have spent many years camping in Natl. Forest (MO and elsewhere) and have often canoed the rivers of MO in our own canoe. The Current River, with the Jacks Fork, is one of our favorites. We would like to see restrictions on use of motorized boats in at least some stretches of the river. It is a beautiful river and can be enjoyed by so many more if motors are restricted to a certain area. It would be great to designate of a pristine area as a wilderness area, with primitive camping only. Even if that eliminates us, with a trailer, I still think it is a good idea. ATVs should be kept out under all circumstances. There are parks specifically for them. No objection to horses, horse trails, etc. Thank you,	7/16/2009	No			MO	63149
3151	Dear Sir or To Whom it May Concern, Please keep our riverways pristine. Isn't there enough lakes for boating without adding more for pollution & also trash! Why must motors want to come in our beautiful clear waterways for canoes & rafts only. NO. Don't let them, please. We get crowds & trash still for sure, but leave the boats with motors OUT. Do allow more natural beauty, more hiking trails perhaps, a nature center, a bathroom or two, but keep prohibiting those motor boats. Allowing horses involves a program for clean-up for sure. We want the pristine conditions, the animals in the wild to still be there, and the springs to still be clear. I want things to be of use for the future generations. The boaters with motors can go to Tablerock or Lake of the Ozarks. Thank you.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63367
3152	I have been doing the Ozark rivers for over 50 years. And the improvements in both Federal and State operations are appreciated. But on weekends the rivers have gone overloaded. Since I've retired weekdays are great for me. I doubt usage fees charged to liveries (canoes, rafts, horses) on weekends would reduce usage much but this may reduce overusage on weekends a bit. No power boats on weekends may also help reduce conjection & noise. I do hope you are successful in keeping the rivers (near) pristine. Yours,	7/17/2009	No			MO	63144
3153	Dear Madam or Sir, I'm anxious to write to encourage you to place good bounderies on the presense of noise, trash generation and anything else that may pollute the environment of our National Forests. These lands are a treasure that has to be carefully cared for. Well-meaning people don't always appreciate the stewardship that goes into them. They just enjoy them. So I support firm measures and policies that will preserve the gift of the forests ad infinitum. Thank you for your help. Sincerely,	7/16/2009	No		First United Methodist Church of Webster Groves	MO	63119
3154	Sir or Madam: It is urgent that we take care of the Jacks Fork and Current rivers so that our children and grandchildren can enjoy the peace and beauty of this natural area. They have been sorely abused in recent years. As you decide on a new management plan for these rivers, I urge you to substantially decrease the number of access points; close up the illegally developed roads and trails. Motorized vehicles should be limited to official roads, and ATVs should be completely banned. Horses, too, should be limited to prevent pollution of the waters. Our precious wilderness needs to be preserved as wilderness. That could be helped along if you designated the back country portion of the old Big Spring State park as a Wilderness Area. It would also help if you monitored and restored the water quality, the stream beds and banks, and native forest habitat. In sum, please reaffirm the priorities established by law when the Ozark National Scenic Riverways act was established in 1964. Preserve our river areas. Don't destroy them. Sincerely,	7/24/2009	No			MO	64110
3155	Dear Sir: Immediate action should be taken for the preservation of the Current and Jack Fork Rivers. The main types of abuse Stopped Now which are the following: Stop the many man-made bank opening Stop the illegal river extension of the two-track roads Stop the horse trails that hug the rivers banks Stop the the ATV's off road boundaries Stop the parking of motorized campers on or just above the river banks. My choice – trail alternative A is my choice. Excuses do not fix this problem. Stop playing politics - do the work that must be done now with the resources available. Who is getting the BIG PAY check for doing nothing? Sincerely,	7/29/2009	No			MO	65644-9232
3156	Dear Superintendent Detring, I am writing to you regarding the future management plans of the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. I decided to make Missouri my home 35 years ago - in part because of the beautiful rivers we are so lucky to have in the Ozarks. I have enjoyed many years of floating and camping. Unfortunately, in the past several years, I've noticed the damage that illegal vehicles, illegal accesses, and jet boats have caused. The once gorgeous gravel bars we used for camping are criss-crossed by tire marks. They are no longer safe havens for tent life. I no longer feel safe bringing my great-nephews down for overnights on the river. Please do whatever you must to protect these special resources. Sincerely,	9/8/2009	No			MO	N/A
3157	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION: I do not think the ONSR should regulate any motorized limitations on the Current River at anytime. The people that live by or hear the river are the people that work to keep our rivers clean of pollution. Response to Question 2: Keep all roads & trails open to public. Do not restrict or remove any public use of our rivers. The ONSR should clean out roads & rivers from any debri from blocking the rivers & roads. Response to Question 3: No limits on public access to our roads going to the rivers. I strongly do not want any restricts on motor limitations to Current river. Response to Question 4: The Current & Jack's Fork Rivers mean a great deal to me & my family. I have always enjoyed going to the river in our boat & floating. Please choose the No-Action Plan so me & my kids will continue to enjoy the rivers Response to Question 5: Don't take away our rights to enjoy what the local people do by using trails & roads. Don't make any limitations for motorized boats. If people are breaking laws then ticket them.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65438
3158	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION: If the ONSR wants to change anything it should be ticketing the people that break the law. Put more rangers out to keep the people from littering our rivers & bringing illegal drugs to our area. DO NOT put any limitations to people with motorized boats that enjoy the rives. We are the people that take care of our rivers Response to Question 2: Open current closed roads to the rivers, take any motor limitations off the riverrs. (No-Action Plan Response to Question 3: No limitations for public access to our rivers & roads to rivers. No Horse Powwer limtations for Motorized Boats Response to Question 4: The Current & Jack's Fork Rivers have been apart of my whole life living in Carter & Shannon Counties. I enjoy & go to the rivers camping & boating. Do not remove or take away our right to go to the rivers. Response to Question 5: If people are doing illegal things on our rivers whether locals or tourist they should be punished. I believe the ONRS should not ever	7/6/2009	No			MO	65438

	take away the public to enjoy going or using the Current & Jack's Fork Rivers.						
3159	Response to Question 1: No-Action Only: Make No Change to the existing plan. Response to Question 2: No limitations for Public access to Our Rivers or Roads to the Rivers. - Open current chosed Roads Response to Question 3: No Horse Power limitations to motorized Boats. No limits on public access by all vehicles Atv's & Boats Response to Question 4: The Current & Jack's fork Rivers. No Action plan is the only plan that will be good for our local people that enjoy our Rivers Response to Question 5: Write more tickets to people littering & bringing illegal drugs on our rivers. Hure more Park Rangers to take care of this problem.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65438
3160	Response to Question 1: No-Action Plan: Do not make any changes to the existing plan. Response to Question 2: No Part - No Action Plan only. Do not take away Public access to our roads & Rivers Response to Question 3: No limitation for all recreational vehicles & Boats No Horse-Powwer limitations Response to Question 4: No Action Plan: Only. My family & I enjoy going to our local rivers. We boat, float & camp. I want my kids & their kids to be able to continue to enjoy these recreational Activities. Response to Question 5: Do not punish everyone for a few hundred people that dont appreciate & that dont take care of our local Rivers. If people Break the law, give them tickets. Hire more law enforcement to contol littering, illegal drugs being used.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63965
3161	Response to Question 1: No-Action is my idea of the Best of the Alternatives. As a person with disabilty's I cant sit in a canoe for a Long trip. A jet boat Boat Lets me enjoy the river on short trips. Response to Question 4: I grew up in this area. I enjoy the Jacks fort and current River from the Headwaters to the Arkansas State Line and beyond. I believe No-Action Is the best Alternative for me. Response to Question 5: don't close Any more primitive Access and camping Areas on both Rivers. You Have slowly been closing Areas over the Life of the park.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65466
3162	Response to Question 1: No Action needed More resources and recreational Activity's added Response to Question 2: Free or resonable acess for usage of the waterway and camp gounds Response to Question 3: Restricted usage & Access to the Recreational area's Response to Question 5: Better Access And less restriction's overall	7/6/2009	No			MO	63136
3163	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATION USAGE & ACCESS. Response to Question 3: RESTRICTED RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS Response to Question 4: BAY CREEK & FLYING "W". Response to Question 5: MORE RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS	7/6/2009	No			MO	63017-6010
3164	Response to Question 1: NO ACCESS Response to Question 2: Open recreation Response to Question 3: No Restrictions Response to Question 4: Bay Creek should be open & free of restrictions Response to Question 5: No aciton required	7/6/2009	No			MO	65201
3165	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. WOULD LIKE MORE RESOURCES ADDED TO CURRENT RECREATIONAL Opportunities Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATION USAGE & access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & access Response to Question 5: MORE Recreational usage & access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63111
3166	Response to Question 1: No action. Would like more resources added to current recreational opportunities. Response to Question 2: Free recreation usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access Response to Question 5: More recreational usage & access	7/6/2009	No			MO	Unknown
3167	Response to Question 1: No-Action - Leave things Alone Response to Question 2: Free usage And Free Access Response to Question 3: All Restrictions Response to Question 4: All the Rivers; Current, Jacks Fork & Eleven Point - Need More Access. Response to Question 5: INSTALL MORE BOAT RAMPS, BATHROOMS, DUMPSTERS.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63109
3168	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the engine power at jet pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives abc Response to Question 4: I like to fish and float from Acers to the Arkansas line because it is enjoable family outing for all of us Response to Question 5: I would like to improve the boat ramps and Bathrooms and better camp sites and cheaper	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3169	Response to Question 1: No action Rate Horsepower to Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Two Rivers Response to Question 5: Need to improve Boat ramps	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3170	Response to Question 1: No action No horse power limit Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I Love to fish, hunt, & Float the whole Current River to Arkansas Line. Response to Question 5: more Boat Ramps more access to the river	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3171	Response to Question 1: No action Rate the horse power at the Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: I fish the whole River all the way to Arkansas. I love to spend time with my family. Its nice & Relaxing Response to Question 5: Better roads to get to the River. Cleaner & more Restrooms more boat Acss to River	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3172	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative ABC Response to Question 4: Whole River Response to Question 5: Fix Ramps, Roads	7/8/2009	No			MO	63601

3173	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt. ABC Response to Question 4: Several parts of river Response to Question 5: Better boat ramps	7/8/2009	No			MO	63645
3174	Response to Question 1: No Action, 40 HP at the Jet! Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B and C Response to Question 4: no action Response to Question 5: Stop using our tax money to restrict our access to our natural Scenic riverways	7/8/2009	No			MO	63664
3175	Response to Question 1: No Action The horsepower should be rated at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: My boy & I love going to the river all the time I never got into boats but he has 2 and Love the river. Response to Question 5: need more fish cleaning spots and more trash cans for trash	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3176	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Several Parts of River Response to Question 5: Better Boat Ramps	7/8/2009	No			MO	63601
3177	Response to Question 1: I SUPPORT THE "NO ACTION" ALTERNATIVE. I AM A TAXPAYER AND I ENJOY BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER. REDUCING HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF VAN BUREN AND SURROUNDING AREAS. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: REDUCTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING Response to Question 4: POWDERMILL TO GOOSNECK. TWO OF THESE ALTERNATIVES (A & b) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH OUR 40 H.P. MOTOR. WE ALSO USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACCOMMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS A YEAR. Response to Question 5: 1. ELIMINATE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 2. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP. 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63042
3178	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Return Rules from 1950!! Response to Question 3: Horsepower Limits Response to Question 4: The Hole River is Special. Response to Question 5: Leave it Alone	7/8/2009	No			MO	63901
3179	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: RETURN RULES TO 1950 Response to Question 3: HORSEPOWER LIMITS Response to Question 4: THE WHOLE RIVER Response to Question 5: LEAVE IT ALONE	7/8/2009	No			MO	63944
3180	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Rules should stay the same Response to Question 3: Horsepower limit, Access limits Response to Question 4: The entire area Response to Question 5: Leave as is	7/8/2009	No			MO	63939
3181	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Rules should stay the same. Response to Question 3: Horsepower Limit, Access Limits Response to Question 4: The Entire Area Response to Question 5: The way things are now, Leave As-is.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63901
3182	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate horse power at the pump. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C. Response to Question 4: I enjoy floating, swimming, and fishing from Akers to Doniphan. Response to Question 5: Bathrooms, showers for floaters, more trash cans to keep down on trash.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3183	Response to Question 1: No Action You cannot rate horsepower at engine rate it at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: I pretty much travel the whole riverway all seasons and own 2 boat's myself. fish, sight see, Gig, swim, float and what ever Response to Question 5: need more fish cleanig stations, better bathrooms, and more improved boat ramps	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3184	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate horse power, pump not engine Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C. Response to Question 4: I like to go Fishing, gigging, from Akers to the Arkansas line. Response to Question 5: Boat Ramps, Bathrooms, better road ways to the river.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3185	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE Response to Question 2: NO CHANGE Response to Question 3: NO CHANGE Response to Question 4: NO CHANGE Response to Question 5: NO CHANGE	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3186	Response to Question 1: No Limit on Motors. Keep them as they are now.	7/28/2009	No			UN	Unknown

3187	Response to Question 1: No Limit on Motors.	7/28/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3188	Response to Question 1: No Action - Modify this alternative by Keeping roads and access to the ONSR and the river open. Do Not change the Horsepower rating to the powerhead. Response to Question 2: 1. Provide access to the river through additional boat ramps, camping areas with restrooms, and roads. This reduced congestion and conflict as well as provides for emergency Access. Response to Question 3: 1. Any additional restriction on horsepower for motorized boats. 2. Keep horsepower rating at the output shaft. Changing this rating to the Powerhead will prevent a boat with a family aboard from getting on plane and will cause more wake. Response to Question 4: Jacks Fork from Bay Creek to Two Rivers and Current River from Jerktail to Van Buren. No Action is the only alternative that protects my freedom to enjoy the forms of recreation in the ways my family has for generations. Response to Question 5: 1. No additional restrictions or changes to horsepower regulations 2. Educate floaters and boaters on how to share the river and what they can do to avoid conflict. 3. Additional NPS Agents in high traffic areas. These agents should be visible and engaged so as to prevent problems and protect visitors	7/16/2009	No			CA	93524
3189	Response to Question 1: No Action, because there would be No chance, or rather, less chance of losing existing priveleges. Enforce existing regulations to control the behavior that is detrimental to the enjoyment quality of the ONSR. Response to Question 2:1. Improved river access and amenities. 2. Additional NPS Patrols to protect visitors to the ONSR, both local and people from outside the ara. NPS Patrols also protect the environment from littering & destructive behavior. Response to Question 3: Any additional limits on horsepower for motorized boats. This includes limiting horespower at the powerhead. Horsepower regulations should be set at the output shaft. This is, by far, my biggest concern! Response to Question 4: Current River from the Two Rivers area to the Log Yard area. The only plan, at this time, that would be acceptable is No Action. Reducing HP or even changing the HP regulation to the powerhead would greatly reduce our ability to enjoy the river. Response to Question 5: 1. Increase NPS in areas with high floater/boater interaction. 2. Open presence of NPS patrols. Be visible! 3. No changes in horsepower regulations. This is the biggest concern of the residents around the ONSR and will lead to the greatest resistance to changes on the ONSR.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65466
3190	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: The horsepower of an outboard motor should be rated at the output shaft, not the power head. Response to Question 4: Area from Round Springs to Powder Mill - The "no Action" alternative would be the best Response to Question 5: More public river access & free recreational activities for everyone	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3191	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: none - no action Response to Question 3: none - no action Response to Question 4: All 134 miles Response to Question 5: less involment by park service	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3192	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: every single mile Response to Question 5: less involvement by the government	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3193	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: less government	7/28/2009	No			MO	65560
3194	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: The horsepower ratings of an outboard motor should be rated by the output shaft only. Response to Question 4: River boating & unmaintained access from Round Springs to Blue Springs "No Action" is the best alternative Response to Question 5: need to manage the number of conoer's	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3195	Response to Question 1: No action (Keep 40 horse at the pump) Response to Question 2: No action Allow boats to continue to enjoy these riverways for years to come. Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Moss Landing, Paint rock, Owls Bend Blue Springs. No they do not. Just leave it as it is. Response to Question 5: Many generations have enjoyed & looked forward to summer days spent on these rivers. Why allow those who know nothing about this area come in and try to force change!??	7/28/2009	No			MO	63023
3196	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No change on current regulations. Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I was born in Winona, Missouri and am 70 years old and have enjoyed current river my whole life and would like the river ways to remain the same for my children and grandchildren. Response to Question 5: Limit and control alcohol intake of floaters, and boaters.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63023
3197	Response to Question 1: I Prefer The "No Action" Alternative. Response to Question 2: I Think the River Should Be Accessible To Every One At All Times of the Year. We Have A Huge Retirement Community That Use the River Year Round Response to Question 3: Any Use Restrictions Let Everyone Have the Freedom To Enjoy The River in Their Own Way. Response to Question 4: Van Buren is a Huge Retirement - Vacation Community - People Bring Their Families & Boats From a 50 Mile Radius to Spend a day on the River - To Change This Would Cripple our Local Economy And a Huge Loss to These Families Response to Question 5: Protect the Resource Wihtout Limiting Access to It.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63941
3198	Response to Question 1: "No Action" Rate HP at the Pump Response to Question 4: I like Round Spring's on down the River Response to Question 5: More Road Access & Better Boat Ramp at Round Springs	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629

3199	Response to Question 1: No-Action - leave Boat More At 60 HP AT PUMP Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A,B,C Response to Question 4: --Round Spring to Paint Rock --Two River to Round Springs Response to Question 5: *Better horse trails *Better Roads *Keep 40 HP at the jet so I can get up the River safely.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3200	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: The horsepower of an outboard motor should be rated at the output shaft, not the powerhead. Response to Question 4: The "no action" Alternative addresses the area from Round Springs to the Powder Mill best. Response to Question 5: more public river access. Free recreational activities for everyone.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3201	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: all 134 miles Response to Question 5: No government (park service) involvement	7/28/2009	No			MO	65560
3202	Response to Question 1: No Action. Rate the horse power at the pump. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: We spend alot of time on River, we love to go, my family spends alot of time their we have alot of outing on the River. Response to Question 5: Better roads to get to the River. Cleaner & more restrooms. More boat Acces to River.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3203	No responses to any of the questions.	8/12/2009	No			MO	63026
3204	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: all of the river Response to Question 5: less park service	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3205	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: I feel you already manage it more than you should with motor size. Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I was born in Van Buren and have conerns about the whole 134 miles. The alternatives are very intrusive. Response to Question 5: Limit alcohol intake for the canoers. I wish all of the planning team would take a trip on the Current River before voting. It is the clearest, nicest river in Missouri. Boaters & Rafters along with Canoes need to be able to enjoy.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63023
3206	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative C Response to Question 5: The problems along the rivers have very little to do with motorized or non-motorized vehicles, but more to do with the attitude of the visitors & their lack of common courtesy to each other & the resource	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
3207	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: no-action Response to Question 4: All of Current River Response to Question 5: less government control	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3208	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C	7/28/2009	No			MO	65548
3209	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. Limit Horses, Limit canoe outfitters to so many a day. Keep offroad vehicles out of the Park. Ban Alcohol in the park or Ban disposable drink contrainers to limit the trash in the rivers. Response to Question 2: I like All of Alterative A plus what I mentioned in Question 1. Response to Question 3: No Action is Not an option. Wwe tried that. Every year it just got worse. Response to Question 4: I love the current Baptist Camp to Two Rivers and All of the Jacks. No motor boats on offroad vehicles should be allowed here. Close the offroading trails permanantly. Confiscate violators vehicles when caught. Response to Question 5: You should consider a ban on alcohol within the park. This would eliminate most of your problems (Rowdiness, profanity etc.) There are way too many offroad vehicles (one is too many) Limit the number of horse & riders, There are thousands now.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
3210	Response to Question 1: I strongly prefer alternative A. Response to Question 2: Closing unauthorized roads and boat accesses, and enforcing the NO ATV policy. Upper stretches of the river should be closed to motor boats. Protect water quality by restricting, or better yet, eliminating, the number of horses in the river. Response to Question 3: I am opposed to allowing guided overnight float trips. There are fewer gravel bars than in years past and it is becoming more difficult to find a secluded place to set up a quiet camp where one can watch the bats emerge at dusk and listen to the whip-poor-will. Response to Question 4: all of the Jacks Fork and the Current above Power Mill are most important to me. I have floated the Jacks Fork 14 times (12 overnights) and the Current 45 times (18 overnights). It saddens me to see river banks taken over by garlic mustard and Korean lespedeza, trash left behind by the party crowds, erosion caused by ATV use and clearing up to bank. Response to Question 5: I want my grandchildren to experience the unique, diverse nature of the ONSR. If you do your job they will always be able to see snakes, turtles, herons, kingfishers, mink, and gorgeous wildflower displays.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65101
3211	Response to Question 1: No Action (leave size of motor at the pump as it stands) Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: AB & C Response to Question 4: No they do not. Response to Question 5: The Area is beautiful and is managed already. Encourage booze to be left at home. Thats the only problem I have seen in years.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63129-2024

3212	Did not respond to any questions.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65646
3213	Did not respond to any questions.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63023
3214	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DONT CUT HORSEPOWER ON THE CURRENT RIVER Response to Question 5: LEAVE SOME RURAL AREAS FOR THE LOCALS TO CAMP	7/28/2009	No			MO	65809
3215	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Two Rivers to Northern Edge of Van Buren Gap Response to Question 4: Two River to Goose Neck Response to Question 5: --Open more trails to ATV's, Dual Rider ATV's & side x sides vehicles --more open exposure of water patrol on the River --equal respect & responsibility of tubers, conoers & Boaters --more concrete access points	7/28/2009	No			MO	65571
3216	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: All of Current River Response to Question 5: no changes	7/28/2009	No			MO	63052
3217	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: All of it. Response to Question 5: No goverment control	7/28/2009	No			MO	65560
3218	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: No-action Response to Question 3: No-action Response to Question 4: Every bit of it Response to Question 5: less government control	7/28/2009	No			MO	65560
3219	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: no-action Response to Question 4: All of Current River Response to Question 5: less government control	7/28/2009	No			MO	63901
3220	Response to Question 1: *No Action is the best of interest. *Keep 40 HP at the jet pump motor *Keep roads open. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, C Response to Question 4: *Round Spring to Paint Rock *All the areas *Everybody needs to learn to share. Response to Question 5: *Better Boat Ramps. *Educate people Better about the river. *Better Roads so I can get to my favorite fish spot.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3221	Response to Question 1: Yes, #A, I would like to see the land managed to protect & recreate its natural/original setting. Response to Question 2: Quieter activities, address overused areas, * closing of illegally developed roads. Response to Question 3: Big Springs not being given wilderness designation. Response to Question 4: I am concerned about the horse trails near water and the damage to river banks & pollution of water. Response to Question 5: Informational/Educational displays re: history and environmental impact of different activities over time.	8/6/2009	No			MO	63139
3222	Response to Question 1: When the Scenic Rivers Act was passed in the 60s, i thought it was meant to protect pristine waterways: I remember there was a conflict over how many canoes would be allowed on the river, but subsequently, there are more canoes, more ATVs, more horses, more trails and Jet boats. The spirit of the law has been blasphemed. Alternative A is closest to my ideal. Response to Question 2: No motorized boats allowed on Jacks Fork River. Response to Question 3: Non-regulation of motorized vehicles, both land & water, & non-regulation of pollution causing elements like horses & cattle. Response to Question 4: Obviously, the farther upstream areas should be protected more, as all pollution would go downstream.	8/6/2009	No			MO	63116
3223	Response to Question 1: Have more access & boat and canoe ramps. Response to Question 2: More access to rivers & no change in engine Horsepower Response to Question 3: changing horsepower on motors. more access Response to Question 4: From Round Springs to Van Buren should stay the same as now and more facitities such rest Rooms, trash cans, picnic tables	6/25/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3224	Response to Question 1: No-Action Because I like to go four-wheeler riding and going to the rivers and also I like having access to the rivers. Response to Question 2: unlimited use & access and there should not be a limit on the horse power of a boat. They should be able to use whatever horse power they want. Response to Question 3: Limited use and access. Response to Question 4: not enough boat ramps. Response to Question 5: more river accesses to boaters	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3225	Response to Question 1: No-Action I like going to the river and four-wheeler riding. Also I like having access to the river. Response to Question 2: unlimited use & access. Should not be a limit on the horse power of a boat. People should be able to use whatever horse power they want as long as they use common sense. Response to Question 3: Limited use & access. Response to Question 4: No enough boat ramps. Response to Question 5: More accesses to the river	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588

3226	Response to Question 1: No-Action - does not need modified Response to Question 2: The No-Action alternative should be included in the future management plan.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3227	Response to Question 1: No-Action we should not be limted from our resourse's Response to Question 2: Unlimited access & use This land belongs to the people we should have access to enjoy all of missouri's resource's Response to Question 3: limited access & use They should not be able to restrict the use of public land. Response to Question 4: The park service should patrol the rivers in boats. Response to Question 5: Provide more resoures for all recreatinal purpose's	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3228	Response to Question 1: Take no action Response to Question 2: handicapped accessible river access points Response to Question 3: No limitation on out board motors Response to Question 4: From Alley to Two Rivers, From Two Rivers to Van Buren Response to Question 5: No alcohol on river	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3229	Response to Question 1: Of the 4 Alternative Proposals I wish to see the "No Action" Proposal Accepted. Response to Question 3: Leave the measuring of Horse Power to be measured at the Lower Unit Output - Do Not Change it to the Power Head.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3230	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Open roads Back up Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Current River and Jacksfork NO. Response to Question 5: We welcome visitors, but they should not be put before Local people. Whe care for our rivers and streams.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3231	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: TO RAISE THE HP LIMITS ON ALL PARTS OF THE RIVER. Response to Question 3: USE OF THE PARK & RIVER SHOULD NEVER BE EXCLUDED. Response to Question 5: KEEP THE PARK OPEN AND ACCESSABLE TO ALL PEOPLE	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3232	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: ADD more Boat Ramps Response to Question 3: No Limitations on Outboards Horse Power Response to Question 4: Herktail to Owl Bend on Current River Baycreek to Two River on Jack Fork River Response to Question 5: ADD more Park Rangers on the River	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3233	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Plan A, B, or C Response to Question 4: I use all of the River ways Response to Question 5: Keep it the way it is so everyone can use it	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3234	Response to Question 1: No Action. Please. don't take no more away from us locals. it is our River we are the people that are on the River year around Hunting, Fishing, gigging, or jus Boat Riding Response to Question 2: No Action I Think We should Be Able To launch a 200 Horse Jet Boat Response to Question 3: I like the No Action. The Park Service Shoundn't restrict me from launching a 40 Horse. or 200 Horse Jet Boat on any of the landings. Response to Question 4: Blue Spring & Roberts field landings. I dont want the Park Service to tell me that I can't go down a road that I have drove down my whole life, or to tell me that I can't go to the river in my Boat. Response to Question 5: I Think that if Their is that Big of a Problem, take some of the conoes, Floaters of the River. Dont take away from the locals who go Ever chance they get. Take away from those who come ever Ten years. I appreciate you taking the time to read my comments. Thanks	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3235	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION!!! Response to Question 2: More boat ramp's and river accesses. Response to Question 3: No limitation on extra curricular activity involving the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 4: I would like to keep the same rules and regulations that have kept me and my family safe for decades.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3236	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: All special to my entire family and freinds. Alternative's make them enaccesable. Response to Question 5: Sugar Mill - Camp - At Beil Landing below Log Yard. Bring it Back. Sourgum Mill at Blue Springs - Bring it Back Feild Trips for school and church groups, Educate the children.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965
3237	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: - No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Vanburen. Response to Question 5: Leave things the way the are Now!	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3238	Response to Question 1: the no-action plan. Putting any more restictions on Horse Power limits would cost almost every resident in Shannon, Carter, Dent, Ripley, Reynolds, and Oregon County a lot of money as well as Marine businesses. Response to Question 3: Further Restriction on horse power limits Response to Question 4: Current river from round spring to log yard. The no action Plan.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3239	Response to Question 1: No-Action Keep 40 HP lower jet unit Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: Personal Comment Response to Question 5: More Recreational Usage Facilities	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3240	Response to Question 1: No-Action would most definitley be the best alternative! My family and I have been enjoying Our riverways for generations and should be able to continue to enjoy our riverways for however long & whatever we need it for. Response to Question 2: unlimited access use Response to Question 3: limited acess Response to Question 4: I have camped & boated on alot of Current River and believe it should stay Exactley the same as it is. Every single bit of our riverways is special to me & should not be taken away from anyone. Response to Question 5:	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588

	Provide more public use resources & more access for motor boats.						
3241	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Me and my family enjoy the rives in our area and use them often year around. We all have grown up on the rivers fishing, swimming, camping and boating is what my family live for. And to shut off or limit the use of the public right would be devastating. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: limited access to ONSR should not be included in the management of the national riverways Response to Question 4: every inch of the 134 miles are special to my family and me and every time we are on the river we have always tried to make it better than we got there. We all do our part to make it clean there is no harm of our use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 5: Provide more resources for public use and motor boat access	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3242	Response to Question 1: No Action. MUST KEEP Boating privilagees Response to Question 2: No action at all. Response to Question 3: ALL OF THEM SHOULD NOT be included. Response to Question 4: ALL OF THE 134 miles of complete River. Response to Question 5: Do Not MAKE ANY MORE Changes ON the complete entire River.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965
3243	Response to Question 1: No-Action - I've Been using All Area's of the Current River, And Am Used to the Restrictions that Are Now in Place. Response to Question 2: People should Have Access to the River and it's Banks For their Plesure. Response to Question 3: DO NOT WANT TO See Any More H.P. Restrictions on the Riverway. Response to Question 4: My Family And I use the Round Srings Area Down to Van Buren. I Have a 25HP BOAT for that Reason. I feel the Current limits are Adequat. Response to Question 5: Maybe, Put Rangers on the River for Helping Boaters/Floaters.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3244	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: I want No Restrictions on Recreational Activities. Response to Question 4: We go to both Van Buren & Doniphan Response to Question 5: visible water patrol	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3245	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: free Recreation Response to Question 4: mostly Van Buren Area Response to Question 5: patrolling of busy areas	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3246	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: there should be no restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren would become more congested and dangerous Response to Question 5: more patrols of busy areas	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3247	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Other than HP limits, I like many of the suggestions in Alternative C. I would like to see increased presence of Park Rangers in peak season. Response to Question 3: ALL of Alternative A. We are in the tourism business, and it would Ruin us. Response to Question 4: Bay Creek & No-Action Alternative. Response to Question 5: Most problems associated with ONSR are already Regulated. The NPS is failing to, although some inroads have been made, stop drunken & lewd behavior on the Rivers. There are a handful of boats that cause trouble - Not All of them, and they need to be Reprimanded.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3248	Response to Question 1: No action. You need to be less restrictive on the people whom live there, and work there. You all need to focus on the people whom live there 52 weeks a year, and not so much on the people vist one weekend a year Response to Question 2: I think the canoe rentals shouldn't rent to big groups of people, but if the do, no tying them together Response to Question 3: The water being polluted by people. The people whom live there, that river is their life, and many of them livelihood. Response to Question 4: I enjoy upper current the most. Response to Question 5: I would talk to the local people instad of having mettings in Columbia and St. Louis. Those people very seldom vist the river	6/30/2009	No			MO	63020
3256	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Additional Law Enforcement along the River Response to Question 3: Any Restrictions to Access & Usage Response to Question 4: I enjoy the Big Creek Area and the Two Rivers Junction. Response to Question 5: Making the Access Areas more user friendly by Removing gravel and debris.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
3257	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A and B Response to Question 4: All 134 miles of ONSR are special to me. I do have concerns about those 134 miles of ONSR. My concern is with the congested areas that result from too many tubes/rafts. None of these alternatives address my concern. Please consider my concern as a complaint. Congested areas pose a danger to boaters & tubers alike. Response to Question 5: Build a boat ramp at Waymeyer. Doing so will relieve traffic in tubes and canoe floating section of the river.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
3258	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: I am a boat owner who enjoys spending every summer weekend on the river with my family. By changing the horse power limit on motors will limit where me and my family can go on the river. I do not feel that tubes should have more rights than I. Thank you.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63901
3259	Response to Question 1: No-action Because we like our rivers and we like to hunt, boat and ride our four wheelers Response to Question 2: unlimited use and access and we need more 4 wheeler access, boat ramps and as long as people use their common since there should not be a limit on Horse power Response to Question 3: Limited acess & use. We need more places to go and ride 4-wheelers. Mere boat ramp and more River access Response to Question 4: That there is not enough boat ramps Response to Question 5: Provide more access to boaters and more	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588

	places for campers and four wheelers						
3260	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Tourists should definitely be accomodated on the riverways but not at the exclusion of local use of motorboats with larger motors. Response to Question 3: Restrictions on boat motor usage any more than is currently exercised. Response to Question 4: The "No-Action" alternative is the only one that meets halfway between tourists & locals ability to benefit from & enjoy our river. Response to Question 5: The current strategies & approaches to management is sufficient and beneficial to the greatest amount of river users.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
3261	Response to Question 1: I think C is closest. The park has a tremendous potential that is not being managed properly. Definitely the park needs trails for hiking, a proper Wrangler camp for horseback riding with designated trails. The park can offer all the camping, tubing, boating, hiking, biking that will satisfy everyone, but it must be actively managed to protect its resources and prevent abuse. I think it is being undermanaged at this point. I would like Big Spring tract made wilderness Response to Question 2: Resource-based recreation. Some nicely developed areas that are large enough to satisfy visitors, but do not take over the park. Remote areas should be left natural or primitive. Response to Question 3: Alternative A is far too restrictive. Response to Question 4: Because I am a horseback rider I would like to see a Wrangler Camp with about 25 miles of trails. Presently there is no horse camping in the park and the trails at Shawnee Creek are 80% road riding. They are poorly laid out and no one likes riding the roads all the time. I don't think any of the alternatives address horse camping. Response to Question 5: If camping facilities are upgraded to electric and water, to accommodate your larger RV's, you will get a better class of visitor and fewer drug users and problem campers.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63941
3262	Response to Question 1: Take "No Action" - Alternative No Change to Hp measurement to be made from the Output. Response to Question 3: I do no Think that the General Management Plan Wilderness Study has Any Authority to Change Federal Law by making Horsepower measurements at the Powerhead, when federal Law dictates it to be measured at the Low or Unit OUTPUT. Response to Question 4: We do No Want any Limits on Recreation on OZARK National Scenic Riverways Response to Question 5: I think that the users of the Ozark National Riverways should be monitored for Public Drunkenness & handled appropriately!!!	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3263	Response to Question 1: Take no action Response to Question 2: more river access points, concession stands on river bank Response to Question 3: no Limitations on out board motors Response to Question 4: From Alley to Two Rivers From Round Springs to Van Buren Response to Question 5: No nude boating or floating	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3264	Response to Question 1: No-Action Do something about all the drug use and under age Drinking Response to Question 2: The small learning center would be great. Response to Question 3: Shuting down the John-boats. I have grown up on this river and raised my children on it. The canoers and the boaters need to learn to live with each other like the good old days Response to Question 4: Akers to Twin Rivers Response to Question 5: The Visitor need to be taught MANNERS. I do not pee in thier backyard or cuss them in a drunken slurr! Nor do I expose myself to their childred while smoking dope.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63629
3265	Response to Question 1: A. Marked limitation of the number of visitor and uses similar to the Boundy Water near Ely, Minnesota Response to Question 2: --Horsepower limitation on motor boats --Limit canoe, floating inner tube use --Aggressive enforcement of alcohol, drug & lewdness laws Response to Question 3: The concessioneers should be limited or eliminated completely. They benefit mainly from our national resources and contribute minimally. Response to Question 4: The entire Current River is special and all efforts should be explored to perserve this stream. Response to Question 5: Having grown up on this river over the past 50 yrs and now have the extreme luxury of living in the Scenic Riverway we must bring back traditional families and recreation and eliminate the Animal House mentally of a significant number of visitor and the people who profit from this.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63937
3266	Response to Question 1: A & B Response to Question 2: Big Spring should have wilderness designation. Response to Question 3: Don't just do primitive qualities of Big Spring. It needs to be wilderness. Response to Question 4: I would like plants & animals protected. I realize there needs to be some areas for things I don't like. I don't like ATV's tearing up the land but to be fair to those who want it there probably needs to be a small area for those kind of trails.	6/30/2009	No			MO	64137
3267	Response to Question 1: No Action! The riverways belong to the people. to deny Access even with Limits would be unconstitutional No patriotic American would vote to take thier rights and heritage Away. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Limitations or denial of Access should Never be included Response to Question 4: My family and I have lived near the riverways for generations the entire riverways is a special place. Thier should be no alternatives to have to choose from. Response to Question 5: The park service should be on the riverways to help people Not harass boaters No one should have to pay to fish or park thier vehicle on public land.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3268	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Make concrete Boat ramp at Jerktail handing on Current River. This Area has been Neglected.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3269	Response to Question 1: No Action Because if any change it should allow the locals to Have less regulations. Because It is our river. Are Moms, Dads, grandparents left it to us we want to do the same. Response to Question 2: No Action None The Park should Have no control on me, If Im not doing Nothing Wrong Response to Question 3: No Action The shouldn't Be No Horsepower limit on the current & Jacks Fork Rivers. Response to Question 4: Blue Springs & Roberts Field landing I like it the way it is leave it alone you. already took the My 200 Horse dont take my	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588

	40 horse Response to Question 5: Dont Take No More from the locals it I Thier River. Dont let someone who comes once a year control what we do all year Its not Fair						
3270	Response to Question 1: No-Action I Think they should be no horsepower limit on any Jet Boat on the current or Jacks Fork River. Response to Question 2: No-Action Its not the Park Services Job to tell me that I can not put a Jet Boat on the river. Response to Question 3: I think there should not be any regulations, that tell me that I can only go to the river with a Certian Size Jet motor. And that I cant go down some of the Roads on the Park. Response to Question 4: I go to the Rocky and Blue springs landing. Wich my family owns some of Rocky Creek. And my great Aunt own the Blue Springs Area Before the goverment took it. Now you are trying to do the same. Response to Question 5: I think if anything you should take the tourist off the river. The locals is the ones that have to clean up their trash. They can throw it on the gravels bars and leave it. never to see it again. We have to clean it up	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3271	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Open roads you have closed on National Forest ant riverway - We want more access. Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Do not limit access Response to Question 3: Altenatives - A, B, C Limits on access & camping Response to Question 4: Current River and Jacksfork. No. Our rivers are in worse condition since National Park Service (National Scenic Riverway) has taken over. They are filling with gravel, river banks have become overgrown. Their condition has declined steadily since taken from the land owners along the rivers. Response to Question 5: accesses to the rivers need to be reopened. There should not be restricted campsites. There should be access to all lands under control of National Scenic Riverways. The visitors are welcome. However, They don't have the right to be nude, stoned, standing in boats or on bank urinating when we have family and children present. Local people live and take care of and take pride our rivers.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3272	Response to Question 1: Yes, Alternative C, we need more campsites and more access to remote historic or natural sties. You could still have programs about Ozark ways of life. Response to Question 2: More programs about the history of the Ozarks, more trails & camp sites to remote historic & natural sites. Definitely need more camp sites in remote camping Areas. Response to Question 3: The mechanized forms of recreation. Boaters & floaters have managed to get by for years. Leave it the way it is now as far as restrictions for Horse power. Response to Question 4: From Round Springs to Jerk tail There has been no conflicts between boaters & floaters so don't restrict H.p. to 25 there is no need Response to Question 5: I think floaters know where & what to expect on the stretch of river they have chosen to float. I am a local & I know for a fact of the pollution from cross country trail Rides & my Family & Friends will never Float that section. It is just local knowledge "Don't Float Jacks Fork or swim near Trail Rides. I think Visitors like the programs during evening hours to rest & teach families importance of history & parks beauty & values to keep them that way.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3273	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: VAN Buren - Restrictions would congestion a problem & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: more water patrol druing peek season	6/30/2009	No			MO	63901
3274	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Our riverways are beautiful - Boats have been on the riverways for years.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3275	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: public restrooms Boat Ramps Response to Question 3: Not shutting down the river. Response to Question 4: Bay Creek to Two Rivers on Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: No action	6/30/2009	No			MO	63021
3276	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Restrooms, Boat ramps Response to Question 3: No closing the river. Response to Question 4: Bay Creek to 2 Rivers on Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: No action	6/30/2009	No			MO	63084
3277	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 2: Closing illegally developed trails limiting mechanized forms of recation Response to Question 3: Over developing the area. Commercially guided tours & permanent "float camps" Response to Question 4: The Jack's Fork - Particularly limiting the development & # of boaters. Response to Question 5: Keeping the motors on boats & ATV's away.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63116
3278	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
3279	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Vanburen	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3280	Response to Question 1: I strongly oppose any action on this Riverway. (No Action)	6/30/2009	No			MO	63901

3281	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3282	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational use for All Response to Question 3: No more Restictions or Regulations Response to Question 5: More Facilities & Recreational usage	6/30/2009	No			MO	65752
3283	Response to Question 1: A. It is imperative to keep as much land in its original state as possible. Motorboats do NOT belong on the Jack's Fork OR Current River. ONCE YOU "COMMERCIALIZE" AN AREA, THERE IS NO GOING BACK! WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO FUTURE GENERATIONS TO KEEP THE AREA IN ITS NATURAL STATE! Response to Question 2: *More hiking trails to access historic areas. *LIMIT THE NUMBER OF CANOES ON THE RIVER DURING SUMMER - TOO CROWDED. ALSO, REQUIRE FLOATERS SIGN A "RIVER ETTIQUETTE" FORM TO HELP CURB LEWD & DRUNK BEHAVIOR. Response to Question 3: *KEEP HORSES OUT OF THE WATER. THEIR WASTE CONTAMINATES THE WATER - e-coli. Response to Question 5: (READ ABOVE) RIVER BEHAVIOR ON WEEKENDS NEEDS SERIOUS ATTENTION	6/30/2009	No			MO	64119
3284	Response to Question 1: "A" is definitely my choice. I own a cabin on the Current. I hate being there in the summer & find I am forced indoors due to the noise from an over-crowded river. The people who come in the summer would be better served by going to Six Flags. They are interested in drinking, swearing, lewd behavior & making as much noise as possible. Response to Question 2: A way of monitoring density & behavior on the river. Response to Question 3: Development! We don't need to encourage more drunks to come. That is not why I bought my place! Response to Question 4: Of course, the area of most concern to me is where my house is which is downstream of Akers so I get a lot of the partying. I am so sick of hearing "fuck" and "bitch" screamed (and any combination of those words) all summer. Response to Question 5: My main concern is having enough Rangers to enforce the laws & to make the river a pleasant experience for those who enjoy nature. Restrict Development of any kind. Intentions may be good around development but you can't predict or restrict the people who use the services.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63011
3285	Response to Question 1: Keep it the same. No-Action! Response to Question 2: More visible Rangers both on shore and in motor boats. Response to Question 3: Any Restrictions on Access and Usage. Response to Question 4: I love the Broadfoot Bluff hole & the Two Rivers Jct. Both Are great for swimming. Response to Question 5: Do more burnig and plant more food plots. I used to kill a lot of quail Along Current River & wood like to Again. Also some (Not a lot) dredging At boat Access points.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
3286	Response to Question 1: Yes, Alternative C Response to Question 2: Alternative C The current operation is working Response to Question 3: Any change to current operation of Ozark National Scenic Riverways Response to Question 4: The Entire Riverways is very important to me. The NPS is doing a great Job the way it is being managed now. Why change something that is not broken Response to Question 5: Again, the NPS is doing a Great Job managing. They are gaining respect of the Locals and Tourists Alike. Leave the ONSR the way it currently is.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63020
3287	Response to Question 1: I feel Alt. A most close to my ideas for the river. Response to Question 2: Limiting the large motorboats to the area below Powder Mill. Ten HP would be adequate for any upper river areas. Eliminate all the "jeep trails" up & down the river. End the night spear fishing with the noisy generators & bright lights. Response to Question 3: The people who offer boat rental & other services are for the most part courteous and competent business folks who do not need to have NPS planning their offerings to the public. I saw the Current River as a teen in the 50's and there is no way the river can be returned to that state. Response to Question 4: I think the camp ground at Akers Ferry should be re-opened. That area is the natural starting point to 2 or 3 day river trips. I also feel the elimination of the cabins & camps along the river would be very good for the river experience. Response to Question 5: Do not increase the numbers of boats available for rentals. Horses and motor boats have a large impact on the river and should be restricted. Efforts to keep litter off the river should be increased.	6/30/2009	No			IL	62901
3288	Response to Question 1: 1. no Action 2. more for Local Tax payers 3. Leave the Boats Alone! Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: 1. Boats REgulations 2. Response to Question 4: 1. Sinking Creek Response to Question 5: 1. Leave Boats Alone 2. More Local Tax payer input 3. Less Alcohol & more Family.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63629
3289	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: No profanity tolerated. Limit the size of the groups coming down together. Response to Question 3: Doing away with the 60/40 jets. Forget limiting the motors from Memorial day - Labor day. Response to Question 4: From the 60 Bridge to the Log Yard. Love the views, wildlife & clear water. Response to Question 5: I think all the rental equipment should have very large numbers on them - so when there is a problem we can tell rangers or water patrol which person caused the problem. Like to see signs "Congested Area Emergency Stopping Only" on top middle & bottom of Mill Creek. Very congested!	6/30/2009	No			MO	63841
3290	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: No Action Leave use alone, No changes. Response to Question 5: 40 HP. to out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3291	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Pull gravel from the rivers so they will quit filling in. Open all closed Roads and trails Response to Question 3: Removing boats from the River, decreasing motor sizes, Removing the use of roads. Removing horses from the trails	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438

3292	Response to Question 1: No-Action Enjoy it as is! Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Thes best alternative is no-action Response to Question 5: Keep as is!	7/28/2009	No			MO	63108
3293	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Two Rivers to Northern Edge of Van Buren Gap Response to Question 4: Two Rivers to Goose Neck Response to Question 5: Open more trails to ATV, Dual Rider ATV & side by side vehicles. More open exposure of water patrol on river. Equal responiblity of tuber's, canoers and boaters. More concrete access points.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63051
3294	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 3: there should be no changes in the size of motors on Jacks fork or Current. Some of the proposed changes would stop gigging. This goes on at a time it doesn't interfere with conoeing ect. Response to Question 4: at gooseneck a boat ramp should be built. The lack of a place to launch a boat has kept our family from utilizing the camp grounds as we did in the past. the nearest launch site is Grubbs. many miles out of the way. Response to Question 5: inforce the laws on the books now. also watch for more drinking & drug use as these people causes most of our trouble on the rivers.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438-9243
3295	Response to Question 1: No-Action should be preferred Alternative Manage According to 1984 GMP. Review/update (with public involved) special management plans such as R & T Plan, River Use Plan, Horse Use, etc. . . Response to Question 2: More emphasis on: -- Historical/cultural significance (including cemeteries) --Reestablish cultural demonstations such as Blacksmithing & sorghum making. --allow Motorized Access throughout Park, especially for the handicapped & elderly. Response to Question 3:--No Additional limitations on outboard horsepower. --Additional Fee Areas. --Access to Old Farmsteads Response to Question 4: --Alley Spring; Trim vegetation in developed Area and Add More RV campsites w/water & electric hook-ups. --Powder Mill; Construct boat ramp on East side of river. --Rocky/Roberts Field; Construct boat ramp Response to Question 5: --Focus on outdoor Activities & education. --Emphasize Ozark Highlands history (Area & people), "Tell the story."	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3296	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: More user accesses Response to Question 3: No restrictions on h.p. for boats Response to Question 4: No action Response to Question 5: No action	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3297	Response to Question 1: No further restrictions should be the preferred course. Response to Question 2: --Return developed areas to pristine manicured open views that were maintained 30+ years ago. Specifially open Alley picnic, mill & swimming areas above the bridge to historic state. --Clear areas that were once farm fields along the rivers Response to Question 3: --No added motorboat horsepower restrictions. --Added visitor use amenities --Historic homestead access. Response to Question 4: --Alley: clear excess vegetation around mill, shelters, spring, race, historic swimming areas to restore historic vistas & provide for families to use. Families can not monitor kids in a jungle of brush --Provide safer boat launches at Rocky & Powder Mill Response to Question 5: --LE Rangers more visible in known problem locations to provide proactive, non-threatening approach. --Kid & family oreinted activities --Programs with historic significance	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3298	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 4: There is no reason to stop boats on current river between 2 River & Round Springs. No one gets hurt. There are no problems	8/5/2009	No			MO	65479
3299	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action-- Response to Question 3: No limits on horsepower of Boats from Spring to Doniphan. Should Not try to limit access to the people that use the river. No wilderness Area - this is selfish of you to want this. Response to Question 4: Pen Oak to Doniphan - Need better Access Response to Question 5: No Action needed - you need to proof to the people why you want this change & how it would effect the community.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
3300	Response to Question 1: Yes - A. Basicly maintain the Riverways as they are now, with some additional exclusions, such as horses, motorized boats & ATVs. Response to Question 2: It is my belief that the original plan as expected and explained to property owners at the time should be adhered to closely, with no changes. It was explained at the time of establishment that the rivers would be maintained as they were when white men first came. Response to Question 3: Any more roads or boat ramps, or trails, etc. All ATV's & and other motorized vehicles and boats should be excluded from all sections. No more horses and some now allowed should be eliminated.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63011
3301	Response to Question 1: No Action!! Provide all types of Resources to recreationists! Response to Question 2: I want free Recreational usage! Response to Question 3: want Restricted Recreational usage and all access! Response to Question 4: I love all the Riverway. Response to Question 5: Would like more recreational access places and usage!	6/30/2009	No			MO	65752
3302	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action	6/30/2009	No			MO	65472
3303	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: N/A Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: N/A	6/30/2009	No			IL	62961

3304	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: ALL AREAS ARE SPECIAL TO ME. I WANT NO CHANGE. Response to Question 5: No Action	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
3305	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: A OR B	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
3306	Response to Question 1: No Action, Keep Hr Rating 40 hp at the Pump for Boat moters Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, And C Response to Question 4: No Action Love the River, Leave it alone Response to Question 5: Bathrooms, Boat Ramps, Hookups	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3307	Response to Question 1: No Action, Keep 40 HP. Rating At the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C. Response to Question 4: No Action, Please Leave the River As is Response to Question 5: Boat Ramps, Bath Rooms and Need Hookups.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63601
3308	Response to Question 1: No Action Keep Jet Rating 40 HP At The Prop Shaft Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C Response to Question 4: It Is All Special To Me Leave it Like it Is No Action Response to Question 5: Better Camp Ground's with Hook Up's for Electric	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3309	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No action camping at Log Yard with the family for over 30 yrs.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3310	Response to Question 1: Yes, No-Action	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3311	Response to Question 1: No-Action works for Current River Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Log Yard - Family Camping for over 30 yrs.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3312	Response to Question 1: Yes - No Action AS A NATIVE AMERICAN I CRY WHEN OUR USA GOVERNMENT TAKES AWAY MORE OF OUR RIGHTS. YES, TO USE THE CURRENT RIVER IS A PRIVILEGE TO ALL - TO NATIVE AMERICANS IT IS OUR RIGHT.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3313	Response to Question 1: No action - Keep HP Rating 40 HP at the pump. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No action - Don't fix something that isn't broken - Leave it alone! Response to Question 5: Clear the fields on the old farms like they used to be	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3314	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION KEEP HP RATING 40 HP AT PUMP Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: LOVE THE RIVER LEAVE ALONE Response to Question 5: OPEN THE OLD FARM FIELDS UP THE WAY THEY WERE WHEN THE THE THE LAND WAS PURCHASED.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3315	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: Van Buren, MO	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
3316	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Restore & preserve natural & scenic nature of riverways low impact - reversal of impact from overuse & development Response to Question 3: No increase of equestrian or motorized vehicles & boats minimize use of these to preserve peaceful environment - many-many places/parks that allow off-road vehicles, high speed boats and horses. Response to Question 4: Big Spring - very supportive of Wilderness designation. Only a few places meet requirements for wilderness - need to preserve these for future generations. Bass & trout areas need protection Response to Question 5: Permit system to allow but limit use & impact of horses & boaters (canoe/Kyak, etc.) No motorized boats (allow trolling motors) no excessive alcohol use - no boom boxes - loud music, etc. Need enforcement - more designated equestrian trails - specify river crossings	8/5/2009	No			MO	63013
3317	Response to Question 1: A is preferable. The addition of small guided tours in B sounds OK in theory but would create additional disturbance to natural settings. Response to Question 2: No ATVs or motorboats. Peace and quiet are a big part of experiencing the natural beauty of the riverways. Response to Question 3: Do not cater to consumer \$\$\$. You are safeguarding a scarce, unique resource. Establish canoe & horse limits and allocate them to the commercial operators. Their fees wil rise so their revenue stays up, and this in turn discourages over use. Discourage drinking alcohol on the riverway. (e.g. 3.2 beer) Response to Question 4: My family owns land above Cedar Grove. Limits on canoes, horses, and elimination of ATVs would restore our experience of our area to the tranquility and sense of isolation I remember as a child. Response to Question 5: Enforcement! More park rangers. Communication of rules/regs. More signage. Permit system - see #3.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63119

3318	Response to Question 1: No-Action This Alternative could be made better by including the addition of New boat ramps above and below major floater put-in and take-out locations. Response to Question 2: There should be No addition regulation on the riverways, especially with regard to horse power limits. Response to Question 3: --No additional regulation on the riverways, including any changes to the current policy regarding horse power Limits. Response to Question 4: The area's around Van Buren, Round Spring, Eminence & the upper	8/4/2009	No			MO	65043
3319	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No motor restrictions Response to Question 3: No motor restrictions Response to Question 4: Van Buren Response to Question 5: More boat docks with easier access More dredging	8/4/2009	No			MO	63967
3320	Response to Question 1: "No Action" is the best alternative. Response to Question 2: None. Response to Question 3: The rating of the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It should be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: We've spent most of our time on the area between Round Spring and Powder Mill and have not had any problems. Nothing should be changed! Response to Question 5: Public accesses to the river should remain open, and maybe increased. All recreational activities, such as camping, should be free of charge!	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3321	Response to Question 1: No-Action is the best alternative Response to Question 2: None. No-Action is the best way. Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It should be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: Alley Spring to Powder Mill. The "No-Action" alternative addresses this area the best. Response to Question 5: Do not try to shut down public river accesses. Free recreational activities, such as camping, should be free to everyone.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3322	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horse power Restriction Response to Question 3: The right to Camp and boat on the river Response to Question 4: Current River all of it Response to Question 5: no change of Road closing & Recreation	8/19/2009	No			MO	65466
3323	Response to Question 1: No-Action The government has no Right To change something that is working fine. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No change Response to Question 5: Leave a Good thing alone.	8/19/2009	No			MO	63023
3324	Response to Question 1: No Action, Leave Boats & motors AS IS. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Leave all areas alone. All areas are special to us that live here. Response to Question 5: Make food plots in the old field areas I wouldn't mind seeing some trophy BASS area's	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3325	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave Horse power 40 at the pump 60 at power head - Family boating needs this to be able to carry a Load of 4 Response to Question 2: None of the A, B, or C - They were written for people who don't really use the "River" They are for environmental people who don't want anybody to see or enjoy the area Response to Question 3: No Primitive & no wilderness Response to Question 4: Again = No Action Response to Question 5: water patrol - more control of drugs & drinking	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3326	Response to Question 1: No Action - Leave H.P. 40 at the pump (not at the power head) Response to Question 2: NONE of A, B, or C. You all know that A & B are Absolutely stupid! they are EPA & environmental people controlled! Not good for the original use of Park, or Local users. Response to Question 3: No wilderness & No Primitive Zones This Park was original for Recreation for people - not for environmental protection (environmentalist make undocumented & False Accusations) Response to Question 4: more water patrol & (more drug & drinking control) Response to Question 5: I think county officials should have some control - they are elected by the people & the Local People are the ones that take the best of care of the ONSR.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3327	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Road Closing Response to Question 5: 40 Horse Lower unit	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438
3328	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: None. Response to Question 4: All - No Action - No Road Closings Response to Question 5: No Road Closings - No Horsepower-Restrictions	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3329	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: All - No Road Closings - No Action Response to Question 5: No Road Closings - No Horsepower Restrictions	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3330	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Park Surer Leave us alone	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
3331	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No further Action Response to Question 5: Return to previous times!	8/5/2009	No			TN	38578

3332	Response to Question 1: I was confused by A & B. But B sounds the Best. I would like to see the Big Springs Wilderness set aside. Response to Question 2: The Big Spring's Wilderness plan. I would like to see more of the Glade's and other Natural areas restored. Response to Question 3: Lets get rid of the Large Number of Horeses on & in the Riverway along with the ATV's & Large Mortor Boats that ruin the rivers. Response to Question 4: We need Big Springs as a Wilderness & more areas set aside suth as Natural Area's or Wilderness. I would like to see more Burning to help restore some of these Natural area's.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63074
3333	Did not respond to any of the questions.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63026
3334	Response to Question 1: "Alternative A" is A start towards resolving many of the serious issues that confront the park today. "Alternative A" over time must begin to reverse the benign neglect which has developed over the past 2 decades with respect to Management of the OSNR. Better Landing and Natural resource Managent A priority. Response to Question 2: 1. Enhanced visitor Experiene. 2. Consolidated Services & Facilities (Too many roads & Access Areas) 3. Focused Intreptation & Educations - Cultural Resources 4. Natural Resource Mgmt. (Higher regard for land & water quality) 5. Wilderness - High priority on inclusions of the Big Spring tract Response to Question 3: 1. No-Action - There must be Action for change & progress in the Future 2. More roads - Close many that we have for control purposes 3. Horses - Establish A system to minimize impact on land & water 4. Motorized Vehicles - Establish stronger rules on size, use & Access Response to Question 4: 1. Enforce easements 2. Partner with Missouri on the development of the old Alton Box Board Site As a historic treasurer & river eduction Area 3. Protect springs & caves to highest extent possible. Protect habitat. 4. Big Spring Wilderness Area Response to Question 5: 1. Protect ? from Abuse (i.e. Big Creek) 2. Land Acquisition where possible on inholdings, Jacks Fork & Lower 3. Develop & Foster "Friends Groups" to gain improved ? ? ? and support for OSNR & NPS programs and projcets 4. Work closely with CFM, NPA & NPCA & other friends	8/5/2009	No			MO	63073
3335	Response to Question 1: I want the original intent for the ONSR to be enforced & communicated to all visitors to these waters. That is to protect & maintain a pristine, natural river enviroment conducive to passive, non-destructive uses. Enforcement is the key issue, followwdd by education. Response to Question 2: #1. The removal of roads and enforcement of eliminating usage of these roads. #2. Strict enforcement outlawing 4-wheeling on our riverways #3. Strict limits on equestrian usage through permitting & enforcement. Response to Question 3: No further "improved" access areas. There are too many roads & access pts. along the rivers. There is a sense that visitors have a right to use this resource without consideration of their impact & long term health Response to Question 4: I urge a permitting system be considered. The rivers, the gravel bars, & the access points all show huge signs of overuse & pollution, litter, water quality, erosion, cave disturbances, traffic around springs, etc. Response to Question 5: Strong educational element to increase understanding of natural systems & what activities destroy or greatly reduce quality of natural resources & living systems. Consider requireing visitors to wathc 15 min. video on these topics (as the Boundary Waters does)	8/5/2009	No			MO	63119
3336	Response to Question 1: Alternative A	8/5/2009	No			MO	63119-2226
3337	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: None. Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the powerhead. It should be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: Alley Spring to Powder Mill. The "No-Action" alternative addresses this area best. Response to Question 5: Free recreational activities to everyone. More public river accesses. More bathrooms along the rivers.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65775
3339	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All parts of A, B, C Response to Question 4: All areas are special. No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3340	Response to Question 1: No Action Stay OFF the motor boats Response to Question 2: Clean up the old Farm sites Response to Question 3: The wilderness idea is a no no Response to Question 4: Boat access points from two Rives to Van Buren need improved Response to Question 5: More Access Routes to River.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3341	Response to Question 1: -A Response to Question 2: -Keep 40 HP boats below Big Spring (Van Buren) 1st choice -Keep 40 HP boats below Two Rivers 2nd choice Response to Question 4: -The 40 HP boaters between Round Spring & Two Rivers have created a dangerous situation for paddlers (not to mention the noise pollution and constant smell of gasoline exhaust). A or B would solve the problem. -Stop the water pollution on the Jacks Fork River caused by Trail Rides. (I don't see anything addressing that problem)	8/4/2009	No			MO	64015
3342	Response to Question 1: No Action - Add more campsites along both rivers & more boat landings. Also improve our existing boat landings. Response to Question 2: None - I believe that the management should remain as it is now. With no more road closures. Howwever motor boats can save lives. If someone floating is hurt a motor boat can take them down or up-river in a emergency situation where a canoe cannot. Response to Question 3: Exempting motor boating & closing any further roads which lead to the jacks fork & current rivers. Response to Question 4: All of the 134 miles. If motor boating is prohibited then I will not be able to gig, nor my children, or grandchildren, or anyone else for that matter. Response to Question 5: Yes. I think park rangers should patrol the rivers every day during tourism season to not only inform locals & tourist of river ettiquette but also help whomever may need help. I believe that the rangers should be the "highway patrol" of the rivers	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466

3343	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 4: Big Springs to Blue Springs, more restrooms & showers Response to Question 5: Better assistance from Park Rangers.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63755
3344	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 4: Big Springs to blue springs More showers & restrooms. Response to Question 5: better campsite (showers, electrical outlets) more interaction w/park rangers.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63755
3345	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 4: Blue Springs to Big Springs is where we spend most of our time. Response to Question 5: More showers and restrooms between big spring & blue spring. More interaction with park rangers instead of them posted up on the sides of the rivers.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63755
3346	Response to Question 1: 40 Hp at the out put shaft from big spring to two Rivers is the least a Family or Fisherman can get by with No Action Response to Question 3: no wilderness Response to Question 4: Improve access points like moss landing and powdermill	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3347	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do not restrict H.p.	8/5/2009	No			OH	45356
3348	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do not restrict H.p.	8/5/2009	No			FL	32822
3349	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 3: Two Rivers to the northern edge of the Van Buren Gap should not be included. Response to Question 4: Two River to Goose Neck Response to Question 5: 1. Open more trails to ATV's dual rider ATV's & side x side vehicles 2. More open exposure of water patrol on the river. 3. Equal respect & responsibility of tuber's, canoers and boaters 4. More concrete access points	8/5/2009	No			MO	63052
3350	Response to Question 1: No Action - get more law enforcement out amongst the people on the riverways, not in the bushes. More boat ramps to access river. Response to Question 2: More access to the river by adding additional boat ramps. Response to Question 3: Limiting horsepower Big Spring park should not be "wilderness" Response to Question 4: Lower current congestion - should limit # of tubes, canoes that can be put on in a day at one access point. Response to Question 5: Tubers & canoers should have to take class concerning safety. More law enforcement easily seen & accessible on river. More access points to help congestion.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63941
3351	Response to Question 1: A - LEAVE STREAMS AND LAND UNDEVELOPED AND NATURAL Response to Question 2: CLOSING ILLEGAL ROADWAYS LOWER HORSEPOWER MOTORS PROTECTING HABITAT Response to Question 3: NO MORE ACCESSES NO MORE EXPANSION Response to Question 4: UPPER RIVER AND THE MORE REMOTE SECTIONS (WHAT'S LEFT OF IT) Response to Question 5: LIMIT ACCESSES, MORE PEACEFUL USES	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3352	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Reversal of over use. Response to Question 3: More Access, Boat ramps, and trails Response to Question 4: Trout fishing areas. No Response to Question 5: Keep and repair the rivers to pristine.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63021
3353	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: No restrictions Response to Question 3: The national park service personal should be in uniform, at all times, and not be in the bushes watching, to see if they can catch people, doing something they shouldn't. Response to Question 4: One half mile up stream, from Williams landing my husband and I have a cabin. We spend a lot of time, there watching the wild horses, deer and other things. He also still likes to fish. I would like, to see no changes. Stay as is Response to Question 5: They spend two much money on our parks and are supposed, to keep them looking beautiful the last time I was on Alley, it was far from it. The grass along the launch needed cutting. Beavers had cut down trees and they stayed there for ever, blocking the Side.	8/12/2009	No			MO	65588
3354	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. ENOUGH RULES ALREADY IN PLACE. I AM WORRIED ABOUT THE ECONOMIC IMPACT IF MORE RESTRICTIVE POLICIES ARE PUT IN PLACE. SO MANY ROADS HAVE BEEN CLOSED AND AREAS CLOSED OFF IT IS BECOMING A PARK FOR THE YOUNG & FIT. CHILDREN, SENIORS AND PHYSICALLY CHALLENGED ARE ALREADY LEFT OUT. THERE ARE BEAUTIFUL PLACES THEY CAN NO LONGER ENJOY.	8/12/2009	No			MO	65466
3355	Response to Question 2: Black River Black River Lodge Down to K Response to Question 4: Black River Black River Lodge down to K Response to Question 5: Expand St. Joe State Park for the ATV & 4x4	8/5/2009	No			MO	63129
3356	Response to Question 1: A. LIKE TO FLY FISH, AVOID OVERCROWDING, ABUSE, DESTRUCTION TO NATURE. ENJOY WILDLIFE & PRESERVE THE WAY IT WAS. Response to Question 2: PRESERVATION OF HABITAT LIMIT NOISE & POLLUTION FINE LITTERING, DESTRUCTION	8/5/2009	No			MO	63122

3357	Response to Question 1: No Action on A-B-C!! Please leave things alone. Response to Question 2: Horse back riding in conjunction with open river access. Response to Question 3: No more government controll!! Response to Question 4: Please leave things alone. Nature shall take care of itself. Response to Question 5: Each geographical location has its own special assets. There is no one mold for all of our rivers.	8/7/2009	No			MO	65466
3358	Response to Question 1: What's wrong with original mission: -conserve area/river & surround's -enjoy without impairing ENFORCE ORIGINAL PLAN AND SAVE THE Current & Jacks FORK RIVERS. WE ARE 50 YEAR FLOATERS AND SEE THE CHANGES BECAUSE OF LACK OF ENFORCEMENT Response to Question 2: 1) CURTAIL river access (no more than 20 on entire 134 miles) 2) END illegal use of motorized vehicles 3) Enforce terms of scenic/conservation easements 4) Regulate & limit horse access to gravel bars 5) Establish low horsepower limits on river Response to Question 3: 1) Allow for self-discovery NOT "managed" by park and/or commercial services (NO TO ALTERNATIVE B) 2) DO NOT provide more facilities that would increase public access (NO TO ALTERNATIVE C) Response to Question 4: DON'T "ZONE" rivers or we will lose beauty & natural aspects of them.	8/12/2009	No			MO	63132
3359	Response to Question 1: O Recommendno Action on present motor boat Horsepower The 40 horsepower at the pump is barely adequate to haul a party of 4 Response to Question 2: B. some of the old Farm sites if not all should be preserve like they started out a few years ago Response to Question 3: Any wilderness in the Ozark Scenic Riverway. The Ozark Scenic Riverways Area was to be a national Rereation area only Response to Question 4: Why not improve the log yard boat Access & Powdermill like those in other areas is this in any way a political matter Response to Question 5: I think each canoe should have the name of the Rental concessioner and a number, we should support more state water patrol	8/5/2009	No			MO	65715
3360	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Trophy BASS areas	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3361	Response to Question 1: No action: Keep HP rating 40 HP at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: No action love the whole river, leave it alone. Response to Question 5: Build boat ramps, camping hook ups, & dump stations, bathrooms, open old fields, and better road maintenance	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3362	Response to Question 1: Alternative "C" makes the most sense to us. 40 hp is the MAX needed on our river "Current"	8/5/2009	No			MO	63841
3363	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: 40 H.P. Rated at the Pump Response to Question 5: Floater education about River Safety	8/5/2009	No			MO	63601
3364	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: I personally use the whole river for fishing, floating and also boating. Response to Question 5: More trash dumpster's at the boat landings. Better maintained boat landings.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63629
3365	Response to Question 1: No-Action on Current River or Jack's Fork River. Response to Question 2: Rymers to Bay Creek 25 HP Seasonal Response to Question 3: Alt A-B-C (Current River & Jacks fork) Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no-Limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63825
3366	Response to Question 1: I am in favor of alternative A Response to Question 2: I feel emphasis shoold be on the original objective in establishing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am a local person and am not in favor of how other local people are opposed - to the Park service. They act as if they own the area, forget it is national, and are generall misinformed. Response to Question 3: Less ATV and Horse trail use. Response to Question 4: Big Spring Behavior of canoeiste in the Van Buren Area. I don't like Jet Boats, or personal watercraft or alcohol on the river Response to Question 5: More publicity in local publications to educate local people why preservation is important, and what harms the riverways.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65588
3367	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION! Response to Question 2: The NO-ACTION preliminary alternative. Response to Question 3: I strongly oppose alternatives A, B & C. Response to Question 4: I am concerned about the local people no longer being able to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways by limiting jet boat motor use. Response to Question 5: My suggestion is to not change anything or expand the use of closed roads and do not limit the horsepower of jet boat motors below two-Rivers.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3368	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: All - No Action - No Road Closing Response to Question 5: No Road Closings - No Horse Power Restrictions	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3369	Response to Question 1: No action: keep HP rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No action. Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: No action love the whole river, leave it alone. Response to Question 5: Build boat ramps, camping hook ups, & dump stations, bathrooms, open old fields, and better road maintenance	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638

3370	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63654
3371	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: B) the old famr sites Response to Question 4: motor boat access at the log yard and other river accesses Response to Question 5: Canoe should have a number and the name of the Rental concessioner. Also water patrol should be supported.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3372	Response to Question 1: I have read the alternatives and prefer the No-Action. It reads as the most protective and at the same time less restrictive-especially to the local residents. I have no modifications to suggest for the No-Action alternative; I believe it is sufficient. Response to Question 2: continued freedom of use of motorized johnboats with no further restriction of HP (no less than 40) continued access to cemeteries, no additional road closures Response to Question 3: restricting horsepower of boats to less than 40 HP, closure of anymore areas to motorized boats, designation of any part of ONSR as wilderness Response to Question 4: I will not focus on one area, just that I support a combination of developed and resource-based recreation in the land-based mngmt. zones and only the mixed use in the river-based management zones. Response to Question 5: I feel that consideration & respect for the wishes of the local residents should be important since the majority of the time it is they who make use of the ONSR. They are very interested & participate in keeping the riverways clean and protected since it's their home area. All of us who've grown up here appreciate its beauty and want to be able to continue using it as we have. Thank you.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63941
3373	Response to Question 1: No change in horsepower regulations. Horsepower ratings should stay at 40 hp at the jet pump. Response to Question 3: Any wilderness areas in the ONSR. The ONSR was to be a National Recreation area only. Response to Question 5: More Missouri State water Patrol	8/4/2009	No			MO	63621
3374	Response to Question 1: No changes in HP regulations Response to Question 2: preserve some of the old farms along the River Response to Question 3: No wilderness areas Response to Question 4: numbers and names on canoes of the Rental concessioner on All Canoes. Response to Question 5: More water patrol, conservation & Park Service on the water.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63620
3375	Response to Question 1: No change on horsepower regulations. Horsepower rating should stay 40 hp at the Jet Pump. Response to Question 5: Should be more State Water Patrol	8/4/2009	No			MO	63957
3376	Response to Question 1: No action on horsepower regulations. Ratings should stay at 40 hp at the jet pump. Response to Question 2: Some of the old farm sites should be restored to how they were 40 years ago. Response to Question 3: any wilderness areas in the ONSR should not be included. Response to Question 4: Improve boat access at logyard and powdermill.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
3377	Response to Question 1: No change in horsepower regulations. Horsepower rating stays at 40 hp at the Jet pump. Response to Question 3: ANY Wilderness areas in the ONSR area. Response to Question 5: More Missouri State Waterpatrol	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3378	Response to Question 1: No action - It could be modified so there are more river access areas for all kinds of river traffic Response to Question 2: More rest rooms, camping areas and access areas. Consider local residents as well as tourists Response to Question 3: Leave it the way it is basically as it is and remember local folks like the river or we wouldn't live here. Its not just for tourists Response to Question 4: From Blue Spring to the 2 mile limit out side of Van Buren. Clean up more hazards in the Water Response to Question 5: Clean out some root wads & dangerous debris in the water - if you want to make it safe. Thats not hurting the beauty	8/4/2009	No			MO	63965
3379	Response to Question 1: No Action We can't stand Revenue loss!!	8/4/2009	No			MO	63965
3380	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horse Power Jet Pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, &, C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to the Arkansas Line. I like to fish, swim, camp, or spend time with family Response to Question 5: Boat Ramps, Cleaner Bathrooms, Better Roads to the River, cleaner camping areas	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3381	Response to Question 1: No Action plan works After changing hp limit to 40 it has been to my best knowledge to be safe Response to Question 2: No Action Plan Response to Question 3: Option A, B, & C Response to Question 4: From Powdermill up Two Rivers Response to Question 5: More trashcans and bathroom sites	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3382	Response to Question 1: No-Action More trails/No Horse Power change for the boat motors Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, C Response to Question 4: Power Mile - To - Round Springs Response to Question 5: I hope they keep the 40 HP at the jets so I can get my family up & down the river safly.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3383	Response to Question 1: No-Action/Keep 40 HP at the jet for boats Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative a, b, c Response to Question 4: Rocky to Round Springs. Response to Question 5: more roads more bathrooms Better Boat ramps Why are we getting another hp cut on the boats. We have gave up enough.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588

3384	Response to Question 1: No-Action Plan works the Best for me. 40 hp outboard motors works great on the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Response to Question 2: The No-Action Plan Response to Question 3: Option A, B, C, are all option's I don't agree with, that would work well Response to Question 4: The entire area is special to me. Response to Question 5: The Boaters too me are the peaceful people on river canoes & tubing people, for most part are out of control, so less of them make more since.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63945
3385	Response to Question 1: Plan A, definitely! Minimize/eliminate as much motorized activity as possible, minimize development and maximize the "Wild and Scenic"-ness of the area!!! NO ENGINES!!	6/8/2009	No			MO	63112
3386	Response to Question 1: I like Alternative A. But would not want to have to use a commercial operation for floating on overnight float trips. these are things I have enjoyed for over 40 years. Response to Question 2: A closing down illegally developed Roadways. Limit Horsepower on all sections of all of the Ozark National Waterways. NO MOTORS ABOVE ROUND SPRINGS Response to Question 3: I do not want to have to use commercial operators for any of my activities on the Riverways Response to Question 4: My Favorite areas are from Baptist Camp to Round Springs. Keep all motorized boats and vehicles out of these areas. Response to Question 5: Electric campsites @ Pulltite.	6/8/2009	No			IL	62260
3387	Response to Question 1: I think alternative A offers the best plans for protection of the current and its watershed. Response to Question 4: I have the most concerns about the upper current. I own a cabin on the current next to Montauk State Park. Response to Question 5: far to many beavers are destroying an excessive amount of large timber protecting the river banks. I recommend an extended beaver only trapping season.	6/8/2009	No			IL	62864-0017
3388	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: A-B & C are bad ideas Response to Question 5: get ride of horse power linets	7/8/2009	No			MO	63638
3389	Response to Question 1: The No-Action preliminary alternative is the closest of the four options to my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The only way I would modify it would be to include a provision removing all horsepower restrictions from Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 2: If the current horsepower limitations are continued, I strongly feel that a provision requiring horsepower measurements be taken at the jet pump rather than the block be included. This is necessary to allow boaters to safely navigate Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 3: I am strongly opposed to any further horsepower restrictions. Additionally, I am vehemently against making any section of Ozark National Scenic Riverways a non-motorized zone. Response to Question 4: The portion of Ozark National Scenic Riverways that is most special to me is the stretch of the river between Big Springs & Blue Springs. The No-Action alternative is the only alternative that begins to address this area adequately. The other alternatives are too restrictive in terms of motor boat usage, hunting, & floating. Response to Question 5: I believe the National Park Service needs to respect local traditions & local abilities more when it comes to strategies or approaches to Ozark National Scenic Riverways management. The vast majority of us in the local area have been raised on the rivers that make up the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. To us, the rivers represent economic lifeblood, family gatherings, time with friends, and enjoyment of our cultural heritage. We are the best stewards of our rivers. We have a vested interest in maintaining them properly. Please keep this in mind when making any decisions about our rivers!	7/8/2009	No			MO	63638
3390	Response to Question 1: No action Horse Power at the propeller & not the engine Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A.B.C Response to Question 4: Round Springs through the Arkansas line. I like to fish & swim & camp & have fun Response to Question 5: Boat Ramps, cleaner bathroom, better road to drive on to the river. Cleaner camping areas	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3391	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 H.P. Rate At Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: With family you Need No less than 40 H.P. at the pump Response to Question 4: Just like it is No No Action Response to Question 5: more Road access	7/8/2009	No			MO	64119
3392	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 HP at the Jet! Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A, b or c Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Anything that doesn't Take Away from us!	7/8/2009	No			MO	63664
3393	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 hp at Jet Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Anything that doesn't Take Away from us	7/8/2009	No			MO	63664
3394	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: TUBING, CANOEING, RAFTING, AND BOATING PARTIES ON THE RIVER Response to Question 4: THE NEW PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES DOES EFFECT ME AND THE PLACES I FISH AND ENJOY RECREATION SUCH AS CAMPING AND FLOATING. Response to Question 5: N/A	7/8/2009	No			MO	63937
3395	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: limiting boating, and horse power limits, accessing the parks land. Response to Question 4: All of it, I PAY taxes on all of it and should Be able to boat/float and hunt any portion of it	7/8/2009	No			MO	63965

3396	Response to Question 1: No Action H.P. Rate At the Jet pump. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Restrict Access to River, And And the boats with Any lest H.P. would be unsafe. Response to Question 4: It would be bad not to be Able to enjoy the River. And too do this with my family we need 40 H.P. At the pump. Response to Question 5: Better boat ramp's	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3397	Response to Question 1: No-Action - Because a family of 4 or 5 can not easi travel or use very many miles of the 40 hp. area as it is because of weight & fuel. It would really limit the fishing because of weight & extra time & fuel involved in running back to your landing, if you have floated & fished down stream all day. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Gooseneck to 17 Hwy. & Montawk. No-Action - Because I can avoid congestion on holidays when using a boat, and when using a canoe on the upper ends of Current & Jacks fork I have never noticed boat traffic being a problem. Response to Question 5: No-Action There is enforcement employed federal & state. Just enforce the laws & rules there is to keep problems down. I also feel that casualties will go up with less boat traffic around to help people	7/8/2009	No			MO	63937
3398	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3399	Response to Question 1: Leave HP on motors Alone. 40 HP AT The Pump Response to Question 3: No Wilderness Areas Response to Question 5: More uniforms patrolling the river	8/4/2009	No			MO	63636
3400	Response to Question 1: No changes in horsepower Regulations. Any motor boats abouve big springs to Round Springs should be rated 40 HP At the Jet pump Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All motor restrictions	8/4/2009	No			MO	63654
3401	Response to Question 1: Do not change the horsepower regulations. Keep them @ 40 HP at the jet pump Response to Question 2: None should be included. Leave everything alone Response to Question 5: We need more water patrol, park service, conservation on the river. That would take care of a lot of problems.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63650
3402	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 2: Higher water quality Response to Question 3: Limit the amount of horse usage of the area.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63031
3403	Response to Question 1: I would favor option A, which will return the River Area to a more Natural State Response to Question 2: -Limiting horse impact on Rivers -Restricting Access points on River Water quality given a priority Response to Question 3: -Limiting recreation that has an Adverse impact on the environment - Access horse traffic, ATVs Response to Question 4: upper current should be Addressed because its small and Adverse impacts have a great impact Response to Question 5: -enhancing water quality to maintain and expand trout fishing	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3404	Response to Question 1: A - Best for the streams Response to Question 2: Anything that helps to maintain the water quality and the TROUT! Response to Question 3: Hores in the streams ATV in the stream do not belong in the Trout Water Response to Question 4: All Trout Waters - control Access to all, but Fisherman Response to Question 5: see #4	8/5/2009	No			MO	63131
3405	Response to Question 1: Alt A is best option The smaller the River the less traffic it can take without damage The upper current And All of Jacks Fork Are in Need of increased protection Response to Question 2: --Reduced commercial float traffic in upper Rivers --Prohibition of motor boats in upper River --limitation of hourse impact Response to Question 3: --increased development --ATV usage --increased or present levels of hourse traffic Response to Question 4: My biggest concern is the Jack Fork River And the upper Current River.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63011
3406	Response to Question 1: "A" Preserve our streams - that means no horse poop, engine fuel & tire tread. Response to Question 2: Preserve our natural habitat. Response to Question 3: New access areas. Response to Question 4: Tan Vat Response to Question 5: Stress keeping our streams clean & release the fish back into the water.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63119
3407	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: The No Action Alternative Response to Question 3: You need to Rate the Horse Power at The OUTPUT Shaft Response to Question 4: Eminence to Two Rivers on Jacks Fork Round Spring to Log Yard on the Current Response to Question 5: Let the Rangers be seen on the River Leave the river access's alone don't try to shut them down Free Comping in Primitive areas	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3408	Response to Question 1: No Action - Leave it alone.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63965
3409	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: alternatives a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			FL	33919

3410	Response to Question 1: No Action or Unlimited Horse Power	8/5/2009	No			MO	63601
3411	Did not response to any questions.	7/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3412	Response to Question 1: A. No gasoline powered motors from North Boundary to Van Buren. Electric motors (i.e. trolling) but with horsepower limits would be acceptable. Response to Question 2: Restrict horses from crossing river. Restrict ATV/motorcycle/motor vehicles from riding in the river and along gravel bars. On duty law enforcement & rescue boats/vehicles would be the exception. Response to Question 3: C Response to Question 4: North Boundary - Van Buren Prongs - to - Eminence I no longer float below Eminence due to horse pollution. Response to Question 5: Maintain communication with State Park Services so that enforcement of laws are consistent. Educate visitors & local public as to why the changes are being made. Educate & encourage enforcement officers to be patient during the transition.	7/30/2009	No			MO	65203
3413	Response to Question 1: Definitely plan "A"! Block all of the illegal access roads and trails. Enforce existing laws concerning motorized "recreational" vehicles. Response to Question 2: As per above. Move the preposterous horse camps away from the watershed! Response to Question 3: No-Action, B or C. Response to Question 4: Jack's Fork - From "PRONGS" TO EMINENCE. NO . . . TO VAN BUREN! Response to Question 5: CLOSE THE ILLEGAL ACCESS POINTS THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE SYSTEM AND BAN ALL HORSES, MOTOR BOATS (ALL MOTORIZED VEHICLES) AND GET THE DAMN HORSES (OOOPS - BEING REDUNDANT - SORRY)!	7/30/2009	No			MO	64131
3414	Response to Question 1: A is closest, but I would go further and eliminate motorized boat travel. Response to Question 2: I think Wilderness considerations should figure strongly in management. Response to Question 3: Motorized boat travel. I personally do not horse back ride but I think horse travel can be accomodated if managed properly - it is traditional, after all. Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Jack's Fork has some of the nicest scenery & best camping gravel bars. However, jet boat traffic detracts greatly. Sometimes 8 or more jet boats congregate in one spot, reving engines & joy riding up & down the stream. Response to Question 5: Close down road accesses. Almost every gravel bar seems to have a road access.	7/30/2009	No			MO	63301
3415	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A+B-C Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Spring no-limit	8/5/2009	No			FL	33991
3416	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: alternatives A-B-C Response to Question 5: Southern Edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no-Limit!	8/5/2009	No			FL	33991
3417	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate horsepower at the Jet pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: To many extreme changes Response to Question 4: All of them Response to Question 5: more and better access to river	7/8/2009	No			MO	65438
3418	Response to Question 1: No-Action 40 hp. At the pump Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: all Response to Question 4: Log yard	7/8/2009	No			MO	63665
3419	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 hp. rated at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: lower HP creates safety hazards when running under a load Response to Question 4: all the river should be treated the same and all the people (canoers & boaters) should all be the same. Response to Question 5: enforce the laws and don't play favorites crack down on trash and drug & alchol abuse.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63633
3420	Response to Question 1: No-Action *Keep Road open so I can get to my favorite recreation site. *Keep 40 HP at the jet boat motors. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Every where. Response to Question 5: *Better Roads *Better Boat Ramps *More Trails.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3421	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the Horsepower at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives, A, B, C Response to Question 4: we use all of the River, for Giggling and fishing. Response to Question 5: Open the primitive camp grounds Back up, maintain Boat Ramps Better.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3422	Response to Question 1: No Action, you should rate the horse power at the pump not the engine!!! Response to Question 2: No action. Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I travel the river 3 or 4 times a week and I want a boat quick enough to get me to Point A to Point B without taking all day. Response to Question 5: I want to see more boat ramps, more improvement on roads to the river. all trash cleaned and bathrooms with toilets that wipe your own ass.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63016
3423	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives AB & C Response to Question 4: We do not own a boat but we enjoy going with our family if they ban boats we will have no reason to go. Response to Question 5: More bathroom Access	7/8/2009	No			MO	63633

3424	Response to Question 1: No Action keep the 40 hp limit Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A B C Response to Question 4: No Action is the best for all the Scenic Riverways For 20 years I've been on the river and never had any problems. I feel it will take away a lot of revenue Response to Question 5: Improve the roads, ramps, and campsites	7/8/2009	No			MO	63633
3425	Response to Question 1: Keep horsepower rating at 40 hp at the jet pump. Do not change horsepower regulations.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
3426	Response to Question 1: No change in horse-power regulations. Rating stays 40 HP at the pump.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
3427	Response to Question 1: Leave the HP at 40 HP at the pump Response to Question 3: I don't want any wilderness areas Response to Question 5: Put more uniform's out on the river	8/4/2009	No			MO	63620
3428	Response to Question 1: LEAVE THE HP @ 40 HP AT THE PUMP Response to Question 2: B. Preserving some/All of the old farms that were along the river Response to Question 3: 0 WILDERNESS AREAS IN ONSR Response to Question 4: BETTER BOAT ACCESS @ LOG YARD & Powdermill Response to Question 5: We Need More Park SERVICE, WATER PATROL & CONSERVATION Agents on River. Hefty fines for drunkenness, Littering Would Take care of A lot of problems	8/4/2009	No			MO	63620
3429	Response to Question 1: Horsepower rating stays 40 HP at the jet pump. No change in horsepower regulations.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
3430	Response to Question 1: No Action, I would have unrestricted recreational usage and access to riverways. Response to Question 2: I feel the river ways should be unrestricted usage and access. Response to Question 3: I feel the national riverways should not be restricted recreational usage and access. Response to Question 4: We enjoy floating, swimming, and the horse trails on the National Riverways. A special place for my family is the Shawnee trail. It is a beautiful ride and we love seeing the wild horses. The Shawnee is clean and easy access, although it would be nice to camp with the horses closer to the rivwer. Response to Question 5: I believe there should be more resources for recreationist.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65438
3431	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action - Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Leave Every Thing Alone. Response to Question 5: 40 HRS to Lower Unit allowed on the rivers	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3432	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp. To the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	64870
3433	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Preserve old homesteads & clean up. Response to Question 3: Any wilderness in the Ozark Scenic Riverway area. Response to Question 4: Inprove log yard access & Powder mill. Response to Question 5: Each person on river or campground clean up all their own trash. use only proper toilet facilities.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65588
3434	Response to Question 1: A BECAUSE I LIKE CLEAN CLEAR WATER Response to Question 2: THE PARK NEED TO CONTROL USE OF PARK	8/5/2009	No			IL	62221
3435	Response to Question 1: A IS BEST - OKAY AS IS! OVERUSE WITH ATV's & HORSES IS A PROBLEM Response to Question 2: PLAN A IS A BENCHMARK FOR THE FUTURE Response to Question 3: AS Response to Question 4: JACKSFORK SMALLMOUTH CURRENT RIVER TROUT Response to Question 5: WE NEED TO PROTECT THE STREAMS FROM ATV's, HORSES & BOATS WITH MOTORS	8/5/2009	No			MO	63038
3436	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 3: Horses, RVs, Motor boats	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3437	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It should be rated at the output shaft Response to Question 4: Area from Alley springs to Powder Mill. Response to Question 5: More public river accesses. Free recreational activities to everyone	8/4/2009	No			MO	65775
3438	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp. To the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	64870

3439	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: I have A Boat and Enjoy fishing on the rivers Response to Question 4: LEAVE it Alone. Response to Question 5: Their is Enough Room for Everyone. Curious goes A long way for both parties	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3440	Response to Question 1: No Action on either Current or Jacks Fork River Response to Question 2: There should be no change in the future Response to Question 3: None of the alternatives should be included in the future. Response to Question 4: None of the alternatives are suitable. Giging Season should go back to October 15th. Response to Question 5: Reopen closed roads. People should be alowed to stay at least 3 wks in the same place. Fees for camping should be less or none.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65588
3441	Response to Question 1: No- Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Alternatives are not fully addressed Response to Question 5: Locals should be enlisted to Manage Area	8/5/2009	No			IL	62237
3442	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Road Closeing Response to Question 5: 40 Horse Lower unit	8/5/2009	No			MO	65548
3443	Response to Question 1: OPTION A - I WOULD MODIFY IT BY LIMITING POWER BOAT MAXIMUM VELOCITIES TO 5 MPH. Response to Question 2: A) LIMIT HORSE POWER & DO NOT ALLOW FAST SPEEDS B) CURTAIL THE HOURSSES. I HAVE BEEN FORCED TO CAMP ON GAVEL BARS THAT SMELLED OF HORSE URIN AND WAISTE. THEY ARE OUT OF CONTROL C) NO ATV's Response to Question 3: ANY THAT ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS, ACCESS POINTS SHOULD BE REDOCED Response to Question 4: ALL 134 MILES IS IMPORTANT TO ME, HOWEVER I SELDOM FREQUENT THE LOWER SECTIONS BECAUSE THE PARK SERVICE DOES NOT ENFORCE HP LIMITS. Response to Question 5: STOP THE DRUNKENESS, STOP ATV's, STOP HORSES, STOP SPEED BOATS.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63122
3444	Response to Question 1: No-Action. I feel that the rivers should be free to public use. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: I do Not think the alternatives are fully addressed. Response to Question 5: Locals that know the River and fished, swam & canoed on it for years should been enlisted to manage areas.	8/5/2009	No			IL	62237
3445	Response to Question 1: N/A Response to Question 4: No raod closing. Response to Question 5: 40 horse at lower unit	8/5/2009	No			MO	65548
3446	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: alterative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no Limit	8/5/2009	No			NY	11758
3447	Response to Question 1: Keep HP AT 40 HP AT THE PUMP DO NOT CHANGE ANY HP REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: 0 wilderness AREAS Response to Question 5: More uniforms patrolling River	8/4/2009	No			MO	65650
3448	Response to Question 1: Leave all Horsepower Regulations Alone. Motors from Big Springs to Round Spring ARE TO BE Rated 40 HP AT THE PUMP Response to Question 3: I dont WANT ANY Wilderness Areas in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Response to Question 4: Improve boat ramps (access) Response to Question 5: More patrolling on River	8/4/2009	No			MO	63654
3449	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: alternatives a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no Limit	8/5/2009	No			FL	33919
3450	Response to Question 1: No-Action is my idea of the best way to manage the public land owned by the taxpayers and managed by NPS. Response to Question 2: I feel the 40 hp limit currently in place from Van Buren to Big Spring should be made to unlimited. Horsepower has nothing to do with safety or the environment. Stupid people can be found in all types of boats, tubes, canoes, etc. Response to Question 3: The horsepower limits should not be included. Bad idea!!! Response to Question 4: All of the river is equally importan, however I use the lower section (south of Big Spring) more. Response to Question 5: Yes, I can name some ideas. My #1 concern is littering the river. Nearly all littering comes from floaters that do not respect the river or other river users. Fines should be increased by at least 1000%, plus outfitters should be held responsible.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63935
3451	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: Two River to the Northern Edge of the Van Buren Gap Response to Question 4: Two Rivers to Goose Neck Response to Question 5: Need to open more trails to ATVs More Concrete Access Points Open Exposure of Water Patrol on the River	8/5/2009	No			MO	63052
3452	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the horse power at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: We use the whole river, From Boating, fishing & floating. I would like to see more river clean ups I worry about stuff in the river that can hurt my kids & the wild life. Response to Question 5: Better roads more boat aces to River Cleaner & more bathrooms	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629

3453	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-action Response to Question 4: Every single mile Response to Question 5: less government involvement	7/28/2009	No			MO	63901
3454	Response to Question 1: No Action Keep horsepower rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	63640
3455	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: No Action	7/28/2009	No			MO	63601
3456	Response to Question 1: No Action. The Traffic will regulate itself, If it gets To Conjested users will leave and come back at a different Time Response to Question 2: More Guide Service, however your Insurance Mandates Kill this possibility I would suggest that you all cover the Cost or Self Insur the Guides Response to Question 3: No wilderness Area, Period. No Limits on Outboard Motor use Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Gooseneck (NAWS) 40 HP or Larger Motors Canoes, Horseback Riding, Tubes, Swimming Ect Response to Question 5: Rate the horsepower at the pump Like the Manufacture Recomend	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
3457	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Horse Power Limet	7/28/2009	No			MO	63654
3458	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the horse power at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: we use the whole River from fishing, Boating & floating. We love spending time on the River. Response to Question 5: more boat acess to River Better Roads to get to the River More trash dumpsters.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3459	Response to Question 1: No Action Keep hp rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: No Action - Love the whole River LEAVE IT ALONE!!! Response to Question 5: build boat ramps, more camper hookups, more bathrooms more picnic areas, more maintinence in the boat ramps, picnic Areas, & camping areas	7/28/2009	No			MO	63901
3460	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 hp at the pump is the way it should still be Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: No Action Keep the entire river just as it is	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
3461	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: About Restrictions & LimitsResponse to Response to Question 4: Care About being able to use the Riverway @ Vanburen. Response to Question 5: Provide info; Dont hide in woods & spy to harass if you cant be on the rivers w/us & be upfront.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3462	Response to Question 1: No Action Start having more personel on the river to help people without harassing the users. Response to Question 2: More facilities and accesses without charging Response to Question 3: Any kind of restrictions past what is already in place. Changing any horse power restrictions on the river Response to Question 4: I access the river at diffrent times over it's entire length, even below the park. The only alternative is to not change anything and remove some of the restrictions that are now in place Response to Question 5: There should be demonstrations in the parks that show how the first settlers in the area lived. There should also be more boat access available and the riverway should work with the Conservation Dept. in a stocking program for fish.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3463	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action. The local people enjoy the river with their jet boats. It's their get away. Response to Question 4: Taking the river away from our local people, don't do Response to Question 5: The local & the tourist came work together and both enjoy the rivers	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3464	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action The way it is now the local people can emjoy the river with thier families with the jet boats. Response to Question 3: Taking the river away from local people (that pay the taxes here) all summer long is not fair to the people who live here. Response to Question 4: Yes Response to Question 5: Leave things the way they are. Local people and visitors can both enjoy the river the way it is.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3465	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: No park service involvment	7/28/2009	No			MO	65560
3466	Response to Question 1: "No Action" Rate H.P. at the Pump Response to Question 2: "No Action" Response to Question 3: ABC With a Family you need no less than 40 HP at the Pump Response to Question 4: I like Round Springs to Owls Ben Response to Question 5: more Road Access & Better Boat ramp at Rounds Springs	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3467	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the horse power at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: we use the whole river from Boating, fishing and floating. It very nice & Relaxing. Response to Question 5: More boat Access to River Better roads to the River more trash dumpster's	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629

3468	Response to Question 1: No Action I Am disabled Response to Question 5: 40 h.p. at output shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3469	Response to Question 1: Yes-No Action-I don't want there to be any restrictions in recreation areas in any way, shape or form. For years the locals have done fine taking care of the riverways and truly believe we will continue to do so. We are proud of what we have to offer. Response to Question 2: ONSR should be left as is. The locals work with the tourists to keep the areas clean and assist each other when the need arises. Response to Question 3: Rating of horsepower @ the powerhead on jet motors. It should be rated at the output shaft instead. Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Two Rivers - Our family goes there most weekends of the season to enjoy the camping and boating facilities. I want my kids & grandkids to be able to continue having a chance to go there without additional regulations and restrictions being imposed. Response to Question 5: Keep the local nature attractions open on weekends so that people can enjoy them. Provide more bathrooms in primitive camping areas. Quit blocking roads leading to primitive camping areas. Provide more demonstrations @ local parks.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3470	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION AT ALL. LEAVE THE RIVERS THE WAY THEY ARE PARK SERVICE CAN'T MAKE THE RIVER BETTER JUST ADD NEW RULES. HORSE POWER RATING SHOULD STAY THE SAME OR TAKE ALL LIMITS OFF HORSE POWER Response to Question 2: NONE I DON'T SEE ANY PROBLEM IN THE WAY THEY ARE RIVERS CLEAN WE GET ALONG WITH JET BOATS AND THEY HAVE HELPED US. HELP PICKING UP OUR STUFF WHEN WE TURN OVER. Response to Question 3: THEY ALL SHOULD NOT. HORSE POWER RATING SHOULD BE AT THE PUMP NOT POWER HEAD LEAVE THE PEOPLE ALONE Response to Question 4: FROM ROUND SPRINGS TO JERKTAIL GREAT FLOAT. I THINK WHEN FLOAT THE CURRENT RIVER YOU FEEL FREE IF ANY OF THESE ALTERNATIVES THAT FEELING WILL BE GONE THIS COUNTRY IS FREE THERE IS NO PROBLEM. PARK SERVICE JUST WANT TO TAKE MORE OF OUR FREEDOM. Response to Question 5: HAVE MORE BATHROOMS ON RIVER HAVE MORE DISPLAY BOAT MAKING SHOWING THE PAST WHEN PEOPLE WERE FREE DONT TAKE AWAY WHAT'S OUR'S MY KIDS LOVE THE RIVER LEAVE THE JET BOATER ALONE. WHEN FLOATING THE RIVER YOU NEVER SEE PARK SERVICE WHAT GOOD ARE THEY. THEY NEED TO GET OUT MORE	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3471	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more horsepower on boats	8/4/2009	No			MO	63146
3472	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3473	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3474	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION THERE IS ROOM FOR EVERY ONE TO ENJOY THE BEAUTY OF THE CURRENT AND JACKS FORK RIVERS. MY WAY TO MODIFY IT WOULD BE TO PUT PEOPLE IN CHARGE AT VAN BUREN THAT WOULD LET THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE LIVED HERE ALL THEIR LIVES ENJOY IT. Response to Question 2: TO LEAVE THE HP OF AN OUTBOARD MOTOR 40 HP AT THE PROP OR JET, AND TO STOP TRYING TO TAKE THE RIVER FROM THE LOCAL PEOPLE, AND TO KEEP THE PARK AND CAMP GROUNDS MOWED AND LOOKING LIKE A NATIONAL PARK SHOULD. Response to Question 3: LETING IT GO BACK TO THE WILD, TURNING IT INTO A WILDERNESS, TAKEING THE BOATS OFF THE RIVER. JUST LEAVE IT LIKE IT IS. Response to Question 4: THE WHOLE 134 MILES ARE SPECIAL TO ME. I GREW UP ALONG CURRENT RIVER AND IT MAKES ME SICK TO SEE SOME ONE COME IN HERE THAT KNOWS NOTHING ABOUT THE RIVER AND CHANGE IT TO SUIT THEM SELVES. Response to Question 5: JUST TRY TO GET ALONG WITH THE LOCAL PEOPLE. LET THE PEOPLE CAMP WITH OUT HIDING IN THE BRUSH SPYING ON THEM, LET THEM FISH, GIG FISH WHEN IN SEASON, BOAT WITH THEIR FAMILIES CANOE OR TUBE FLOAT. THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE AT O.N.S.R. THAT DO NOT WANY ANY PEOPLE ON THE RIVER AT ALL	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
3475	Response to Question 1: The No-Action alternative is closest to the best management of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. No-Action still needs modification though. All horsepower limits should be removed from both the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers as they were before the last GMP in the 1980's. The wilderness Area Proposal should be thrown away and left alone to be enjoyed as the people of Carter County, not the National Park Service see fit. Response to Question 2: I believe with No-Action, that the 3,400 acres below Big Spring should not be proposed as wilderness, and that no motor limit should govern the river between Big Spring and Gooseneck. Response to Question 3: No Horsepower limits should govern Jacks Fork or Current River. Years ago, my family and their friends ran whatever they wanted wherever they pleased because they had sense and capability of safely running the river with large motors, where they could be run without harm. The proposed land should not be made wilderness but managed in a way that Carter County Citizens feel right. Response to Question 4: I have grown up on the River between Paint Rock and Panther Springs. No alternatives address them adequately. You people want to talk about heritage. Mine isn't bringing in tourists and showing them what life was 80 years ago. My heritage is hunting, fishing, gigging, and running a boat on Current River without the Greenheads telling me I'm wrong. My heritage is the Current River and the stories told by old-timers to me, not stories about the old-timers. Response to Question 5: Don't sit in another state and say how to manage the resources here. Let us say how to manage them. Don't limit boat motors in any way & don't call some of the best land in the State of Missouri wilderness. Let us hunt it and let timber be managed in a smart way decided by	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965

	Peck Ranch Conservation, not National Park Service.						
3476	Response to Question 1: No Action//Rid campsite user fees/Reopen closed roads for better river access/Allow Taxpaying citizens who own ATVs equal rights & access, the same as horse owners. Response to Question 2: Increase public access/primitive camping access//Keep horses out of the river More Boat Speed Limits./Lower noise Level emissions Response to Question 3: No reservation crap/no user fee (we pay Taxes) no commercial blacktop campgrounds Response to Question 4: Circle B to below trail ride, clean up the sewage! Response to Question 5: Put patrol on the water in canoes undercover, instead of in the bushes, they will catch more idiots. Close the Mo. to Illinois Boarder, Problem Solved. Get Shannon County Road District to stop using Clay Mud gravel within certain distance of waterways	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
3477	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Too many laws & regulations that negatively impact OUR National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 4: I grew up fishing every stretch of current & Jack's Fork Rivers, from Alley to 2 Rivers and from Round Spring to Log Yard. These proposed actions will end all of that.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63703
3478	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: Leave out the closed wilderness Areas Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: More River Access - Use park rangers more in tourist friendly ways and less as law enforcement. Drug Charges are a minor problem and should be handled as such on the River	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3479	Response to Question 1: Yes - No Action - Please do not impose any restrictions in the recreation areas. Response to Question 2: ONSR should be left as is. The locals and tourists work together to keep the areas clean. Response to Question 3: Rating of horsepower at the powerhead on jet motors - they should be rated at the output shaft instead. Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Two Rivers - our family spends most weekends there enjoying the beauty and spending quality family time. Response to Question 5: Provide more bathrooms in the primitive camping areas. Quit blocking the roads leading to the primitive camping areas.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3480	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: From Blue Springs to Big Springs. Response to Question 5: No-Action People need to know they have to share the riverway just like we have to share the roadways. The river is not just for people with one interest.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63633
3481	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3482	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Leave it alone Response to Question 3: Any of it you mess with too much now. Response to Question 4: Our family has Roberts Field Named for our family who had our land forced off of our heritage.	7/1/2009	No			MT	63638
3483	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Leave it alone Response to Question 3: Any of it Leave it alone Response to Question 4: Roberts Field it is part of my family heritage that was taken from my future of my children	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3484	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 2: Park should be used for all Types of Recreation Response to Question 3: No Natural Area's Response to Question 4: All Area's free for use Response to Question 5: Enforce laws and let visitors come and use the Resource	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3485	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: HP Limits should not be imposed/changed to be STRICTER. Response to Question 5: ENFORCE THE LAWS ALREADY IN PLACE.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
3486	Response to Question 1: (No-Action) There is No Reason to Limit Hp on Boats when Tub's And Canoeing is where 90% of All Tickets Are issued. Response to Question 2: No Action is the only Alt. that is close to Anything that I would support. Response to Question 3: Hp Limits!! there is no data that supports a 25 HP motor is safer or Eco-Friendly than any other motor. Response to Question 4: From Waymeyer to Two Rivers that section of the River has no Tub's or Canoe Traffic. Response to Question 5: The River is a special place to all of us, the River is in as good as shape now as it was many years ago so why change anything	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
3487	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3488	Response to Question 1: No-Action, no limit on horse power Response to Question 2: Don't limit the use of parks Response to Question 3: limited use of park or anything in the NPS. Response to Question 4: ALL OF IT LEAVE IT ALONE	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588

3489	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: Do not change the way the horse power is rated. Rating at the power head instead of at the pump would make alot of boats already owened by the people ilegal costing people who own these boats thousands of dollars each. Response to Question 4: the entire Ozark National Scenic Riverwas is special to me. I think there are already more laws and regulations than needed whitout adding more.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
3490	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: do not limit access Response to Question 3: Limited access Response to Question 4: All of this country is special. Response to Question 5: You could keep the Roads open and Cut the brush instead of Letting it grow into a big heaping mess.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3491	Response to Question 1: No-Action I like going Four-wheeler riding, having access to the rivers, and going to the river Response to Question 2: unlimited usse & access. There should not be a limit on the horsepower of a boat. They should be able to use whatever horsepower they want. Response to Question 3: Limited use and access. Response to Question 4: not enough boat ramps. Response to Question 5: more river accessses to boaters	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3492	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: do not limit access Response to Question 3: do not change Response to Question 4: I do not have a special place The river should be left the way it is Response to Question 5: You could open more Road's and cut the Brush instead of Letting it grow into Thicket's	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3493	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: Do not close roads within our park areas Limiting access is a painful joke. Its been said there's nothing worse than an educated fool!! Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: A stress free access to our beautiful riverways. They are here to enjoy, over & over. Don't modernize - don't change our beautiful Ozarks Be kind to our beautiful wild horses too.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3494	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE "A" Response to Question 2: ALTERNATIVE "A" Response to Question 3: NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE Response to Question 4: THE WHOLE RIVER SYSTEM - "A" ANSERS THE PROBLEM. Response to Question 5: ALL THE THE THINGS MENTIONED THAT YOU LISTED IN YOUR NEWSLETTER THAT YOU'VE HEARD FROM PREVIOUS INPUT.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63941
3495	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Open up more Access to the Park and River!! Response to Question 3: Any Limits on use of Park or River. Response to Question 5: Put in more access points and concrete Boat Ramps!!!	7/1/2009	No			MO	63755-1671
3496	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Van Buren, Mo No of them Response to Question 5: Listen to the People that Live Here and use the River Daily. We Are Smarter than you think and make things work for the good.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
3497	Response to Question 1: Alternative C, but leave it unlimited from Big Springs to Goose Neck Response to Question 2: More primitive camping. Permanent boat ramps @ Pin Oak, Paint Rock & Big Tree campground. Response to Question 3: Wilderness designation.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
3498	Response to Question 1: No Action, No change, Nothing! The people who Actually live in this Area Are fine with that. But my question to you is why do you care? Response to Question 2: Don't try to confuse us country folk with your large words & proper grammar. just leave our boats, canoes, floaters, hunters, & fishers ALONE! Response to Question 3: Once again, nothing should be changed. NO ACTION!!! Response to Question 4: All of it. I was raised on it. My grandparents lived on it. I believe every place should stay like it is now. Keep trying to take our beloved river away piece by piece. Or here is a preliminary Alternative "D" - Don't like it? Don't look at it. Response to Question 5: I suggest a proper reason as to why this is even an issue. Inform us more! Erosion happens! Pollution is everywhere! You are all biology degree holders, eh? What is at the bottom of the river? Gravel! Since we are so concerned about the way our River runs we should probably tear down each & every bridge - that way our River can flow peacefully & fish can swim more easily in their own natural habital ???	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3499	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no aciton Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: ALL! Response to Question 5: nah	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3500	Response to Question 1: absolutely not even close to how I want the riverways managed. I am a proud boat owner and plan to keep it that way. With taht being said, A, B, or C Does not meet my needs. I choose NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: Well, preferably No Action! What's funny is that A, B, & C really don't explain themselves hmmm Response to Question 3: A, B, and C please Response to Question 4: ALL PLACES - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE Response to Question 5: People keeping the freedom they have on our river. It is fine and has been fine all along!	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3501	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on boats, bikes, floaters, campers, etc. Response to Question 4: Van Buren Community thrives on the River Response to Question 5: water safety patrol	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
3502	Response to Question 1: -No change- Response to Question 5: I think at times the safety is an issue. People drink and act in manners that are not appropriate.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63701

3503	Response to Question 1: No Action Remove Horsepower limits on Boats Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B & C Response to Question 4: We use all of Ozark National Scenic Riverways No Action Response to Question 5: No Action-	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3504	Response to Question 1: NO CHANGE Response to Question 5: MORE OF A WATER PATROL/RANGER PRESENCE TO ENFORCE THE LAWS IN PLACE. WOULD LOVE TO SEE A HIKE & BIKE TRAIL A LONG THE RIVER SO IT CAN BE ENJOYED ALL YEAR IN A DIFFERENT WAY.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3505	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Log Yard Up & Down Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3506	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No. Trashing of Non Accessable Camping Spots That Are Used By Canoers Only. Response to Question 5: It should be Open to everyone	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
3507	Response to Question 1: No Action needed Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Each bend holds its own unique beauty and character.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65456
3508	Response to Question 1: No action, motor restriction should be lifted. Response to Question 2: no, action Response to Question 3: alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: log yard above & below no action Response to Question 5: no action & lift all horsepower restriction	7/1/2009	No			MO	65566
3509	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: None Response to Question 5: No	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
3510	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No restrictions on horsepower Response to Question 3: The ones to Close roads & restrict recreation. Response to Question 4: They are all special. The local people should not get managed (pushed) out of our recreational activities in the area where we live.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
3511	Response to Question 1: No-Action, raise the horse power at the Jet pump Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: to many regulations Response to Question 4: it hard to say one place because I LOVE All of IT!!! Response to Question 5: Enforce the rules and regulations that we currently have	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3512	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: too many laws Response to Question 4: The river is one of the only times my family & friend get togethe. restricting areas & motor size	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3513	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restricted horse power, and river access	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3514	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. The legislation establishing ONSR says it is for recreation. Do not limit motorboats. Response to Question 3: Do not shut access points to rivers Do not close roads Do not limit motorboats. Response to Question 4: Lower current. No. Shuts Down horsepower. No need for that. Response to Question 5: encourage different user groups to work together.	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3515	Response to Question 1: A WITH A BIT OF B. CLOSING MOST OF THE RIVERSIDE TRAILS AND RESTRICTING HORSES FROM MOST TRAILS WILL ELIMINATE THE HORSE IN THE RIVER PROBLEM. NEW TRAILS TO HISTORIC & NATURAL SITES WOULD BE GOOD. THE BUFFALO NAT. R. DOES THIS WELL. THEY SEEM TO HAVE A BALLANCE OF ACTIVITIES THAT SUITES MOST PEOPLE. Response to Question 2: THE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTIONS MIGHT HELP ELIMINATE THE NOISE AND LIGHT POLUTION THAT COMES WITH THE LOCALS GIGGING OUTFITS THAT HAVE RUINED THE PEACE OF MANY AN EVENING CAMPOUT. AS A PADDLER I LOOK FORWARD TO THE SOUNDS OF NATURE, NOT A GENERATOR. Response to Question 3: MORE DEVELOPMENT - THESE AREAS ARE ALREADY ACCESSABLE. Response to Question 4: PLEASE KEEP THE UPPER JACKS FORK PRISTINE; IT IS OUR CROWN JEWEL. THE SAME FOR THE CURRANT; IF WE CAN KEEP MOST MOTORBOATS BELOW TWO RIVERS IT GETS MY VOTE. Response to Question 5: OUR PARKS ARE FOR EVERYONE. THE POWERBOATER'S AND HORSE PEOPLE SHOULD BE OFFERED OTHER AREAS WHERE THEY ARE WELCOME; NOT JUST TOLD TO GO AWAY. INDEED, WE HAVE ALOT OF LAND - PERHAPS DEVELOPE AREAS FOR THEM. ST. JOE ST. PARK KEEPS MANY ATV'S OUT OF THE BLACK R. AREA.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63116
3516	Response to Question 1: Leave the recreation for the people alone and do more cleaning of the areas you wish for people to enjoy that are under NPS now. Response to Question 2: Our rivers of JACks fork & Current river should be for recreation year around. No tour guides are needed for familys to enjoy their weekends together. Motor boats should be left alone because they also help the rescue of the canoests due to no water patrol or Rangers around. Response to Question 3: Our local parks have become a joke. for instance Alley Springs picnicing area. What elderly	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466

	folks that knew this area as a child beleave today its no longer a sight worth seeing. Nothing is the way it was in earlier years and you can't see the branch run because of srub trees nor can you relax and hear the water run. Response to Question 4: I feel all camping area's should be no charge to have a family outing to keep families close and enjoy our freedom. Alley Springs picnicing area is a disaster and not an enjoyable place anymore, due to the spring destortion. The creek is hidden by the srubbish trees you can't hear the water flow. Response to Question 5: Since 1951 there has been but 1 death on Jacks Fork or Current River. Water patrol gets paid salarys to water patrol no bank patrol put them on the rivers and do the job their paid to do and not horass the familys enjoying the day 40 hp motors should be noted at the bottom of the propellor shaft.						
3517	Response to Question 1: No Action is needed on Changes the thing should the park service needs to do is clean up whats already under your jurisdiction. Response to Question 2: No changes need to be to Add to your park lists. first need to repair whats allready distroyed Response to Question 3: Do not enlarge Any more release the charges for camping, leave the Boaters alone. Tourists don't acknoleage our beauty on the Rivers that we grew up with. Response to Question 4: Alley Springs its been distroyed and there are no reasons why it can't be restored back to its beauty that our heritage knew for many years. Response to Question 5: Visitors All ready know the tours provided Are fiction many have laughed at these ideas. All motors need 40 hp at the Jet.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65548
3518	Response to Question 1: Alternative A - emphasis on traditional, non-mechanized forms of recreation and activities that are quieter, less crowded and slower paced. I hate to say it but there shouldn't be 60 canoes being put in at one access at the same time - too many to separate out downstream. Like the Colo. River in the Grand Canyon - # of outfitters and/or people may have to be limited via reservations etc. Response to Question 2: Big Spring Wilderness - I really believe the fast Jet boats belong in a limited zone below Van Buren John Boats with small outboard motors could be allowed from Van Buren -2 rivers Mo is 97% Private - we need more wild country Response to Question 3: Alt C - "a lot of traditional commercial services" - its like converting a rural community into more of an urban community. TOO MANY PEOPLE - We need too start talking about the population growth in this country like we were doing in the 70's - We are the most populated Developed country in the world Response to Question 4: I think the upper river (Montauk to Round) should not see increasingly bigger campgrounds - protect the watershed - ANY OPPORTUNITY TO ADD MORE LAND SHOULD BE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF Response to Question 5: 1. Close "Homemade" accesses & those from Private inholdings. 2. ATV's don't belong anywhere near this river. 3. Horsetrails should be near the upper part of ridges and cross the river infrequently. Overnight with horses should be in Fenced off area away from the river - I tried to camp at Cedar Grove - Horse Dung from the night before covered the ground - Eminence is to big of a trail ride for the Jacks Fork - A river Ecosystem is a very biologically limited and sensitive corridor - there are Equestrian trails in state parks & Nat'l Forest - Riding in the rain really damages trails quickly	7/1/2009	No			MO	63701
3519	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do away with Horsepower limits	7/1/2009	No			MO	63648
3520	Response to Question 1: No Action But Restore the Old Law with No Horsse Power limits Anywhere on the River. Response to Question 2: No Action Please Shannon Reynolds Carter Depend on it for Economic Reasons and Recreation Response to Question 3: A B C out of the Question Response to Question 4: From 2 Rivers to Doniphan Please leave everybody Alone The Boaters, Canoers, tubes, ATV, Horses. Let People enjoy there own thing Response to Question 5: Please leave it Alone The people in these Areas will keep it clean. Because they love it and Appreciate more than Anybody	7/1/2009	No		Reynolds County County Commissioner	MO	63638
3521	Response to Question 1: No-Action 40 HP. Lower end Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action Why should the tax payers that live here have to sufer for the so called visitor that come to our riverway and act like that are some kind follos	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
3522	Response to Question 1: No Action. I think the way things are right now is pretty good, it just need a little fine tuning. All the other alterative are to much. If the managment would work this out with the locals we could solve it. I don't understand how people who don't ever live here or at least most of their lives can govern how it should be. Response to Question 2: More boat ramps, and camping spots, with out tourism and people buying things and gas to go too the river small towns and stores will all die off. they need this money to survive. Response to Question 3: I feel ther roads should not be shut off. they should be left alone. It is nice just to drive around thru the river bottoms. Keep people on the roads, but leave them open. Response to Question 4: All of my grandparents were born on the river. thats were my heritage is. I was raised on the river. It is all special to me. I know all the river from Montauk to Blue Springs. Response to Question 5: I think we need to concentrate more on the drinking and drugs. I don't drink and the people I hang around don't drink. We get along with the canoers and everybody just fine.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
3523	Response to Question 1: LEAVE IT ALONE!! Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: The whole River Response to Question 5: YES GET RID OF THE PARK SERIVCE AND GIVE LAND YOU STOLE BACK TO THE PEOPLE	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3524	Response to Question 1: Take no action. Don't want A-B-or C. Response to Question 2: No Action. Leave motor rated @ the pump-not the power head. Response to Question 3: A-B-& C. Response to Question 4: The whole Current River is special to me. Take no action! Response to Question 5: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3525	Response to Question 1: I think you should Back off and Let the people enjoy the River - To many Rules Response to Question 5: I Think you should Back off on the Management of the River and Let it take care of its self. The River has Been There Taking Care of it's Own problems alot longer than the Park Service Has Been in Business.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63625

3526	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: Roberts field was taken from my family and caused my Great Grandfather to die at an early age.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3527	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 3: Do not want to see any change.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63701
3528	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63701
3529	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: Limit the number of tubes on Saturday around the Van Buren area - Entirely too many!!!	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
3530	Response to Question 1: No-Action The Riverways should stay as they are Right now and well into the future. I think if you Restrict Horsepower on motors it would make parts of the River where you couldn't get ot oit. Since I like to fish this is very important to me. Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: Any Restrictions of motors on the River. Response to Question 4: I think all part of the River should be accesible to any person Because I Beleive the River belong to the people.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
3531	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horespower Restriction Response to Question 3: The right to camp and Boat on the river Response to Question 4: Current River all of it Response to Question 5: No change of Road closing & Receation	8/19/2009	No			MO	65466
3532	Response to Question 1: No action is ideal Response to Question 2: None - I prefer no action Response to Question 3: I feel strongly that no action is the best policy. Response to Question 4: All areas should remain under the no action plan Response to Question 5: No	8/5/2009	No			MO	65566
3533	Response to Question 1: No. The entire process has been unfairly done. No science exist to support your conclusions. It appears the Park Service included and solicited the preservationest comments not the local population. Response to Question 2: None. Start again and this time try to be understanding and willing to listen to the local population. Response to Question 3: All. They all exclude people. Response to Question 4: It is an important natural resource that is beautiful it entire length. Response to Question 5: Quit trying to police people out of the park, it is wrong.	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3534	Response to Question 1: No. All the Alternatives are more restrictive not less. There is no balance. Response to Question 2: None. No zones at all. zones will concentrate certain activities placing more people together in smaller areas creating more conflict. Response to Question 3: Zones. They pit user-groups againts each other. User groups sometimes need each other like when motor boats save canoers lives. Response to Question 4: The entire river is special and I have enjoyed most of it. Response to Question 5: Yes. The Park Service should return to earlier days when they tried to bring people into the parks and were people oriented. Today your motto is "People bad, Nature good," and all you try to do is kick people out.	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3535	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - THE RIVERS USE SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED, BUT MADE MORE ACCESSIBLE TO HUNTERS, CAMPERS, FISHERMEN, FLOATERS, ATV'ERS, FOUR WHEEL DRIVE INTHUIESTS, HORSE BACK RIDERS, AND ALL OTHER USERS. Response to Question 2: NO PART SHOULD BE CONSIDERED THAT LIMITS THE USE OF THE RIVERWAYS. WE DON'T WANT IT TO BE ANOTHER YELLOWSTONE PARK WHERE THE ONLY THINGS THAT HAVE UNLIMITED USE IS THE WILDLIFE AND THE HIKERS, A VERY LIMITED & ILETE GROUP. Response to Question 3: NO LIMITATIONS - THE FIRST THING WAS DONE WHEN THE FEDS TOOK OVER WAS TO REMOVE ALL THINGS THAT WERE USER FRIENDLY. EXAMPLE LIMITING CAMP SIGHTS, REMOVING STRUCTURES WHICH COULD ACCOMODATE PEOPLE USE. Response to Question 4: NO ACTION - AT LEAST NO ACTION THAT LIMITS ITS USE. I WAS FORTUNATE ENOUGH TO HAVE GROWN UP ON JACKS FORK. IT SADDENS ME BEYOND DESCRIPTION TO WATCH BOTTOM FIELDS TO GROW UP WITH TRASH (LOCUST, MULTIFLOWROSE, ETC)THAT PREVENTS THE RIVER FROM SLOWING DOWN & ADVERSELY CHANNELS THE RIVER WHICH PERMOTES EROSION OF THE RIVER BANKS & BOTTOM FIELDS AND THE DEPSIT OF MORE & MORE GRAVEL, WHICH NEEDS NO FURTHER ACUMULATION BUT REMOVAL. Response to Question 5: WHEN TAKEN THERE WERE PUBLIC & COUNTY ROADS, (TRAILS) IF YOU LIKE RAN ALONG THE RIVER FROM ONE END TO THE OTHER, WITH MANY, MANYACCESS ROADS TO THES ROAD. I CAN SEE THESE ROADS OPENED WITH HUNDREDS OF CAMPESITES POSSIBLE FOR USE BY ALL USER GROUPS. EXISTING PARK RANGERS COULD TRAVEL THESE ROADS, MONETORING ITS USE AND PROVIDING HELP TO THOSE WHO NEED IT. MAKE IT USER FRIENDLY, NOT USER UN-FRIENDLY, HAVE THE PHILOSOPHY OF HELPING USERS OUT WHILE IN SHANNON COUNTY AND NOT HELPING PEOPLE OUT OF SHANNON COUNTY	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3536	Response to Question 1: No. Over 100 years ago the white man drove the Indians off thier land just like you are trying to do to the Ozarkians today. Today as then you are squeezing them out with rules and zones and restrictions. If it was wrong then it is wrong now. Response to Question 2: None of the above. They are pushing the people native to this area off of and out of land that has historicly been thiers to use. Now thru restrictions and regulations you are excluding them. Response to Question 3: Why would anybody ever want more rules and regulations from	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown

	the government? Response to Question 4: This question like your "zones" tries to separate us like small Indian tribes so that we might be conquered and expelled one at a time. Response to Question 5: The fewer rangers I see the happier I am.						
3537	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Put on Idle	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3538	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: 40 hr power @ shaft.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65201
3539	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is closest to my ideals. My ideals do NOT include drunkenness, ATVs destroying the natural habitat, horses running around un-checked, or too many access points ruining prime camping sites. Response to Question 2: The amount of development must decrease in order to promote tranquility & the enjoyment of the natural world. Response to Question 3: Too many access points make camping on gravel bars impossible. ATV's disrupt the environment through sound pollution & un-needed paths. Response to Question 4: Gravel bars are a sacred place. With too many access points they cannot be enjoyed fully. Rivers are best enjoyed while floating or hiking around them while not disturbing the natural habitat as much as possible. Response to Question 5: The fact is that becoming overly intoxicated, riding ATVs, riding horses, and driving are not activities which need to be done on National Scenic Riverways. There are other places more fit for these activities while canoeing, camping & hiking are activities carried out in national scenic locations.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63122
3540	Response to Question 1: No Action: The Horse Power Limits should be lifted downstream of the Van Buren Gap. Having the River section with a 40 hp Limit Below the Gap to Big Spring has never made sense. Response to Question 2: The Land use Patterns shown on Alternative B is the Best Plan for the land use for the lands surrounding the River. However, the River use and the Access Points should Not change. Hunting Along the River is a tradition that should Remain Permitted. Response to Question 3: Further Restrictions on the river use should Not Be Included. The Proposed Changes in the Horse Power Limits And Horse Power Definitions are unfair to the users that Have made equipment Purchases Based on the current H.P. Regulations. Response to Question 4: Two Rivers to Van Buren - Holiday weekends are crazy. Law enforcement Needs to be increased on the River during the Summer holiday weekends. During the Holiday weekends, the vast Number of Park users impact the serenity of the River. However, Please Don't make Any Drastic changes in Regulations that affect the users at all other times of the year based on these congested weekends. Response to Question 5: The River is a Great smallmouth Bass Resource downstream of Two Rivers. This Resource should be managed as a Trophy SMB Management Area like other Areas managed by the MDC. I would like to see a slot limit Allowing the Public to harvest 11" to 13" fish (3 fish limit) and Protect Larger Fish to Grow to Trophy size. This would be Ideal from Two Rivers to the end of the Park.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63043
3541	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: No changes on motor HP should Be made Response to Question 4: Cedar Grove to Round Springs. Roads to the primitive camping areas should not be blocked off.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65560
3542	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Trees & gravel needs to be taken out of our rivers if you don't we won't have a river before long it will be like Logan creek the water will be under the gravel. Response to Question 3: Leave the boats alone the river water levels takes care of where the boats can run and teach people about the Jet Boats people don't understand. Response to Question 4: Open the road to Family Grave yards that's on the river like the BLAND's on current River. Leave the open roads open they are there for a reason. Response to Question 5: There needs to be more primitive camping for Family Camping as a group that means more than 6 people & two tents as many as wants as long as they're not causing trouble.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65588
3543	Response to Question 1: NONE Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: NONE Response to Question 5: 40 HORSE	8/4/2009	No			OR	Unknown
3544	Response to Question 1: No Action - Leave Hp rating 40 at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No Action! Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I like it all - No Action - Leave as is.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3545	Response to Question 1: (Absolutely No Action) (We Need 40 H.p. At the pump. Leave power Head at 60 hp.) Response to Question 2: Neither of A, B or C. The NPS is Being Controlled By Radical Groups That want to shut off all Boating, when there Has Been "No" study on Motor Boats. Response to Question 3: No primitive zones & No wilderness zones at All. "This is a Recreation Area Not a park, Never was intended to Be a park" Response to Question 4: Current River is very special to me. "None of the alternatives to be put in place." No Action Response to Question 5: More Law enforcement, Take the Alcohol off the River. And the problems will Be solved.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3546	Response to Question 1: No action - add more access points to better disperse the people along the riverways whether it is in a boat or tube/canoe. Add visible law enforcement to the river ways to better control rowdy people. Response to Question 2: The addition of boat ramps, more resource based recreation opportunities Response to Question 3: Horsepower Limits the existing limits are functioning fine now. None of the Big Spring tract should be designated as a "wilderness" Response to Question 4: I don't think any of the suggested alternatives address the	8/5/2009	No			MO	63941

	congestion of the lower current near wameyer. There should be a tighter restriction on amount of tubes/canoes are allowed in an area at any one time. Response to Question 5: Visible Law enforcement on the river they should make themselves seen instead of always hiding in the brush. Try to improve existing access points so that people have more choices of places to enjoy the river.						
3547	Response to Question 1: No Action or go to Unlimited Horse power.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3548	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: Open more camping ground clean path way's around Round Spring . Alley cut out poisen Ivy-Oak	8/5/2009	No			MO	63630
3549	Response to Question 1: No Action Resources Available provide more Resources to present recreationists. Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & Access Leave it as it is Now. Don't close any River Road Access - ambulances may need to save people that are hurt. Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & access Response to Question 4: re-open all old campsites and current, Jacks fork; river. Place outside Restrooms on trailers, so you can move them During flood stages Response to Question 5: Moter Boats save hundreds of Lives Every year. Mo. State Water Patrol Every Year have 9th Grade training for Boats. What does Fed. Park Service Have to offer canoe, & tube safty. 40 Hp. at the out put shaft.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3550	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Alternatives are not addressed Adequately. Response to Question 5: Locals know their Area & Environment and should be enlisted to control & manage It.	8/5/2009	No			IL	62801
3551	Response to Question 1: I would accept only A. I strongly oppose B & C. Response to Question 2: Prohibit Power Boats above two Rivers. the river is just too small for the noise & wakes of Power Boats. Require horse trails to be located away from the river and reduce the number of roads and access points. Prohibit ATV's. Response to Question 3: Include all of Alternative A Response to Question 4: I hope the Big Springs area is declaired a Wilderness! Response to Question 5: control the number of floaters by starting a permit system! Employ more Rangers and Police to enforce the rules.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63129
3552	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION!! IT IF'S NOT BROKE DON'T FIX IT! Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: LIMITING HORSEPOWER ON BOATS. THE EXISTING 40 HP IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE Response to Question 4: VAN BUREN AREA	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3553	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave all Access point open Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 HP. to out-put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3554	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave us Alone down here, we are happy with what we have. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Mo State Water Pat. Has training for 9th Graders what does N.P.S. offer to caneoers, tubers Response to Question 5: No Action 40 HP. to out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3555	Response to Question 1: No action leave as is Leave 40 HP rating at the pump (Not at the power head) Response to Question 4: more water patrol. More checks for drugs and alcohol and reckless and/or lewd behavior for boaters and canoeists.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63640
3556	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: As a "boater," limiting the HORSEPOWER of our outboards below 40 HP would extremely limit my ability to use OUR river. With a family of 5 anything under what is allowed now would not be SAFE and would be completely inadequate. Response to Question 4: I mainly use the river from GOOSENECK to LOGYARD. Changing the regulations (40 HP) that are in place now would completely change the way I use the river. NO-ACTION Response to Question 5: I would support additional patrolling of the river by the PARK SERVICE and other agencies during "peak season."	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3557	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave HP Rating 40 hp @ Pump for Boat motors Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Leave it alone - No Action.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3558	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave the 40 hp at the pump NOT the powerhead Response to Question 3: None of A, B, or C Response to Question 5: local people use it more and have taken good care to keep it up - use local & county officials and water patrol	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3559	Response to Question 1: No action It does not harm the environement of the river by leaving things just as they are. Response to Question 2: Pull gravel from the rivers so they will quit filling in. Open all the previous closed roads. Leave the roadways open, leave the trails open for horses & atv's, and the river open just as it is Unlimited reacreational access and use Response to Question 3: Lowering engine sizes on any part of the river. Limiting recreational access and use Response to Question 4: The ability to camp, boat, canoe and horse back ride & atv's in all Areas of the National Scenic riverways. We use all portions of the riverways for all kinds of activities. Response to Question 5: Have the park rangers help	8/5/2009	No			MO	65438

	more people and harass them less. Having more access to the river and surrounding area for all users; horses, atv's, boats, hikers, etc.						
3560	Response to Question 1: no changes. Response to Question 3: definely no changes in motor sizes. If everyone uses common courtizy there would be no problems inforcement of current laws would help. Response to Question 4: at Hawes Campground (gooseneck) there should be a boat ramp built closer to the mouth of the old slough. to camp & fish a person must drive out of their way for miles to launch the boat. Response to Question 5: closing all the farm roads is a slap in the face to the residents who had to give up their land for this park.	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3561	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: Van Buren area No Response to Question 5: Better Inform floaters, canoers, of the dangers.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
3562	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: No-action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: Paint rock to Gooseneck No-action Response to Question 5: NA	8/5/2009	No			MO	63965
3563	Response to Question 1: No Action - 40 HP at pump 60 at Powerhead Response to Question 2: No Action None of Above Response to Question 3: No Wilderness - no Primitives I want it to be where my grandchildren & Great grandchildren can actually use the park not just look at pictures of it! Response to Question 5: Local users & county officials need to have more input	8/5/2009	No			MO	63621
3564	Response to Question 1: No Action/Keep the 40 HP at the Jet motor. Open up more road so I can get to my favorite recreation site. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: alternative A B C Response to Question 4: Log Yard to Round Springs Powder Mill Response to Question 5: Everybody can work together and keep the river clean & safe. It's sad to see the people that truely loves the river get's their rights, heritages pulled from them	8/5/2009	No			MO	63638
3565	Response to Question 1: Yes, Alternative A. Response to Question 2: Preservation of the ecology, water quality and sound land-stewardship practices. Response to Question 3: No horseback riding in the rivers, no ATV's in the rivers, limited motorboat usage on the riverways. Response to Question 4:All of them are special! Response to Question 5: Education. The more we can educate those who live near and use the riverways, the more they will want them protected and preserved.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65804
3566	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65501
3567	Did not respond to any of the questions.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3568	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: alternative a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no limit	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3569	Response to Question 1: I feel that the system we have in place works fine, so the No-Action plan is the best way. Response to Question 2: I think that the littering of our riverways should be STOPPED!!! Response to Question 3: I feel that the horsepower limits should be left alone. Motor boats are a way of life in this area and can actually be a great asset to floaters that get in trouble or get hurt. Response to Question 4: Every square inch of our riverways are important to me. And again they are already being taken care of. Don't "fix" what isn't broken!!! Response to Question 5: Once a year is simply not enough for the Stream-Team to be affective. We should go at least once a month to ensure that the litter is cleaned up adequately.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3570	Response to Question 1: No Actions Response to Question 2: I feel strongly that we should have the rights to use and have access to the riverways w/out limitations. Response to Question 4: I enjoy driving the scenic riverways roads & would like to have them left open. Response to Question 5: Be helpful in giving out info to tourists (floaters, boaters, etc.) Don't take away our heritage land that so many of us enjoy. Just because you dont like somethings that are done find a diffrent way to fix them; than punishing everyone for it. Thats not fair. This is historical & important to alot of ppl.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
3571	Response to Question 1: A Designated areas for horses away from rivers. Response to Question 2: Closing illegal roads and trails Response to Question 3: No Action & C Response to Question 4: Akers and up - no horses or motorboats! Response to Question 5: Keep horses from dumping in stream or close to it. Keep ATVs off current and Jack Fork	8/5/2009	No			MO	Unknown
3572	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 5: MAINTAIN PRISTINE WATERWAY - NO HORSES, MOTOR BOATS, ATV, ETC. WANT TO ENJOY WATER IN PRISTINE QUIET MANNER. ENJOY STREAM FISHING.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63017

3573	Response to Question 1: no-action on current river & Jacks Fork River Response to Question 2: no-action on current River Rymers to Bay Creek 25 HP Seasonal on Jack's Fork Response to Question 3: alternatives a-b-c for Current River and Jack's Forks River Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no-limit.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63825
3574	Response to Question 1: no-action Response to Question 2: no-action Response to Question 3: alternatives a-b-c Response to Question 5: Southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs no-limit.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63825
3575	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: LEAVE IT ALL THE WAY IT IS . . . Response to Question 5: NO MORE TRAIL RIDERS unless they are taught BY PAMPHLETS ABOUT BEING courteous to others.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3576	Response to Question 1: "A" Response to Question 2: Limit to the horse usage. Lower the horsepower on All boats & keep ATV's out of the River. Return to nature & more traditional forms of recreation Response to Question 4: Current River	8/5/2009	No			MO	63304
3577	Response to Question 1: A. Response to Question 2: RETURN TO TRADITIONAL USAGE. NON MECHANIZED RECREATION. REDUCE ACCESS. LIMIT HORSE USAGE Response to Question 4: CURRENT RIVER	8/5/2009	No			MO	63304
3578	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: A Response to Question 3: C Response to Question 4: The Current below Montauk. Sometimes but times are changing & the river is changing with them. Response to Question 5: Limit the development all these rivers	8/5/2009	No			MO	63119
3579	Response to Question 1: PLAN A a) 99 HP Limit b) NO HORSES, THERE IS PLENTY OF RIDING IN THE FOREST. PROTECT THE STREAMS FROM DAMAGE & POLLUTION. Response to Question 2: ALL Response to Question 3: SEE (1) Response to Question 4: UPPER CURRENT, YES IF YOU ELIMATE HORSES ENTIRELY.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63128
3580	Response to Question 1: A. You can't go back but you can preserve. Response to Question 2: close illegal roads & access. Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: upper current	8/5/2009	No			MO	63139
3581	Response to Question 1: No Action! Keep H.P. limits and areas as is.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3582	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Return river to natural & scenic conditin - recreation good as long as quality of river and surrounding area Response to Question 3: current or increased use of ATV/vehicles/motorized boats and horse use. No - off road vehicles or high hsp boats (trolling motors only if at all) No additional development or access! Response to Question 4: Big Springs area - highly recommend wilderness designation/overall water quality Response to Question 5: permitting system for horse & boaters (canoe/kyak) to allow activity without destroying quality of the rivers or experence on river no alcohol or boom boxes!	8/5/2009	No			MO	Unknown
3583	Response to Question 1: A - we need pristine, the springs and streams are being destroyed by over building! Get it back to what it use to be. Response to Question 2: The minimization of assess points. The elimnation of cabins. The elimination of horse & ATV traffic. Response to Question 3: No horse, no ATV's. Save nature. No Jet boats. Keep it pristine. Response to Question 4: The upper Current and lower Jacks Fork are in danger. Help!!! Response to Question 5: Look at the Buffalo river. It is controlled. You have lost control	8/5/2009	No			MO	63128
3584	Response to Question 1: A Limit access (but develop those) Get rid of horses, motors, RTVs. Enhance trails for hiking Response to Question 2: Reversal of over use! Response to Question 3: Horses, RTV's, motors Response to Question 4: Baptist Camp, Parker Ford, Tan Vat. A addresses most - get ride of horses, their feces is poluting the river Response to Question 5: Clean up the rivers, riparian zone, etc, to improve fishing - this will improve visitor experience Floating experience would imporve with cleaner rivers.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63021-5704
3585	Response to Question 1: "A" continue to maintain areas such as Baptist Camp Response to Question 2: Reduce Hp. of boats & or eliminate jet boating Keep Big Spring as Wilderness Designation Response to Question 3: "C" Response to Question 4: Upper Current - Montauk - trout areas on Meramec, Mill Creek. Response to Question 5: Eliminate 4 wheeling in streams	8/5/2009	No			MO	63021
3586	Response to Question 2: horse camping - camping with amenities - hookup for our trailer 30-50 Amp - metal stalls (or portable pens)for hores We put a lot of money in the economy & wants to use (carefully) our parks Response to Question 3: ATV's roaring around & dirt bikes on hiking & riding trails. The good riders are OK the bad riders endanger all of us. Response to Question 4: trail riders want to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverway just like the people who canoe or hike Response to Question 5: Keep including trail riders in this process. I'm 58, my mare is 27 we just want to walk the trails & enjoy this area partly because its close to home and partly for its beauty	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
3587	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All parts of A, B, C Response to Question 4: All Areas are special. No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638

3588	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 5: 40 hp. output shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3589	Response to Question 1: No-Action. There are enough restrictions as is. I'm on the river every weekend in the summer and sometimes in the fall, winter & spring I see no problems. Response to Question 2: No-Action is needed. Response to Question 3: No-Action is needed. Response to Question 4: All of the area is special to me. I especially enjoy boating on Current River between Williams Landing, all the way to Van Buren. I fish alot, me & my kids love it. I grew up on the River. Response to Question 5: If you believe there is such a problem that we need change than why don't I ever see Rangers on the River. No-Action is needed.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3590	Response to Question 1: No Actions Response to Question 2: I feel strongly that we should have the rights to use and have access to the riverways w/out limitations. Response to Question 4: I enjoy driving the scenic riverways roads & would like to have them left open. Response to Question 5: Be helpful in giving out info to tourists (floaters, boaters; etc.) Dont take away our heritage land. that so many of us enjoy. Just because you dont like somethings that are done find a diffrent way to fix them; than punishing everyone for it. Thats not fair. This is historical & important to alot of ppl.	8/5/2009	No			MO	63901
3591	Response to Question 1: No Action. Leave the boat motor regulations @ 40 HP At The pump Response to Question 3: No Wildernesss Areas Response to Question 4: My Dad has been taking me to the River in our Boat since I was 2 weeks old. I Don't Want Any Thing to Change. We Take care of & Love the river. Response to Question 5: We Need more uniforms on the river more often.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3592	Response to Question 1: Don't change horsepower regulations. Keep horsepower rating at 40 hp at the Jet Pump.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3593	Response to Question 1: Leave all Horsepower regulations Alone. All boat motors above Big Springs up to Round Springs stays at 40 Hp at the Pump. Response to Question 3: No wilderness area's in the ONSR Response to Question 4: Let us who use the river year round take care of it, we do any way. We keep it clean and pass on our love of the river to our kids and grand kids, who love it as much as we do. Response to Question 5: More water Patrol, more often, patrolling the River. Also more Park Service & conservation Agents.	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3594	Response to Question 1: No Action on present motor boat Horsepower Leave it at 40 at the pump Response to Question 3: No wilderness areas Response to Question 4: imporve boat access at Log yard Response to Question 5: canoes should have names & numbers of Rental concessioner. more uniforms on the River	8/4/2009	No			MO	63620
3595	Response to Question 1: Their should not be any change in horsepower Regulations, any motor boats above big spring to Round Spring should be Rated 40 HP at the Jet Pump No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3596	Response to Question 1: No-Action Don't change horsepower regulations. Leave horsepower rating at 40 hp at the JET PUMP!	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3597	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Leave all Access points open safty issues. Response to Question 5: 40 HP. to out put shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65466
3598	Response to Question 1: No action - 40 hp rating at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: We believe any alternatives other than "no change" are unnecessary! Response to Question 4: No action - Leave the river alone - we love it like it is!! Response to Question 5: Site improvements: Boat ramps, camping hook-ups, bathrooms, leave primitive areas alone	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3599	Response to Question 1: No-action leave the hp alone. The Boats don't hurt anything they help canoe people & pick up trash from Tubers & canoers. Response to Question 2: The Boats and all of the tax payers should be able to use the river, when and how they want. Response to Question 4: Schoolyard should have Electric and be charged to use it. Response to Question 5: Eduacate the canoe people & Tube people	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3600	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 4: The Log Yard to Twin Rivers. I would not like any changes made. Response to Question 5: I love going to the river and ride the boat with friends & family.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3601	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: The alternatives do not properly address them at all. I have lived on the Current River all my life & I enjoy all the areas alon the current as well as respect the river. We certainly do not see this with tourism. They trash the river & 75% of them are drunk 15 min p be ginning their float trip. So who should we turn the current to I think NPS has done enough. Response to Question 5: Instead of taking rights away from locals, hit the visitors. Limit the # of floaters per day & limit the amt. of alcohol if any they can take on a float trip. I feel very few visitors to the rivers in no way appreciate the beauty or respect it.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63965

3602	Response to Question 1: A is preffered basic alternative. NO MOTORS OVER 25 HP ANYWHERE ABOVE WAYMEYER NO BIKING ON TRAILS. HORSES ON DESIGNATED HARDENED TRAILS ONLY - BRIDGES ONLY CROSSING FOR HORSES. Response to Question 2: DESIGNATE BIG SPRING WILDERNESS Response to Question 3: DO NOT CREATE ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT MAY LEAD TO "IMPROVING" HWY 19 Response to Question 4: ACQUIRE PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS ON ALL PROPERTY WITHIN 1/2 MILE OF THE RIVER. Response to Question 5: GO TO A USER PERMIT SYSTEM AND PROTECT THE RESOURCE BY LIMITING USE WHILE RESTORING QUALITY TO THE USER EXPERIENCE. NEVER ALLOW MASS HORSE RIDES.	7/7/2009	No			AR	72701
3603	Response to Question 1: We sure Don't Need Any more Regulations As the Park Service Has Already Ruined Current River & Jack's Fork Response to Question 2: They Have Closed Roads, so the Handicapped Can't go Places They Like to go sometimes to where they was Borned Response to Question 3: Like the Flood in 1993 They Had All Local People People Helping Them. Using Their Motor Boats, Soon as Everything Response to Question 4: Get's Good They Try To Take Them Away From Them, Still When you want to make A Regulation, You go to Response to Question 5: St. Louis or Columbia For Your Supoprt When They Shound't have a say, it should Be Local People That has the Say	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3604	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Keep area pristine Response to Question 3: I do not want horseback RIDING, ATV's or motorboats	7/7/2009	No			MO	63119
3605	Response to Question 1: Alt. A Adding foot trails would be OK Response to Question 2: No motorboats or ATV's. No horse trails Response to Question 4: All of them are important	7/7/2009	No			MO	63119
3606	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: hp on boats Response to Question 4: Below Big Springs Response to Question 5: Restrictions on tubes & non motorized crafts	7/7/2009	No			MO	63965
3607	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 4: The Log Yard to Twin Rivers. I would not like any changes made. Response to Question 5: I love going to the River with friends and family and ride on the boat.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63633
3608	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 4: Log Yard to Two Rivers. I would not like to see any changes made. Response to Question 5: We take the boats and kids to the river every weekend and is something we all love to do together.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3609	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: The Logyard & Two Rivers Response to Question 4: Those places would be from the Loy Yard to Twin Rivers. I would not like any changes made in those places. Response to Question 5: I like to ride boats with friends & family.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3610	Response to Question 1: No action - 40 Hp. rating at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: We believe any alternatives other than "no change" are unncessary! Response to Question 4: No action - Leave the river alone - we love it like it is!! Response to Question 5: Site improvements: Boat ramps, camping hook-ups, bathrooms, leave primitive areas as is.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3611	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 4: The log yard. I dont want any changes made. Response to Question 5: I love going to the river with my family on the boat and everyone has alot of fun.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3612	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 4: The Log Yard to Twin Rivers. I don't want any changes made. Response to Question 5: I love going to the river and ride on the boat with friends and family.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63633
3613	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Keeping it clean and kid safe. No action Response to Question 3: The motor boat limit if so rate it at the pump Response to Question 4: Logyard to two Rivers Response to Question 5: I have to boats and alot of kids we would like to run the river a cannot push a load of kids and a cooler of food & drinks without a 40 hp Ive run this river since a child myself and love to get to do it with my kids	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3614	Response to Question 1: you shouldnt change anything wwwe pay taxes on this and should be able to use it dont change the hp. on boats and dont change where they can run. Response to Question 2: Educate the tubers and canoes about keeping the river clean, pick up there trash and leave the drugs at home Response to Question 3: the changes in the horse power just leave it as it is. Response to Question 4: the school yard/Log yard needs Electric and a boat ramp. The Eldrer people can camp. Response to Question 5: Seems like all the rangers always has new rigs to drive, they should use the money to up grade and add more camping sites	7/7/2009	No			MO	63645
3615	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No-Action Goose neck to Big Springs. Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63937

3616	Response to Question 1: (NO ACTION) Leave HP Limits as they are now. Especially above Two Rivers on the Current, and Jacks Fork Rivers. - Keep HP rated at the Jet Output as it is now. -If ANY change to the HP limits, increase them. Let the people run Bigger motors so that it is easier to get our families up and down the river. -The locals, the ones with Jet Boats, pick up not only their trash, but everyone elsses trash also. We always leave a place cleaner than we found it. -If the canoes from Two Rivers up think they may have conflict with the Jet Boaters, they should be required to go on the Jacks Fork River, where very few, if any Jet Boats run durring the Summer.-There are hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of Jet Boats in this area that will be usseless if NPS should lower HP limits. The Economy is bad enough the way it is already! Leave it alone. - Rangers are supposed to be here to Serve, and Protect. They should NOT be here just trying to find someone doing something wrong just so they can write a ticket. As far as I can see thats all they do. For example, a couple years ago, some good friends of mine, (An older couple) were camping at Two Rivers. Late one night a Ranger came sneaking from the woods, which scarred the lady causing her to trip and fall into the fire leaving a burn scar on her arm . . . -Jet Boaters have saved lives of several visitors on these rivers. I myself have saved a couple dirrerent people who were about to drown when I drove up on them in my Jet Boat. -Jet Boaters also help others gather there belongings when they get their canoe hung in a rootwad (which shoul'n't be there) causing them to turn over. -NPS should clean out the gravel, also let anyone take gravel because it is choking up the streams. -NPS shoul cut out trees and debris out of the streams, and or let anyone else cut it out. It not only looks better, but it lets water flow better not letting it get stopped up. -Leave access roads tha lead to the rivers open to the public. Open ALL the roads on NPS land back up that have already been closed.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
3617	Response to Question 1: PLAN "A" IS THE CLOSEST TO MY IDEAL PLAN. I WANT TO KEEP THE RIVER AS NATURAL AS POSSIBLE. CARE NEEDS TO BE USED IN CLOSING EXISTING ROADS AND TRAILS AS THE NEEDS OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY NEED TO BE CONSIDERED. Response to Question 2: REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THE USE OF MOTORS. LIMIT THE # OF PEOPLE ON THE RIVER @ ANY GIVEN TIME. PEOPLE CAUGHT LITTERING SHOULD HAVE TO DO PUBLIC SERVICE AND SPEND HOURS CLEANING UP THE RIVER. Response to Question 3: PROPER IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY PLAN IS CRUCIAL TO ITS SUCCESS. THE PARK SERVICE NEEDS TO TEACH AND BE PARTNERS AND BE CAREFUL NOT TO BE TOO HEAVY HANDED. Response to Question 4: THE UPPER JACK'S FORK (ABOVE ALLEY SPRING'S) NEEDS TO BE KEPT NATURAL, IT IS A TRUE TREASURE AND NEEDS TO STAY THIS WAY FOR GENERATIONS. Response to Question 5: SET UP PROGRAM'S THAT ALLOW VISITORS TO BE PART OF THE SOLUTION VS THE PROBLEM. I.E. . . . WHOEVER COLLECTS THE MOST TRASH ON A FLOAT GETS A FREE NIGHT CAMPING.	7/14/2009	No			IL	60189
3618	Response to Question 1: No Action. Remove motorboat horsepower restrictions and zones. Response to Question 2: Unrestricted Access and usage are important to this specially designated riverways because nature is to be experienced and enjoyed. Recreation in the beautiful Ozarks can help people appreciate nature. Response to Question 3: Restricted Access and Usage are not in agreement with recreationist protective enabling legislation. Response to Question 4: I want all roads and trails to be left open Response to Question 5: More visible Park Service employees who are not there to harass and ticket people, but to help and provide information. No hiding in the bushes nor spying on the Current River.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
3619	Response to Question 1: No action because there would be a smaller chance of losing existing priveleges. Use NPS Agents to control rude, dangerous, destructive, and illegal behavior. Response to Question 2: 1. Provide facilities such as boat ramps, restrooms, and camping areas that are beneficial to all users of the ONSR. 2. Increase the amount of NPS Agents to protect visitors and the environment. Response to Question 3: 1. Additional limits on horsepower for motorboats including limiting or rating horsepower at the powerhead. 2. No more wilderness areas. Response to Question 4: Current River from the Two Rivers area to the Log Yard areas. No action is the only plan that allows us to continue to use the river in the way we enjoy. Response to Question 5: 1. Keep horsepower regulations as they are! We recently purchased a new 40 HP Mercury. A smaller moter would not have enough power to push our family of four up the river efficiently. Our new moter is squieter and more fuel efficient and has minimal impact on the river.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3620	Response to Question 1: No action I would like more access and less restrictions Response to Question 2: Open recreational use and access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational use and access Response to Question 4: Bay Creek Access, but the entire river should be open Response to Question 5: more use and access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63116-4817
3621	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Free recreation usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrictions Response to Question 4: Bay Creek, Flying W no new restriction's Response to Question 5: I think the words used in this document may be too erudite for the regular man.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63123
3622	Response to Question 1: No action please Response to Question 2: Free access and unrestricted use Response to Question 3: Restrictions on numbers Response to Question 4: Bay Creek needs less restrictions Response to Question 5: more recreational usage and open access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63010
3623	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: free access and usage Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage and access less rules Response to Question 4: Bay Creek is too beutiful to keep it a secret. less restrictions please Response to Question 5: more recreational usage and access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63010
3624	Response to Question 1: No Action. Would like more resources added to current recreational opportunities. Response to Question 2: Free recreation usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access Response to Question 5: More recreational usage & access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63139

3625	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A Response to Question 2: PROTECT WATER AND HABITAT. MUST LIMIT NUMBER OF HORSES. ELIMINATE MOTORIZED VEHICLES (ATV) IN AND AROUND RIVERS. LOWER HORSEPOWER ON MOTORBOATS Response to Question 3: MORE BOAT RAMPS AND TRAILS ARE NOT NEEDED Response to Question 4: UPPER CURRENT RIVER - MONTAUK TO ROUND SPRING. PLEASE LIMIT HORSES AND ELIMINATE MOTORIZED VEHICLES. Response to Question 5: PRESERVE. DO NOT CHANGE NATURAL BEAUTY OF STREAMS AND SURROUNDING AREA.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63119
3626	Response to Question 1: A Response to Question 2: Natural Resource Management in A Response to Question 3: ALT C - motorized aspects, more ramps, horses on rivers and trails - These should NOT be included Response to Question 4: Jacks Fork - no motorized boats allowed except for emergencies Response to Question 5: Human waste disposal is huge problem! Teach people to bag it with all tissue and trash and bring it out - like dog poop! Manage more like the Grand Canyon - even to the point of permits. Thank you for asking!	6/25/2009	No			MO	63105-2665
3627	Response to Question 1: No Action. ONSR is fine the way it is. The economic impact that is being suggested could severely harm the local towns. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B or C should not be included in the future. Response to Question 4: All of it is special and has been taken care of adequately. ONSR should keep in mind that the local people are the one's that really take care of the river -	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3628	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Mixed Use Response to Question 4: The Current River below 2 Rivers should not be changed at all.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3629	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Plan A B and C Response to Question 4: Two Rivers to Round Spring	7/6/2009	No			MO	65757
3630	Response to Question 1: No-action is closest to my idea of the best way to manage ONSR. If anything, there should be less restriction on boat motors as well as other forms of recreation that used to be enjoyed by many such as river swings. Response to Question 2: Continued access for all those who wish to enjoy the riverways. Response to Question 3: There should be no more limits on the horsepower of boat motors allowed on the riverways. Nor should there be any restrictions placed on the access to any and all areas of such riverways. Response to Question 4: As a young girl, I enjoyed swimming and tubing on the Current River. My family could not afford a boat. Now that I am older and do have a boat to use, I enjoy the more leisurely activities of boating and fishing all along the ONSR. I also enjoy canoeing sometimes. No-action should be taken against these rights. Response to Question 5: There should definitely be more restrictions on the consumption of alcohol along our riverways. Most families do not enjoy dealing with the drunken behavior of others while trying to enjoy their family time.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63965
3631	Response to Question 1: No Action The horsepower Do not hurt anything the people that drive the boats do. You will do whatever you want anyway our vote don't count.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63937
3632	Response to Question 1: No Action would be best although I would like to see a return to prior status, i.e. Allow primitive camping with Larger groups. Have been going to Current & Jacks Fork for over 3 decades & There have been more & more Restrictions over the Years. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Any Thing That Restricts hunting, Fishing, Floating, camping, etc. Response to Question 4: Trout & Small mouth Fishing Areas - Above Akers on Current & Above Alley Springs on Jacks Fork The only concern I have is You All placing more Restrictions on current situation. Response to Question 5: If Anything go back to prior (B400) Regulations. Institute campaign of "Take out one more piece of Trash Than You bring in"	7/6/2009	No			MO	63383
3633	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Restrictions Response to Question 3: The right to camp and use the River for recreational purposes. Response to Question 4: All	7/6/2009	No			MO	63301
3634	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Restrictions Response to Question 3: The right to Camp and access the Riverway for recreational use. Response to Question 4: All of them	7/6/2009	No			MO	63301
3635	Response to Question 1: No-ACTION - I would like to see even more Resources Added - More Roads to the Rivers, more boat Ramps, ect. Response to Question 2: Free usage and Free Access - the way the economy is, people Need to have Free use of Their public Land And Rivers. Response to Question 3: Restricted Access. Response to Question 4: Campgrounds - We Need More That cost Nothing And do Away with Number of Tents per campsite. Response to Question 5: I think you should Add Additional Camp Areas and Additional Access to the Rivers & creeks At No charge.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63028
3636	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Restrictions Response to Question 3: The right to camp and use Riverway for Recreation. Response to Question 4: All	7/6/2009	No			MO	63301
3637	Response to Question 1: A. the only thing I wold add are some hiking trails which lightly impact the environment & do not have noise pollution Response to Question 2 Banning motor boats, horsseback RIDING & ATV's Response to Question 3: No boats, ATV's, horses Response to Question 4: Riverways - canoes only -	7/6/2009	No			MO	63119

3638	Response to Question 1: Alt. A Response to Question 3: No ATV's, motor boats, horseback riding. Response to Question 5: Allow canoes only on RIVERS	7/6/2009	No			MO	63301
3639	Response to Question 1: No action - The others increase expense and do have some positive benefits but all contain negative action toward some other use. Response to Question 2: Leave the horses alone. The original documentation to develop ONSR states all trails/roads will be retained for future generations. Some have already been lost. Access to historic locations should be mapped. Response to Question 3: Overbearing control which would deny access. Response to Question 4: Shafer Lakes. I have offered to fix the dam myself. These beautiful lakes will be lost if not repaired. Response to Question 5: Keep budget within income. There is no reason to create rules/positions to increase cost. Leave the area as natural as possible	6/25/2009	No			MO	65501
3640	Response to Question 1: No Action - I enjoy using the Rivers & trails just the way it is - Response to Question 2: Recreational use @ no cost Response to Question 3: No restriction on recreational useage Response to Question 4: Current river from Van Buren to Hwy 19 & Jacks Fork from Hwy 17 to 2 Rivers Response to Question 5: Provide more restrooms Have Park Rangers respect & show hospitality to the visitors on the trails & rivers	7/6/2009	No			MO	65571
3641	Response to Question 1: B-has several interesting features. The idea of seeing things off of the boater path is a good Idea. We love caving and primitive sites. An interpretive tour of Ozark features would be Nice. I would like to see a greater presence on the river itself this would discourage lewd behavior which influences where and when my family enjoy the river. We dont wish to see and hear the profoundly drunk and ignorant. Responsible fun is not the problem. Response to Question 2: Access to the river must be maintained. I am totally against closing any access or trails. I know this makes it more difficult to manage but, local use often rely on these to avoid large lewd crowds. Makes it more local family friendly I like the idea of overnight floats by commercial operators. We must preserve this wonderfull resourse but encourage responsible use. Response to Question 3: Do Not close or restrict use of any existing trails & access I hope this will exist as a perk for local users of the river. I think we have to be very carfull limiting use on the river. Management of the use In a responsible manor is a better idea Response to Question 4: The upper Jacks Fork is my stomping ground so I care most for it. This is the most scenic part of the river. The park service has done a good job with criminal activity at Blue Springs. It is again a Nice place to go. During busy season, I think enforcement on the river would curb lewd activity. I dont want my kids to see things like that. Response to Question 5: Encourage responsible use. Discourage inapopriate behavior. Enlist local help with historic site use. Expand nontraditional use.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65548
3642	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: FREEING THE CREEKS OF GRAVEL AND THE CLEANING OF SPRINGS OF THE DEBRIS OF FALLEN LEAVES ETC., FOR FREE WATER FLOW INTO THE RIVERS. Response to Question 3: NO MORE ENVIRONMENTALISM - I BELIEVE IN IT, AND THE FACT THAT IT IS NEEDED. NOT HOWEVER TO THE POINT THAT IT ROBS OTHERS OF THEIR BELIEFS OR RIGHTS. THERE IS A HAPPY MEDIUM SOMEWHERE. Response to Question 4: IT IS ALL BEAUTIFUL, AND IS NOT BEING DAMAGED BY THE EXISTING ROADS OR FOOTPRINTS! AS STATED BEFORE - THE DAMAGE IS FROM DEPRIVATION OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CARE OF THE RIVER'S SOURCES OF WATER. Response to Question 5: NO.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3643	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL USEAGE Response to Question 3: RESTRICTED RECREATIONAL USEAGE Response to Question 4: CURRENT RIVER FROM VAN BUREN TO HWY 19 JACKS FORK RIVER FROM HWY 17 TO TWO RIVERS Response to Question 5: MORE PICNIC TABLES, BATHROOMS, HITCHING RAILS, HORSE TRAILS & BOAT LAUNCHING SITES.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65571
3644	Response to Question 1: The only one close would be No-Action, I think we need to stop putting Regulations on Local Entertainment. Down In our Neck of the woods this is most of the things to do Around here. Unlike the Big cities. And most of the tourist Just come once or twice a year. This is our Heritage & way of Life. Response to Question 3: Leave out the clubs like ? or others that want to control our life! Response to Question 4: I only use about 40 to 50 miles of it for the most part. My Mom was born on the River & had a farm there. So I hate to see a part of my heritage take Away or Limited.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65560
3645	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives ABC Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren	7/6/2009	No			MO	65706
3646	Response to Question 1: No Action Except I would prefer to See Big Spring Area receive wilderness designation. It is a unique Area that deserves Wilderness Protection. Response to Question 2: Building of additional designated multi-use Trails (Horses included) Response to Question 3: Interpative Trails Response to Question 4: Horses should be allowed on the Portion of the Ozark Trail that Runs through the Park. Future Trails should be Multi-use.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65588
3647	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION: Historically, canoers, johnboaters & horses used the riverway (you go back to the 50;s) Alt A would only slow johnboats down but still allow all of the abuses (noise, drugs, drinking) of the canoers. Your alternatives target all users EXCEPT canoers who bring noiseboxes, and unwarranted, unwanted behaviors to our rivers. The sight and sound of the johnboat was here before/with canoeing. Response to Question 2: reduce motor size - slow the johnboats dwon but do NOT eliminate their use or rights to use the river, same w/4 wheelers - Alt C should include CANOE boating safety - which should be required of each & every person getting in a canoe anyway! Response to Question 3: restricting waterways to canoe ONLY traffic - I think this is incredibly narrow, biased, and DISCRIMINATORY. Your canoers kill wild life, disturb the ambiance with their load noise and music, gang up on others, intimidate rangers, pollute, trash and are NOT all there for a commune with nature, are mostly there to drink, do drugs & party. Response to Question 4: I care about the river & my access to all of it, I can	7/6/2009	No			MO	65560

	NO LONGER CANOE but I can ride in a johnboat. Response to Question 5: get your rangers on the river! Make sure a ranger is at every access. Have some visibility!						
3648	Response to Question 1: No-Action - Jet Boats provide transportation up & down Riverways for pleasure and recreation as well as medical & rescue useage. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C - Because they interfear with public use & recreation for everyone involved. Response to Question 4: Rocky Falls up to Round Springs, they are all within driving distance from our home, for fishing & Boat ramps or any other recreational use of the water ways. Response to Question 5: We feel that the Park Service should patrol more of the riverways and run trash pick-ups more frequently and they need to clear the dangerous logs & root wads from the river ways.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65466
3649	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Plan ABC Response to Question 4: Two Rivers to Round Springs.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65757
3650	Response to Question 1: B, But make Bay Creek to Alley non-motorized and Akers to Jerktail all Non-motorized Response to Question 2: Reducing HP and Boat traffic in busy seasons. Response to Question 3: Alt A, for example, shows an example of a float camp. Sounds like here one is, but you can't float and camp yourself. You might wear out the rocks or something. We're in the 21st century we can't go back in time. Response to Question 4: Jet Boats from 2 rivers up stream should be restricted to 25 hp limit or eleminated entirly during summer season. Don't wait till someone is ran over or killed! Response to Question 5: Set up sobriety check points on rivers for people operating jet boats. These people who are drinking and driving Boats are breaking the law and are dangerous! Do something about it! Do your dam job!	7/6/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3651	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: More Facilities, IE Campsites & Picnic Areas Response to Question 3: Alternatives A and B Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Van Buren Response to Question 5: Make Rangers more visible, on the river or river banks, not hiding and waiting in the woods.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65757
3652	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Restrictions would cause congestions & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: Need more patrol in Riverways during peak seasons	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3653	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren & Doniphan restrictions would cause congestion & dangerous conditons Response to Question 5: More patrol of riverways during peek seasons	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3654	Response to Question 1: ALT. C WITH 90 HP. LIMIT BIG SPRINGS TO GOOSE NECK Response to Question 5: TRY TO GET LIMITS BELOW RIVERWAYS AND DO AWAY LARGE INBOARD MOTORS & JET SKIS I THINK THAT 150 H.P. LIMIT BELOW WOULD HELP RIVERWAYS IN THE LONG RUN.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3655	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - restrictions would cause congestions & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: more patrol of riverways during holiday weekends like 4th of July.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3656	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren & Donphian restrictions cause congestions & dangerous condition Response to Question 5: More patrol of riverways during peek seasons	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3657	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp. to output shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65535
3658	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: no Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: I Love all 134 miles of the rivers Response to Question 5: not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3659	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: All of Jack fork and current River Are special to me and the only Alternative that I want to see it the No-Action Response to Question 5: None At This Time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3660	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no action to anything stay as it is as of right now. Response to Question 3: limiting or river or road usage. I want to be able to go swimming, tubing or just picnicing as I do today. Response to Question 4: Blue Springs on Current River. My access could be limited to certain areas to camp or the time of year I wish to camp.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
3661	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: RESTRICTIONS ON RECREATION Response to Question 4: VAN BUREN - RESTRICTIONS WOULD CAUSE CONGESTIONS & DANGEROUS CONDITIONS Response to Question 5: MORE PATROL OF RIVERWAYS DURING PEEK SEASONS	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901

3662	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - restrictions would cause over crowding & be more dangerous. Response to Question 5: during peek season have more patrol.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3663	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: RESTRICTIONS ON RECREATION Response to Question 4: VAN BUREN - RESTRICTIONS WOULD CAUSE CONGESTION & DANGEROUS CONDITIONS Response to Question 5: PATROL OF RIVERWAYS DURING SUMMER SEASONS 4TH OF JULY HOLIDAYS	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3664	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Restrictions would cause congestions & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: More patrol on Riverways during peak season	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3665	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Restrictions would cause conjections & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: More patrol on Riverways durig peak seasons	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3666	Response to Question 1: No Action Have Less restrictions than we have now. Response to Question 2: Free usage and less Restrictions. Response to Question 3: More restrictions on motorboats and less river access Response to Question 4: The whole river is special to me and I don't want to see any of it messed with. Response to Question 5: More boat ramps along the river. Places such as Paint Rock, Log Yard, and Powder Mill are used very much and need better ramps.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965
3667	Response to Question 1: No-action Leave the park the same way or take away some of the restrictions we already have. Response to Question 2: Free Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreation useage such as cutting the Restrictions on motorboats Response to Question 4: All of the river is special to me. The area between Weymeyer and Powdermill is where I spend most of my time because that is where my whole family was born and raised, However, it is all special to me. Response to Question 5: Have more resources such as more trash cans, picnic tables, and maybe more law enforcement to manage the ones that cause damage to the river	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3668	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Restrictions would cause congestion and dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: more patrol of riverways during peak season.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3669	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren Restrictions will cause Dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: water patrol during summer season	6/25/2009	No			AR	72454
3670	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren restrictions would cause congestions and dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: more patrol of riverways during peek seasons	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3671	Response to Question 1: No-Action Becasue we like to ride our four-wheelers and we like our hunting, fishing and boating and we like our rivers and their access to them Response to Question 2: unlimited use and access and that as long as the boaters uses since then should not be any limit to the Horse power Response to Question 4: The consern that I have is that there is not enough boat ramps Response to Question 5: Provide more River access to boaters and more Recreation	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3672	Response to Question 1: No-Auction. I like having access to the river and also going to the river. Also I like four-wheeler riding Response to Question 2: unlimited use & access no limit on the horse power of a boat. Response to Question 3: Limited use & access Response to Question 4: No enough boat ramps. Response to Question 5: More access to the rivers.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3673	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: The Entire River, No Action Response to Question 5: Open All Roads & Clear All Brush	6/25/2009	No			OK	74343
3674	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave things the way they are! Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
3675	Response to Question 1: No Action We use the river often for recreation and suplement our food by fishing. Please take No action.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3676	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action Needed	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560

3677	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE "A" IS CLOSEST TO MY IDEA OF HOW TO MANAGE THE ONSR - HOWEVER, I LIKE THE "NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT" PORTION OF ALTERNATIVE "B" MORE THAN THE MORE LIMITED MANAGEMENT OF ALTERNATIVE "A." I ALSO WOULD PREFER THAT THE ENTIRE WATERSHED BECOME "NON-MOTORIZED." Response to Question 2: KEEPING THE RIVERWAYS AS NATURAL AS POSSIBLE, RESTRICTING ACCESS BY LARGE GROUPS OR CANOES AND BY LARGE HORSEBACK PARTIES SHOULD BE INCLUDED. Response to Question 3: MIXED-USE AND SEASONAL MIXED USE OF THE RIVER-BASED MANAGEMENT ZONES SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED. Response to Question 4: THE ENTIRE JACKS FORK AND THE UPPER CURRENT ABOVE TWO RIVERS ARE MY PRIMARY ACTIVITY AREAS - ALTERNATIVE "A" AS MODIFIED IN MY RESPONSE TO QUESTION #1 ABOVE DOES A PRETTY GOOD JOB IN THESE AREAS. Response to Question 5: ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING RULES AND STATE LAWS CONCERNING ATVS, HORSEBACK RIDING, GLASS CONTAINERS AND TRASH REMOVAL SHOULD BE INCREASED.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63011
3678	Response to Question 1: YES, No-Action. Invite better separation of floaters and boaters by providing better boater access north of Waymeyer. Perhaps after better access is provided eliminate motorized boat traffic between Waymeyer and Hwy 60 bridge on Saturday & Sunday between Memorial Day & Labor Day. Response to Question 2: Increasing the publics access to outdoor recreation. Response to Question 3: Further limiting motorized boat horse power. Response to Question 4: I am concerned about the portion of the Current River from Waymeyer to Hwy 60 bridge being turned into a private water park. Response to Question 5: Sobriety check points for floaters. Don't wait for problems to occur. Take the load obnoxious drunks off the river & keep them off.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63017
3679	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Response to Question 5: NEED TO CLEAN UP SOME OF OLD FIELDS AND PLANT FOOD PLOT TO MAKE BETTER HABITAT FOR WILDLIFE	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3680	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Response to Question 5: CLEAN UP OLD FIELDS & MAKE FOOD PLOT AVAILABLE FOR WILDLIFE	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3681	Response to Question 1: None of them - I would like a reverse Action - do everything that was promised in the enabeling legislation! Response to Question 2: None. Response to Question 3: Do Not close roads. Do Not stop gravel bar camping hire more People in the field to do what Needs to be done for the recreational Park that it is. Response to Question 4: All of them. Response to Question 5: God and Mother Nature takes pretty good care of the Natural resources	7/20/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3682	Response to Question 1: C remove limits on use. Response to Question 3: The wilderness area. Response to Question 4: put in mile markers. Response to Question 5: Put a visitor center in Salem with audio video facility	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
3683	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Response to Question 5: We need camping areas on the South side of Current River. (Acres Area)	6/25/2009	No			MO	65479
3684	Response to Question 1: A. Response to Question 2: Amount of Boaters There are too many tubes, canoeing, rafting, Two many horses, The water shouldn't be polluted by horses. Response to Question 3: Having more things to do in the Riverways would be great, we could use the jobs, but if we put a stop to the boaters and canoeing we will lose some jobs there in the commercial services. Response to Question 4: I care about all 134 miles, I live 1 mile from Rocky Falls, I wish Rocky has less vistors. Response to Question 5: It isnt going to be easy to keep visitors from the River sinse a lot of it runs thru private land.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3685	Response to Question 1: Personally, I would remove all motorboat activity from the river and allow only nonmotorized vehicles thus A comes closest. Response to Question 2: 1. Big Springs - do make wilderness 2. Sections like they were in 50s & 60s. 3. restore conditions from overuse. Response to Question 3: eliminate motor vehicles. Response to Question 4: Upper stretches, closest to the mouths, should be the quietest, most natural, left along no motorized vehicles	6/25/2009	No			MO	63132
3686	Response to Question 1: No Action Plan because it is the only one that doesn't affect jet boats. Response to Question 2: Make the canoers stop taking off their clothes and littering. Response to Question 3: Nothing that limits boats should be included. Response to Question 4: Current River. No it restricts recreation there by cutting horsepower on boats or taking them off in the summer. Response to Question 5: Hire local people to be park rangers (law enforcement) rather than recruit or transfer from out of the area.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65660
3687	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: None. Response to Question 3: Do not shut down motor boating. Response to Question 4: Current River. Response to Question 5: Leave boaters alone	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
3688	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: A, B, C. Response to Question 4: We love our Riverways. Response to Question 5: Not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
3689	Response to Question 1: No Action. Response to Question 2: No Action. Response to Question 3: No further or different Restrictions on Horsepower of outboards. Response to Question 4: Approx 300 ft Restriction of 40 Hp motors between Big Springs and Van Buren should be lifted	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901

3690	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Furter Restrictions on horsepower. Eliminate 40 Hp Restriction between Van Buren & Big Springs Response to Question 4: Gooseneck to Van Buren should Remain as is. Other than eliminating 40 Hp Restriction of About 300 ft just Above Big Springs. Van Buren is losing Revenue because larger Hp boats cannot use their Ramp	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3691	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: ROCKY FIELDS - MY GRANDFATHERS FARM NO MORE CHANGES	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3692	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A & B Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Donniphan the alternatives do not address them. Response to Question 5: There should not be a limit on motor size. Stop Alcohol on the river for safety to many canoes they Block River so moter boats cant go past.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63629
3693	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Park service needs to be more hands on with public camp grounds along the River. Response to Question 3: Putting restrictions on the size of the motors on the upper end of the river. Response to Question 4: Anywhere from Akers Ferry to Logyard. Response to Question 5: See answer to #2.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63625
3694	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Response to Question 2: Business asal and horse back riding trails. Response to Question 3: Restricting h.p limits on outboards. Response to Question 4: Mouth of Sinking Creek to Two Rivers. Response to Question 5: More local input.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63624
3695	Response to Question 1: No-action. Response to Question 2: All of No-action. Response to Question 3: Lowering of boat motor h.p. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Log Yard. Response to Question 5: More horse back riding trails.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63629
3696	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: I camp along most of the Riverways. I enjoy it as it is. Take No-Action. Leave it the way it is! Response to Question 5: Take No-Action!	7/20/2009	No			MO	65807
3697	Response to Question 2: Leave everything the same. To help Tubers, you might put a spead-limit on all Boat's.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63937
3698	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: All of it. Response to Question 5: Restict drunk driving	7/20/2009	No			MO	63633
3699	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A & B Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Donniphan The alternatives do not address them adequately. Response to Question 5: There should be no limit on motor size. Eliminate alcoholic beverages on the river for safety issues. There are also too many canoes on the river and they create barricades. The canoers are also the ones causing the trash on the river.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63629
3700	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: Learning centers about the heritage of the river. Response to Question 3: Closings of trail and roads and limiting of horse power on outboard motor's. Response to Question 4: Aker's to Two River's. No-Action. Response to Question 5: Increasing public access to the riverway.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
3701	Response to Question 1: Alterative C Response to Question 2: Access Development Response to Question 3: No Horsepower limits or Access Denials to Roads. Response to Question 5: User group committees to help with protection and ethics.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965
3702	Response to Question 1: Alternative C without Any Horsepower Limits Response to Question 2: Access Development for Outdoor Recreation by All user groups. Response to Question 3: Any Access Restrictions or Horsepower Limits. Response to Question 4: The entire Riverways should Be for multiple user groups. It is well protected Now! Response to Question 5: Expansion (for All user groups) of Access and Developed Areas with Cultural Programs By Locals.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965
3703	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: No-action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Two rivers Leave it all as is Response to Question 5: Leave it as is	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3704	Response to Question 1: No Action - It would interest me to know where the things you "heard" under A NEW PLAN came from. I live on the river (Current), and I don't see these things. Maybe all this lewd boating, tubing, canoeing & rafting is in the minds of well-intentioned conservationists. Response to Question 2: If indeed you're thinking about overall costs, leaving things as they are would be cheaper by far. If you've already decided that you are going to do away with the boats (motorized) and horses, it won't make much difference. Apparently you have lots of money to spend. Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: If you want "lewd behavior" and other abuses changed on the rivers, "manage" less and police more. The existing laws seem to be adequate.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638

3705	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Business as usual. Response to Question 3: Closeing off roads & trails. Changing hp limits. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Owls Bend. No-Action. Response to Question 5: Learning center's and ranger programs to learn more about Ozark heritage.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65440
3706	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Business as usual. Response to Question 3: Lowering of horse power on outboard engines. Response to Question 4: Sinking Creek to Two Rivers. Response to Question 5: More primitive camp sites.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65440
3707	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Business as Usual. Response to Question 3: Horse power limits being lowered. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren. Response to Question 5: Learning center's and more primitive camp sites.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63650
3708	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Response to Question 2: Leave as is. Response to Question 3: Lowering outboard motor h.p. Response to Question 4: Akers to Owls Bend. Response to Question 5: No-Action.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3709	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
3710	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Leave it the way it is thing are good the way the are, "youall Have Ben doing a good JOB P.S. youall did a good JOB with the glass Bottles!!! If it will Help I would Be glad to put money to Help manage River, charge At Sticker FEE for Each Boat That go in the Water 10. 20. or whatever to help out each year Log yard is special to my Family we gig in the Fall if a Beer can is in the River it comes in the Boat First always! Then the Fish I wont our River Clean Thak you For Listen to Me Response to Question 5: More Agents protroling River - Leave Hose Power Limits the way they are The Crrunt is to Strong to Run with any Body in Boat with Lower HP. Limts Its Dangerous	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3711	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp. to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65535
3712	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp. to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65535
3713	Response to Question 1: No-Action. The current system is working well enough. Don't try to and fix something that already works Response to Question 2: At the present time I do not see where anything needs to be changed. Concentrat on manageing what you have now. Response to Question 3: No further closing of trails and access roads. Horsepower limits on boats are low enough as they are now. I see nothing to gain in lowering them. Response to Question 4: I consider all 134 miles special. Just concentrate on maintaining and controlling what we have now. Response to Question 5: Drugs and alcohol use need to be controlled better. I continually see drunken or impaired floaters on the river when floating. This is what causes most conflicts between floaters & boaters. Most of the impaired people I see are minors in large groups.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65588
3714	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action Needed Response to Question 5: No Action Needed.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65440
3715	Response to Question 1: I live on the current River most of the summer. After the heavy Rains, it seems to be cleaner than Ever. Please don't change the river at all. Leave it like it is. Response to Question 2: Please Leave it alone. The River is beautiful Response to Question 3: Please Leave it alone The River is beautiful Response to Question 4: Please Leave it alone The River is beautiful. Response to Question 5: Please leave it alone. The River is beautiful.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965
3716	Response to Quesiton 1: No Action Response to Question 3: Motor Restrictions Response to Question 4: 2 Rivers to Paint Rock Why place motor Restrictions on this Area There is very little canoe's on this section	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3717	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 3: motor sizes Response to Question 4: 2 Rivers to Paint Rock - very few canoe's in this Area why change motor size?	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3718	Response to Question 1: No-Action It is working as is. On the 10 summer weekends (June 15 - Se Response to Question 2: The Right to Allow boats Access to the River. Very few boats are on the North Section of the Upper Current due to HP Restrictions and canoe density. Response to Question 3: No Further Horsepower Restriction Boaters are being forced of the River by the Number of tubers Don't modify horsepower at "powerhead" Response to Question 5: Open up a boat Ramp above Waymeyer & you will immediately have user separation. Boaters do not Enjoy Navigating through the crowds.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965

3719	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: motor sizes Response to Question 4: Owls bend to Paint Rock - There are very few canoe's in this section why Restrict motor size?	6/25/2009	No			MO	63937
3720	Response to Question 1: No action! A 40 horse will cause more erson than a larger motor that can plan off in the water faster Response to Question 2: dont close the roads, but improve them Response to Question 3: limited but not a low as a 40 hp. Response to Question 4: more visiable enforcement, officers to help people using the river. Response to Question 5: limit the # of tubers in groups. they should have the right a way when they meet motorized boats!	6/25/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3721	Response to Question 1: no-action, 60/40 h.p. motor no restrictions Response to Question 2: no-action, 60/40 motors Response to Question 3: a, b, c no restrictions or change Response to Question 4: log yard, paint rock area, no-action 60/40 motors Response to Question 5: no action! 60/40 motors no change	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3722	Response to Question 1: No-action 60/40 H.P. Motor No restriction Response to Question 2: No-action 60/40 H.P. Motor. Response to Question 3: "A", "B", and "C" Response to Question 4: Logyard, Paintrock area Response to Question 5: NO-ACTION! 60/40 H.P. Motor	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3723	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE "A" Response to Question 2: ALTERNATIVE "A" Response to Question 3: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE Response to Question 4: ALL OF THE "OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS" - "A" DOES Response to Question 5: ALL THE THINGS YOU HAVE HEARD AND LISTED.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63941
3724	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreation, especially on motor boats. We have been coming to Van buren and have had a home on the river for 20+ years. Response to Question 4: Van Buren. If restrictions were implemented the areas of the river w/out them would be very conjested and dangerous Response to Question 5: I think it is PERFECT the way it is.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63901
3725	Response to Question 1: No Action! Keep boating privileges! Response to Question 2: No Action! Response to Question 3: None of them should be! Response to Question 4: The entire river! Response to Question 5: No changes to the entire river!	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965
3726	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES-A-AND-B Response to Question 4: ALL 134 MILES ARE SPECIAL. LEAVE AS IS, DON'T TRY TO FIX WHAT THAT IS NOT BROKEN!!! Response to Question 5: BUILD BOAT RAMP AT WAYMEYER TO RELIEVE BOAT TRAFFIC IN TUBE AND CANOE FLOAT SECTION OF THE RIVER.	6/25/2009	No			MO	63965
3727	Response to Question 1: I feel the "No-Action" is the best way for every one to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. More Rangers to patrol the area would be nice. Response to Question 2: I beleive that motorized water vessels should always be in the future plans of the riverways. To me nothing is more enjoyable than spending time with your family fishing & boating on any weekend in the spring summer, and fall. Response to Question 3: Horsepower should not be decreassed more. 40 h.p. at the Jet is suitable for taking a family of five out on the river for an enjoyable day. Response to Question 4: The entire 134 miles are special to me. I have boated, canoed, & tubed almost all of it at one time or another. The No Action alternative would Allow me & others to enjoy it for years to come. Response to Question 5: I feel that the no-Action is the only way to let everyone utilize the Ozark National Scenic Riverways	6/25/2009	No			MO	63638
3728	Response to Question 1: No Action!! Every time the government gets involved they make things worse! They forget - We are the government - we own the River and the land - Let us take care of it. We were Raised on the River - They weren't! Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action - no further Restrictions on horsepower Remove the 40 horsepower limit between Big Springs & Van Buren Response to Question 4: ALL AREAS. NO ACTION. Response to Question 5: Educating the tourists about clean up on the gravel bars and the way the boats have to Run the River. They don't have sense enough to get out of the channels!	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3729	Response to Question 1: no action - It is the only one that does not attempt to restrict motor boats Response to Question 3: Do not include any restrictions on horse power of motor boats or times motor boats can be used. Response to Question 4: Current River - Owl's Bend to Waymeyer. No, because we won't be able to get there if motor boats are restricted Response to Question 5: Have more friendly Park rangers (law enforcement) They should be there to help not harrass.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3730	Response to Question 1: I prefer the NO ACTION Plan Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do not include any restrictions on Boat horse power. Response to Question 4: Current River. No. It limits jet boat horse power or eliminates use. ONSR is for recreation. Response to Question 5: Have nicer park rangers. They use to be local, now they come in here with a "lets whip some ass" mentality.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65483
3731	Response to Question 1: No Action - would like to see a Trophy Smallmouth & goggle-eye Area established on Current River As it is on Jack's Fork River. Response to Question 2: Continue the motor Rating for boats as it is Now. Response to Question 3: Reduction in the motor Rating. Response to Question 4: From Two Rivers to Gap above Van Buren A trophy Area. Response to Question 5: Every one can enjoy our River the way things Are Now if good commen sense is used by everyone.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65438
3732	Response to Question 1: take No Action Response to Question 2: More river accesses, concessions on riverbanks! Response to Question 3: No limitations on outboard motors (HP) Response to Question 4: From Alley to two Rivers and from Round Spring to V.B & eliminate "the gap" on HP. Response to Question 5: No Nude boating or floating!	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965

3733	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION Response to Question 2: More river access points, more concession stands on river bank Response to Question 3: No Limits on outboard motor (Hp) Response to Question 4: From Alley Spring to two rivers an from Round Springs to V.B & eliminate "the gap between Big Spring & V.B. Response to Question 5: No Nude boating or floading!	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965
3734	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A & B & C Response to Question 4: We Love all of Both Rivers Response to Question 5: Not at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3735	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: My tax dollars go toward all 134 miles. So all of it is special. No-Action addresses it adequately. Response to Question 5: No-Action!!	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3736	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: My concern is that if the NPS implements A, B, or C it will push more people to the areas where there are no motor restrictions. This will effect fishing. It will also cause problems with saftey. Your pushing it all down stream, letting someone else worry about it. No-Action addresses this adequately. Response to Question 5: No-Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3737	Response to Question 1: No action - Allow for areas with low floater traffic to have more activities centered around local forms of entertainment. Response to Question 2: More camping areas with restrooms. More boat ramps or improved boat ramps. Response to Question 3: Any additional regulations on horsepower even at the powerhead. Response to Question 4: Log Yard on the current river - only no action, because any additional horsepower regulations would prevent me from using my boat on the river Response to Question 5: 1. No changes to regulations on motor boats and horsepower. 2. Put more law enforcement where the canoes & motor boats are together. Reduce the conflict between them	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3738	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: More horsepower on boats	8/4/2009	No			IL	62401
3739	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: Preliminary Alternatives A, B, & C! Response to Question 4: I am concerned about the roads being closed off to restrict public access to the river. These rivers & wild life are a big reason why we chose to live here!!! Response to Question 5: No restrictions to the jet boat motors on any of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways & no restrictions to access to the riverways to the public, both local and visitors.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3740	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action - Alternatives A, B, & C Response to Question 4: They all need to be left Alone Response to Question 5: 40 horse power (to the lower unit) jet boat motors allowed on all the Ozark National Scenic Riverways	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3741	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Preliminary alternatives A, B, and C. Response to Question 5: 40 horssepower Jet boat motors allowed on all of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3742	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Preliminary alternatives A, B, and C. Response to Question 5: 40 horssepower Jet boat motors allowed on all of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.	8/4/2009	No			MO	65466
3743	Response to Question 1: There should not be any change in horsepower regulation. Any motor boats above Big spring to Round spring should be rated 40 H.P. at the jet pump. No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63665
3744	Response to Question 1: Yes No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All But No Action Response to Question 4: None But No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65440
3745	Response to Question 1: Yes No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All But No Action Response to Question 4: None But No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	65440
3746	Response to Question 1: No-Action - modified as follows: a. 40 hp at the bottom of the shaft below the Van Buren gap. b. No alcohol allowed on the river. This would elimanate alot of conflict between users. c. Park Rangers as a patrolling & helping presence on the river, not is bushes! Response to Question 2: A limit on horse power of boats below the Big Spring. Response to Question 3: If the suggested horse power changes are made it will be the end of family boating. These ratings will allow only one to two people per boat. Response to Question 4: Owl's Bend to the lower end of the river. Response to Question 5: It should be considered that most of the difficulties being acessed happen only on wweekends between Memorial day and Labor day. That is 12 days!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965

3747	Response to Question 1: None Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: None Response to Question 5: 40 HP	8/4/2009	No			MO	63044
3748	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: Blue Springs to Big Springs is where we enjoy spending time and boating and floating. Response to Question 5: -better campsite commodities such as showers and electricity hookups. -better interaction with the water patrol instead of negative interaction	7/31/2009	No			MO	63755
3749	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3750	Response to Question 1: Leave the horsepower regulations alone The need to be a minimum 40 HP at the pump. Response to Question 3: 0 wilderness areas Response to Question 5: more patrols on river	8/4/2009	No			MO	63654
3751	Response to Question 1: No change in horsepower. Ratings should not change. Ratings stay at 40 hp at the Jet pump. Response to Question 3: No wilderness area in the ONSR	8/4/2009	No			MO	63636
3752	Response to Question 1: I recommend no action on present motor boat Horsepower. The 40 horsepower at the pump is barely enough to haul a family of 4. Response to Question 2: Some of the old farm sites should be restored like they were 40 years ago. Response to Question 3: Any wilderness area in the ONSR. The ONSR was to be a National Recreation area only. Response to Question 4: Improve places of boat access Response to Question 5: States Water Patrol should be more active.	8/4/2009	No			MS	63023
3753	Response to Question 1: Keep all horsepower regulations the same. Horsepower rating stays at 40 hp at the jet pump. Response to Question 3: Any wilderness areas in the ONSR	8/4/2009	No			MO	63638
3754	Response to Question 1: I am on vacation in Colorado, and don't have the printed info explaining the choices. However, I feel we should keep much of the park in a "natural state" while trying to serve the needs of the local and visitor populations. Response to Question 2: Keep access limited, and close roads that have been opened and used illegally. No ATV use. I would like to see significant areas of the upper rivers closed to motorized water crafts. Continue natural, historical and cultural education. Response to Question 4: The Upper Jack's Fork, in the Mtn. View area, needs some sinage and recognition of ONSR on Hwy 60. Perhaps an informational kiosk could be provided near the Hwy 17 & 60 intersection. Also, Mtn. View could profit from some of the tourist dollars. Response to Question 5: Keep "family type" behavior the norm - and keep pristine water quality. In the developed camping areas (Alley, Round & Big Springs) provide ample electric hook-ups to attract the older, sedate and more affluent visitors.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65548
3755	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: more showes & rest rooms in Re mote Areas that have camping Response to Question 5: Park Rangers - seen not to be frendly to puplic instead of giving Info And instructing. thy hide And wate till puplic Does somthing. Thy don't Like Them come out of the woods And ticket groups At once	7/31/2009	No			MO	63755
3756	Response to Question 1: If you waunt to stringle the motor boats out of existence elimatte the canoes also. 40 H.P. at the out put shaft will barley do with 3 to 4 persons in the boat Response to Question 2: Have local Farmers come in and Hay the Farms along the Riverways Response to Question 3: I strongly Feel we dont need an Wilderness Response to Question 4: We need more & better access points Response to Question 5: concessioner's should number all equipment	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
3757	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A & B Response to Question 4: From Blue Springs to Van Buren Response to Question 5: No	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3758	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: NONE OF IT Response to Question 3: NO LIMITS ON BOATS NO CLOSING ACCESS TO RIVERS NO CLOSING ROADS Response to Question 4: BLUE SPRINGS The alternative should not be implemented Response to Question 5: STOP TOURISTS FROM BRINGING DRUGS ON THE RIVER	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3759	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Do not limit boat horsepower. Response to Question 4: Current River Response to Question 5: Boaters are not the problem. Canoers bring drugs. They litter or turn over & spill all their trash & beer. They cuss & expose themselves.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
3760	Response to Question 1: A I would like to hear no motors once the boat is in the water. Response to Question 2: Ozark heritage - plants, animals, structures, early settlers guidelines on using fire guidelines on using sand, rock bars general noise abatement, no sound equipment motor boats only for park rangers. concentrate on water quality Response to Question 3: no motorboats no horses in or near river no cattle in or near river no bongos no drugs no sound equipment Response to Question 4: NPS should continue to walk the fine line: respecting the local residents and regarding their wellbeing, and alos respecting the larger environmental issues. Response to Question 5: You will make mistakes but	7/7/2009	No			MO	63105-3040

	if you do, err on the side of conservation and environmental protection. Train the next generation to become naturalists. Enlist input from the canoeing veterans at Jefferson Barracks V.A. Hospital from the Missouri Botanical garden.						
3761	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: NO-ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: CEDAR GROVE TO ROUND SPRING Response to Question 5: JUST LEAVE IT LIKE IT IS.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63074
3762	Response to Question 1: Yes. No-Action Leave it 40 HP at the pump Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: No change Response to Question 5: Quit Hiding Rangers in the woods and Invading peoples privacy	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3763	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative ABC Response to Question 4: Whole River Response to Question 5: More Restrooms	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3764	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: CEDAR GROVE TO ROUND SPRING. Response to Question 5: JUST LEAVE IT ALONE	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3765	Response to Question 1: No Action, 40 HP At the Jet Response to Question 2: No Action! Response to Question 3: A, B, and C. Response to Question 4: No Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3766	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION 40 HP PUMP Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ALT. AB & C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3767	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 hp at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61607
3768	Response to Question 1: No-Action. There are laws and park rules that cover every group and every activity any time there are large groups of people whether it be boaters, canoers, ATV riders, etc. there will almost always be a few troublemakers that give the whole group a bad name, so have the rangers ticket the troublemakers not punish everyone by limiting or banning an activity Response to Question 2: I feel motor boats should be allowed on the river I would like to see the Horsepower raised or left the same but certainly not lowered. HP limits will not stop or even reduce conflicts between boats and other groups. Don't let a few idiots ruin boating for all of the people who cause no problems with their boats. If someone drives a car reckless or inappropriate the police will ticket them, if they continue they will revoke their license not ban cars or reduce motor size on cars try the same approach on the river. Response to Question 3: I do not think HP limits, daily load limits, or banning or reducing activities should be part of the plan. Response to Question 4: Both current and Jacks Fork have a gravel problem, the rivers are full of gravel. When it floods the rivers cut new chanel and cut off banks making them wider, more shallow and full of gravel action needs to be taken to remove gravel and to make the river stay in its chanel, it may not be natural but a rocked Bank looks a lot better than an eroded one. Response to Question 5: The rivers were out of control with partying, excessive drinking, drugs and many other illegal and inappropriate activities the park service decided to clean up the rivers and make them more family friendly, the rangers and water patrol started patrolling and ticketing illegal behavior within one summer it went from an out of control party to a family friendly environment this approach should be used on all problem areas it seems to work. I used to work for a canoe rental and there were a customers who complained about and I'm sure filed complaints about too many people and all of the activities going on, they wanted the river to themselves but out of all the people who said ther was to many none of them turned around and left, they all got on the river.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65466
3769	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A There is too much pressure on the river(s) throughout the summer. The # of people floating should be limited - Prices could increase to offset the drom in numbers Response to Question 2: ALTERNATIVE A - This plan pretty much covers it. Restore conditon along the river. FORBID vistors - as is the case in the Minn. Boundry waters Response to Question 3: More Roads - More river useage - I love for people to use and enjoy the rivers. The over use and disrespect are a real problem. I first started floating 52 years ago - Things have changed for the worse Response to Question 4: I have floated nearly all of the 134 miles (I did not know it was than long) But I've put in just below the Trout Park @ 'Tan Vat' (sometimes Baptist Camp and have floated down to the white. Do ALTERNATIVE A Response to Question 5: When checking in there would be a count of Soda or Beer cans. When checking out a recount. If all items and cans were not taken out, there should be a fine of 2.00 per can not taken out.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63122
3770	Response to Question 1: Alt A Response to Question 2: No ATV's, horseback RIDING, motorboats	7/7/2009	No			MO	63125

3771	Response to Question 1: A. One weekend we had 60 educators from Taiwan to Africa, attending a Webster Univ. program, at our river. They wouldn't leave the river - their rivers were all polluted and useless for recreation. We have a treasure of our Mo. rivers. We have to do everything possible to maintain their pristine condition for the future. We need to keep their purity and not allow them to become polluted by commercialism. A non-motorezid restraint should be incorporated - no boats, 4 wheel drive vehicles of any kind, etc. Keep the conoes on the rivers - boats on the lakes. Response to Question 3: no motorboats of any kind Response to Question 4: I floated a small portion years ago. My husband & I owned property on the Black River w/a miles of the river flowing through our property. We had a quiet river w/float trips every weekend April thru Oct which wwe led on a 121 mile float w/bbq lunch on a gravel bar. Our guests loved experienceing the quietness and beauty of nature surrounding them. Response to Question 5: Floaters read list of regulations apprising Do's and Don'ts and penalties before taking out conoes. Make stiff penalties. Why should drunks get away with causing injury to others.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63122
3772	Response to Question 1: No Action I would like to see stronger enforcment of rules and regulations we now have. Response to Question 2: Should manage riverways for family activities and make sure our children and grandchildren experience fishing and hunting for many generations. Response to Question 3: Should not limit use of boating activities we now have. I would like everyone to enjoy the river as we now have. Response to Question 4: All of the park is special to me. I would prefer to see drinking of alcholic beverages stopped along with group parties that display lewd behavior not good for children. Response to Question 5: Manage in a way to gain respect of general public You have Mine Thank you	7/7/2009	No			MO	63629
3773	Response to Question 1: No Action, 40 horse pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All . . . ab&c. Response to Question 4: All Response to Question 5: Better boat ramps	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3774	Response to Question 1: No action 40 hp out of the pump Response to Question 2: Why do they have to change? Response to Question 3: None of them Response to Question 4: I use all of this river during different parts of the year. But I have a pool so if I'm just getting to swim why waste gas Response to Question 5: Better Roads & Ramps	7/7/2009	No			MO	63629
3775	Response to Question 1: No Action A Response to Question 2: No Changes Nessary Response to Question 3: No Changes Nessary Response to Question 4: No Changeges Nesseary Response to Question 5: No Changes Nessary	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3776	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION 40 HP @ PUMP Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ALT AB & C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3777	Response to Question 1: Rate H.P. at the Jet Pump "No Action" Response to Question 2: "No Action" Response to Question 3: ABC Restrict Access to the River & Lower HP makes the Boat less safe with a load Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Owl's Ben For Boat Riding & Fishing Response to Question 5: Better Boat Ramp for Round Spring	7/7/2009	No			MO	63629
3778	Response to Question 1: no Action 40 hp At pump Response to Question 2: no Action Response to Question 3: Alt AB & C Response to Question 4: no Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3779	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588
3780	Response to Question 2: I feel strongly against them wanting to charge you for camping, unloading boats and it is Bullshit! Response to Question 3: I fell strongly against them trying to take the boats & motors of the rivers and am strongly against trying to shut down accesses to the river Response to Question 4: From two rivers to Doniphan Response to Question 5: Youngs should be more concerned about the local peoples way of life instead so much about the tourists	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588
3781	Response to Question 1: The no-action proposal is best. Leave things alone. Response to Question 2: Leave things alone Response to Question 3: Leave things as they are now. Response to Question 4: All of it is special. It's home country Response to Question 5: The only thing needed is more cops on the river patrol. Do away with the nudity and drinking make the rivers once again a place we can take our kids.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588-9545
3782	Response to Question 2: I feel that youngs are doing wrong by wanting to charge people to camp and to pay to unload your boat. That is just plain Stupid. Response to Question 3: Youngs should not take boats and motors off the rivers that makes no sense at all and trying to shut down access to the rivers. Thats Just Plum retarded. Response to Question 4: From two rivers to Gooseneck. Response to Question 5: Youngs need to be more concerned about the ways of life of the local people instead of worrying to much about making the tourists happy. Thats being communist . . .	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588
3783	Response to Question 2: I am strongly against them wanting to charge people for unloading boats and for camping. That isn't right. Response to Question 3: They shouldn't be allowewd to take the boats and motors off the rivers and it's wrong of them to try shutting down our access to the river. Response to Question 4: From two rivers to Grubbs Response to Question 5: I would think that they would have more concern about our local people instead of trying to please the city folk.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588

3784	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Upper Current No Response to Question 5: We Have Enough Laws & Regulations	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3785	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 4: Mouth of Sinking Creek Round Springs Big Creek NO	7/7/2009	No			MO	65560
3786	PLEASE DO: 1. CONTROL ROWDY & LEWD BEHAVIOR ON THE RIVER & IN THE PARK PLEASE DO NOT: 1. CLOSE ANY TRAILS 2. CLOSE ANY ROADS 3. LIMIT ACCESS TO THE BIG SPRING AREA, INCLUDING MOTOR VEHICLES 4. CLOSE ANY EXISTING FACILITIES IN THE PARK 5. LIMIT ACCESS TO HISTORICAL SITES IN THE PARK 6. IMPOSE MANAGEMENT ZONES 7. CHANGE MOTORBOAT HORSEPOWER LIMIT 8. CHANGE BOATING ACCESS & USE AREAS I enjoy driving all the roads in the park, to visit the historic sites, and view the river from all points. The people of Shannon County & surrounding counties treasure the Riverways & want to use it as they have been for many years - no new limitations. When available, please send me a print copy of: 1. DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN 2. FINAL GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AT THE ADDRESS ON REVERSE SIDE - Thank you.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588
3787	Did not respond to any of the questions.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63665
3788	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: The log yard and Two Rivers. Response to Question 4: The log yard. I don't want any changes made. Response to Question 5: I love going to the river with my family on the boat and everyone enjoys it alot.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3789	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO CHANGE IN OUTBOARD MOTOR SIZ OR POWER Response to Question 3: NO CHANGE IN MOTOR BOAT REGULATION Response to Question 4: NO CHANGES Response to Question 5: UNDER COVER LAW ENFORSMENT FOR DRUGS & ALCOHAL	7/7/2009	No			MO	65588
3790	Response to Question 1: THE BEST WAY IS TO LEAVE IT ALONE! BE AN AMERICAN. Written across the bottom of the form: "BY THE PEOPLE - FOR THE PEOPLE - OF THE PEOPLE"	7/7/2009	No			MO	63901
3791	Response to Question 2: KEEP 40 HORSE MOTORS ON RIVERS Response to Question 3: CURRENT RIVER AND ELUVEN PIONTS	7/7/2009	No			MO	65438
3792	Response to Question 1: I feel that "No Action" is required. I frequent the area of the river from Owls bend to Van Buren and have observed No problems other than an occasional drunk canoer or boater (Non violent). The River is overall very family friendly - a wonderful Place to bring children & grand children Response to Question 3: Do Not reduce the HP on boats because this would elimiate the ability to Navigate with a family in the boat Response to Question 4: owls bend to Van Buren Response to Question 5: I feel the area is a Natural as it Needs to be & as commercial as it Needs to be. It is clean & beautiful just as it is.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65074
3793	Response to Question 1: I favor "No-Action" Our Family, children, grandchildren & other relatives vacation Annually, sometimes up to 3x per year. We Love to Boat up River & Float Back. To Get ovver the shoals requires a Good motor. Response to Question 3: No Low Limit on HP. ? (The River needs to be enjoyed by ALL) What is the benefit to Anyone if turned back to "wilderness" & not allowed near it or on it?) Response to Question 4: From Owls Bend to Van Buren, Mo - (especially Blue Springs to Logyard) No Action! Please don't take Away our Freedom to enjoy God's creation Response to Question 5: Canoe people need to be advised as to Places to dispose of their Trash. And where Trash containers may be found along the River.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65074
3794	Response to Question 1: No-Action!!! Response to Question 2: No-Action!!!! Response to Question 3: A, B, C. Response to Question 4: No-Action It is Fine Like it is! Response to Question 5: LET THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE CLOSE BY AND USE IT OFTEN HAVE MORE OF A VOICE IN HOW THE PARK IS RAN.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63638
3795	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: All-No Action-No Road Closings Response to Question 5: No Road Closings - No Horsepower-Restrictions	8/5/2009	No			MO	65571
3796	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Horsepower at the Output Shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560
3797	Response to Question 1: the best alternative is No Action. Accessibility is already hampered and a feeling of unwelcomeness is already present. Response to Question 2: No Action is best. ONSR is currently available to all public. No further restrictions. Response to Question 3: I feel strongly Alt. A will not Benefit anyone including business or the public. Do Not make a wilderness area. Do not change or restrict the horsepower	8/5/2009	No			MO	65548

	on motorized boats. Response to Question 5: No Action to the management plan.						
3798	Response to Question 1: My idea of the best way to manage ONSR is No Action on either Current or Jacks Fork Rivers. Response to Question 2: There should be no change on Current or Jacks Fork Rivers. Response to Question 3: I feel strongly that there should be no changes or electric motors also be allowed. Response to Question 4: None of the alternatives are suitable! There should be No Change! Response to Question 5: More roads need to be opened that have been closed. Some fees for parking on grass are too high.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65588
3799	Response to Question 1: No Action, the only thing that should change is limiting Atv use. Also horses catch a lot of grief, they do cause a lot of damage, however, if the horse were not concentrated in one spot, it could be alleviated. Adding trails upriver and downriver, could help, not many but a few. Also add horse camps, undercut the concessioners, more business for the park. Response to Question 2: limiting Atv use, and more planning in the horses. Many National Parks support horse back riding in back country and multi-use areas, why not here? Heck, keep them away from the river, but don't eliminate the horses. Response to Question 3: C, having a few wilderness areas is fine, but turning the whole Park would be wrong. Also many features of Plan will hurt the local people. By depending on St. Louis & other cities for the opinions is wrong. The local people should have more say! Response to Question 4: All of the places in the Park are special, change in any way could hurt them. People have opinions on what to do, but the mountains have been here through tough times, different people & horses, I think hikers just don't wanna step in crap. Also E. Coli in the rivers again spreading it out helps Response to Question 5: More programs, perhaps guided horse tours with a ranger would help, By showing horseback riders their welcome instead of a pain in the ass would be nice. By saying they are main cause of E. Coli is, mean, people & drunks, crap in the river along with other animals. And testing for E. Coli after major trail rides & floods are in favor of getting rid of them, like testing for global warming, in major cities near industrial air conditioners	7/14/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3800	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the shaft	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3801	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the output shaft	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3802	Response to Question 1: Alternatives A & B are closest to my preferences. We love floating the Jack's Fork. It is usually a quiet, relaxing, rejuvenating experience - amazing in this place & time. The more commercial areas we avoid - too many motors, drunks, etc. The ideas in C are horrifying. People can go to amusement parks for a rowdy experience. Response to Question 2: The Scenic Riverways are an amazing blessing to the public. I hope they can be maintained and protected in their most natural state. If this involves more physical effort to access the rivers so be it. That is part of the experience. I strongly feel the less motors whether boats or ATVs the better. Response to Question 3: more motorboat use in B. The motor boats are inappropriate, obnoxious, & dangerous - small hp's in off season in certain places may be okay but held to a minimum. Aren't we as a county trying to use less oil? Also, a little more hiking & swimming might help the obesity epidemic. Response to Question 4: The whole 134 miles is a wonderful concept & obviously, the balance between protecting the rivers & watersheds and providing access to the public is tricky. Good luck! Response to Question 5: One problem, as the rivers are used more, that we have encountered is human waste. It is disconcerting to come upon piles & smells of poop & toilet paper on a beautiful sandbar. Perhaps there could be periodic composting toilets built out of the flood plains or information provided on how to poop in the woods - like at least bury it.	8/5/2009	No			MO	65548
3803	Response to Question 1: Rate H.P. at the Pump "No Action" Response to Question 2: "No Action" Response to Question 3: ABC Restrict access to the River & lower HP makes the boat less safe with a load Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Owl Ben for Boat Riding & fishing Response to Question 5: Better Boat Ramp's for Round Spring	7/7/2009	No			MO	63629
3804	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horse Power at the Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more Road Access	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3805	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: You Are Doing a Great Job.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63629
3806	Response to Question 1: no action. 40 hp at the pump Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: Lowering the H.P. of the motor boats creates safety issues under a load. Response to Question 4: The laws should be the same for everybody on the river. The laws should be the same the length of the river Response to Question 5: Enforce the laws fairly and crack down on the drug & alcohol abuse. Make better boat ramps & make them more accessible with better parking. Clean up the trash. Should be able to run a generator all night to help keep campers cool for relief from the sun. Heat Stroke is a Killer.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3807	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A CUT DOWN ON COMMERCIAL OPERATORS. Response to Question 2: ALTERNATIVE B Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVE C Response to Question 4: THE QUIETER, LESS CROWDED AND SLOWER PACED AREAS. Response to Question 5: NO.	7/7/2009	No			MO	65020

3808	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 Hp rated at the pump Response to Question 2: None we enjoy the recreation activities we are currently offered. Response to Question 3: None of them Response to Question 4: We enjoy all of the Scenic Riverways. If this goes into effect we will stay at the creek behind the house and not waste gas money Response to Question 5: Better boat ramps would be a plus	7/7/2009	No			MN	63633
3809	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horse Power at Pump Response to Question 2: no Action Response to Question 3: no Action Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: More Road Access	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3810	1) Is one of the four preliminary alternatives (No-Action, A, B, or C) already close to your idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways? If so, which one, and how might you modify it to make it closer to your ideal? RESPONSE: The best alternative that I feel is NO ACTION. The Riverways are the pride and joy of the Ozarks. The accessibility to them should not be hampered. The modification that I would add is to open up the gap between Big Spring and Van Buren bridge to unlimited horsepower motors. This would benefit the town of Van Buren economically, the home owners along the river, and the overcrowding at Big Spring's landing. 2) Which parts of any of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should be included in the future management of the national riverways? RESPONSE: The NO ACTION alternative is the best. The ONSR is currently available to all public who wish to enjoy them. If we implement any of the alternatives A, B, or C we are then restricting people access to the wonderful Riverways. 3) Which parts of the preliminary alternatives do you feel strongly should not be included in the future management of the national riverways? RESPONSE: To change any part of the river access to non-motorized or lower horsepower should not be included. Motorized boats are enjoyable and part of life for many people all over the area. Non-motorized or low horsepower boats on Current River are dangerous and not practical. Motorized river goes save the lives of many floaters that get themselves into trouble while on the rivers. I strongly feel alternative A will NOT benefit anyone and that ONSR should NOT be deemed a wilderness area. 4) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is 134 miles long, and there may be some areas that are special to you or that you have concerns about. Which are those places and do the alternatives address them adequately? RESPONSE: I have enjoyed all 134 miles of ONSR, but the most special to me is the Van Buren area. The horsepower motor limits should be raised there because of the bigger river size. The gap between Big Spring and Van Buren bridge should be open to unlimited horsepower motors. This would benefit the town of Van Buren economically, the home owners along the river, and the overcrowding at Big Spring's landing. 5) Can you suggest any important strategies or approaches to the management of resources or visitor experiences along the national riverways that you think should be included? If so, what are they? RESPONSE: There should be NO ACTION to the management of the Riverways. The Riverways are here to be enjoyed and shared by all public, and no one should be able to take that away. The Riverways should be freely accessible to all public.	8/4/2009	Yes	46		MO	65548
3811	Superintendent Reed Detring Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, Missouri 63965 Dear Superintendent Detring: I wish to offer these comments concerning the General Management Plan alternatives. I am an equestrian trail rider and treasure riding in the Ozark National Scenic Riverway area. I feel the ONSR should be managed to protect the natural resources while also providing access to recreational activities such as horseback riding. Horseback riding is a long standing tradition and has strong cultural ties to the area. I have read the alternatives and since horses are only to be allowed in the Resource- based and Natural Land-based Management Zones, I feel there should be a blend of alternatives. A blend of alternatives could allow for protection and restoration of degraded biological communities without denying horse access if a well planned trail system is developed and maintained. I would favor nonmechanized forms of recreation as long as there were allowances for adequate number and size of equestrian staging areas and trail heads to park trucks and trailers. Alternative A mentions closing roads and trails that have been illegally developed. With at least one good road to specific destinations and a large enough trail system to keep "legal" trails from being over used this alternative is reasonable. The trail system needs to have enough trails that over use does not occur and thus set the stage for closure. Alternative B seems to allow more for this. If only a few trails become designated or "legal" I feel this would be a deliberate set-up to close shared or multi-use trails in the future and would constitute a design for failure. I favor Alternative B to provide a manageable mix to traditional activities. The "Natural Resource Management" within Alternative B seems difficult to match with the additional trails and a network of learning centers. Restoring natural resources to more pristine conditions seems to promote less access. I do not approve of making access difficult but do approve of well managed and planned trails to protect and restore the natural resources while still providing access. I favor education and promotion of such outdoor ethics such as the Leave No Trace Stock program of the Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen. Many equestrians are aging and unable to access the off road or natural areas by foot. I ask that you recognize and honor the fact that horses/mules are a source of conveyance for many. There are handicapped individuals who access trails with horses and mules. I recognize as does SMMBCH an obligation to handicapped persons through the Americans with Disabilities Act to advocate for access. Please be sensitive to this important provision when developing a new GMP. SMMBCH has heard this and experienced requests from municipal areas such as St. Louis where people have claimed horses and mules as a service animal. While this may be an exception there are still many who can only enjoy our natural resources through some form of conveyance. Many of our southern Missouri trail riders are senior citizens and this provides a way to enjoy our outdoors. While developing and planning for the future management of ONSR, I ask that you recognize the value to the Park of equestrians who belong to and promote the values of Show-Me MO Back Country Horsemen as it pertains to conservation, trail ethics, volunteer service to help preserve our equestrian trails, and our way of life. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the comment period for the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Sincerely, ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Diana Hyde Hydeaway Ranch 78 Pisgah Road Long Lane, Missouri 65590 "The scenic riverways area is my favorite place to ride in Missouri" Paul & Anna Patton Two County Ranch 454 Jones Creek Road Conway, MO 65632-9414 "Please consider keeping trails open for horses and all non-mechanized forms of recreation. My husband and I spend lots of time and money riding our horses in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area. He is 71 and I am 54. Thank you! We are members (very active) in the	7/6/2009	Yes	32		MO	65652-7308

	<p>SWMO Back County Horseman Association." Mary Licata "P.S. While I obviously did not compose this letter, I highly agree with it's content. As a horse owner I am concerned about the decreasing availability of trails for equestrian activity, and the increasing activity of such groups like the Sierra Club--which advocates total non-use. Please remember that the horse industry in Missouri is a major economic benefit to the state and a million dollar industry in the U.S. overall. It would behoove the state to take into consideration the money & jobs created by this recreational activity and plan accordingly for long-term future use. Well-managed, mixed activity trails are available in many parts of the county, where mountain bikes, horses, & hikers share the same trails with great success. My hope is that with good horse operation management and better educated trail riders--this wonderful equine activity will be available in Missouri for my great grand children & beyond." Dale L. Dieckhoff 29829 County Line Road Concordia, MO 64020 "Sir: While I did not compose this letter, it does reflect my views. I am one of the aging equestrians and attend many trail rides in the area. I can attest to the fact that 95+ percent of the trail riders are very protective of the environment. Every group (trail riders, 4-wheelers, dirt bikers, hikers, floaters) has a small percent of irresponsible people that can ruin it for everyone. Please don't let those few affect the future of trail riding in the ONSR. Thanks, Dale" David & Debra Logodon RR 3 Box 85L Kahoka, MO 63445-9474 "We are a couple in our 50's who enjoy going to southern Missouri for our horse vacations. We have a lot of money invested in our horse hobby & would like to continue enjoying where we go riding. We live in northeast Missouri. We also belong to the SMMBCH."</p>					
3812	<p>Dear Superintendent, As a friend of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), I am in favor of a management plan for ONSR that achieves the following: § reaffirms priorities, enforcing regulations originally established by law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations § decreases access roads to every 6 to 8 miles and closes illegally developed roads / trails § limits motorized vehicles to official roads and bans All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) § reduces motorboat horsepower size and limits usage areas for motor boats § enforces scenic and conservation easement restrictions § limits river crossings of horses to only a few and moves trails away from the rivers § restores, studies and monitors the health of the river ecosystem § provides education on ecology, topography, and culture of ONSR Also please ask Congress to: § Increase funding for increased number of park rangers § designate the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area Personal comments: Signature Printed Name Street City _____State ZIP _____ ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS: Stephen D. Moore 3004 McDaniels Street Blue Springs, MO 64015 Please stop the continuing degradation of this beautiful area. Ray Domino 16000 East 37th Street S Independence, MO 64055 This is a unique area that we in MO are lucky to have. Please do all you can to be sure it's managed in accord with the principles mentioned above. Thank you! Alice C. Fuerst 302 NW Golfview Drive Blue Springs, MO 64014 I have not read the plan, but believe we need to limit ATV activity. ATV cause much erosion which leads to degradation of our rivers. Jeff Weary 2600 NW 1st Street Blue Springs, MO 64014 If you have been to this area, than you know these changes need to take place. Please follow as many as the above guidelines as possible. Thanks! Dena L. Love 660 North Spring St., Apt. 609 Independence, MO 64050 Please!!! Help keep Mother Nature to do her precious works. Please!!! Kimberly D. Williams 613 NE 90th Terr Kansas City, MO 64155 Our resources have been shamefully neglected & tha needs to be changed now! Emory Corrigan 12201 East 48th Ter S Independence, MO 64055 We're witnessing disrespect of this area as well as many of our National Parks! Please do your very best with such limited funds! We depend on your to help preserve these gifts of nature for generations to come. With sincere thanks, Emory Corrigan Shirley G. Latore 9112 East 57th Terr. Raytown, MO 64133 It has been years since I have gotten to visit this area, but even if I had never visited, I would still understand the importance of keeping this & other Nature areas in as near perfect condition as possible. Linda J. Chubbuck 201 SE Bristol Drive Lees Summit, MO 64063-5106 The wilderness nees to be loved & protected as a wilderness, not as a playground to destroy & abuse. Please take care of it for us & our grandchildren! David J. Lundquist 213 North 4th Odessa, MO 64076 I've floated the Jack's Fork & Current Rivers several times & have enjoyed it tremendously. Over use of the area can & is destroying the region. We once camped across river to a group of 500 horses. Not much sleep that nite. Harold Johnson 1107 West William Street Savannah, MO 64485-1249 This pristine area deserves protection before it's lost forever! Nancy Gaines 1175 West Division Road Clinton, MO 64735-9021 Enough of our beautiful wilderness areas have been put in jeopardy by George Bush (the "Shrub.") Let's hold on to what we have left. Please. Nancy E. Gaines Rebecca Carle 1212 SW 14 St. Terrace Blue Springs, MO 64015 Whe we go on vacation we make every effort to take advantage of park ranger programs. They are so informative and interesting. Please help conserve the ONSR by limiting access of motorized boats and ATVs. We need to be stewards of our environment. Debra Dolly 85 NW 1150 Road Chilhowee, MO 64733 Please make every effort to protect these green areas & prevent them from becoming commercialized or overrun with people & buildings. Green spaces are becoming too rare. Thank you Roy L. Baskins 2309 North River Blvd. Sugar Creek, MO 64050 1968 Population 3 Billion 2006 Population 6 Billion Most of them are inconsiderant of others & Nature. In favor of above management plan. Used to fish & float Current River. Red Sucker cookouts & camping on gravel bars. Quit 10 yrs. ago, to many people & ATV's. Think problem is to many people in world Michael Lathrop 9011 Main Street Kansas City, MO 64114 I grew up floating these rivers in canoes & innertubes with family, friends a scouts. Please help preserve these fabulous riverways for our children to enjoy. Sincerely Michael Lathrop Joan M. Crews 6212 Claremont Avenue Raytown, MO 64133 This area is beautiful and the naturalness must be preserved for Americans who cannot afford exotic vacations on ocean shores miles away! Joan Crews Pamela S. Workman 15608 T C Lea Road Independence, MO 64050 Especially ban ATVs. They can race their noisy, destructive vehicles somewhere other than natural areas Virginia Newcomb 5817 Ralston Avenue Raytown, MO 64133 Preserve our precious Missouri riverways and wilderness areas. Sandi Malish 8304 NW Hillside Drive Kansas City, MO 64152 Please--Do it for all of us & our future generations. It costs more to fix the longer you let it decline. M. Daniel Lane 1309 SW 22nd Street Blue Springs, MO 64015 The ONSR is an incredible resource. The invasion by such non-native forces such as those outlined above can only serve to decrease its value, it will ultimately destroy it. Please work to maintain it's natural state. M.D. L. Regina Duggan 21902 Peacock Road Higginsville, MO 64037 Please Keep our riverways a peaceful, enjoyable place to be seen and enjoyed by everyone. Barbara Allinder 3808 South Marion Independence, MO 64055 My family has enjoyed these areas for decades. Susan Cooke 4312 South Bryant Court</p>	7/27/2009	Yes	132	MO	64012

	Independence, MO 64055 As a child I was so lucky to get to spend time each summer at Missouri State Teachers Assn's Bunker Hill Ranch Resort. The whole family looked forward to each year's visit. It was so quiet and we slept deeply with open windows. We must protect and preserve our quiet spaces for ourselves and for our natural heritage. BAN ATVS! Bradley Burgess 4701 Fuller Independence, MO 64055 No motor boats above 2 rivers limit horsepower to 25 at 2 rivers river horse crossing for 1 or 2 move trails away from flood plane Jerry White Michael White 701 Pawnee Lane Belton, MO 64012-2940 Missouri has been a leader in environment awarenes being one of the first states to vote for a special tax. Please keep up the good work in this direction Dianne Schmidt 8201 Elm Avenue Raytown, MO 64138 I've spent many wonderful weekends canoeing the Current River and Jack Forks. My canoeing days have ended, but what a legacy for our children and future generations. Keep the Wild, wild. Sharon Arnoldi 11687 Marshall School Road Lexington, MO 64067 As a trailrider who rides horses in this area, I am deeply concerned about the abuses I have personally witnessed. These include people on horses, but also 4 wheelers and erosion causing activities. Please do not allow this beautiful, delicate area to be ruined. Cynthia J. Arnold 1302 Southwind Drive Raymore, MO 64083-9375 I heartily support the above recommended management plan for this valuable area. Carolyn L. Daniels 604-B NW Olive Lee's Summit, MO 64063 I have wonderful experiences on these rivers. As I now have mobility problems & have extreme difficulty getting there now, I want these areas preserved for both my children & grandchildren to enjoy--hiking & canoing. Alyce Elliott 5106 Willow Avenue Kansas City, MO 64133 The Ozarks have allways been importa						
3813	Response to Question 1: Rate HP at the Pump "No Action" Response to Question 2: "No Action" Response to Question 3: A&B&C - lowering the horsepower make the boat not as safe it make it hard to get up out of the water. Response to Question 4: Round Spring - to Owls Ben. Lowering the motor size will make it unsafe for our children, it will not get up on plane as good Response to Question 5: Better boat ramp for Round Springs More Road access	7/7/2009	No			MO	63629
3814	Response to Question 1: No action 40 hP. rated at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Boats Response to Question 4: all 134 miles, No Response to Question 5: More law enforcement to improve rowdy & lewd behavior from canoers	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3815	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horsepower at the Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3816	Response to Question 1: No-Action - If anything, find a way to limit the number of people and animals in the peak season - and No motors on the rivers except troll motors on john boats.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63051
3817	Response to Question 1: Keep as it, dont change hp or the res of the River Response to Question 2: Not changing the horsepower on the boats Response to Question 5: use money to add new campsites with Electric and change a nitely fee.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3818	Response to Question 1: No-action, you should leave it as it is - the people here loves the River and are the one's that pays for it on taxes Response to Question 2: more electric hook ups for RV's Response to Question 3: Leave it as it is. Response to Question 4: Log yard/schoolyard should have Electric	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3819	Response to Question 1: Leave the horse power alone on the river Response to Question 2: Not changing the horsepower on the boats and everyone should be able to continue to use the river, we are the one's thank pay taxes on it and pay the rangers. Response to Question 3: walk in only no swimming no Baots No Tubes No canoe --this is stupid thing to do. Response to Question 4: Schoolyard needs Electric sites and be charged nightly for using them. Response to Question 5: everyone should know the rules and continue to keep the river clean.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63640
3820	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 4: The log yard and Two Rivers, I do not want any changes made Response to Question 5: I enjoy going to the river on the boat and everyone has a great time. Also that is where my family meets up on the weekend	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3821	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 4: Them Places are the log yard and Two Rivers. They are very special to me and my family I was raised there and I want my kids to be one day. Response to Question 5: I have an awesome time at the river and I know everyone else does to and if you look the boat riders are the ones cleaning up the trash, not making the trash.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3822	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 4: Log yard to Two Rivers Response to Question 5: My family & most of our friends all own boats & its an every weekend activity for us. I dont think any changes need to be made.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63638
3823	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: Well pleased with present management.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63640

3824	Response to Question 1: Alternative A the example used in the overview of guided overnight float trips would be OK if there is a limit to how many people are going to be on the river at night. There Are too many people Already on the rivers during the day - Set a limit or issue permits, which could be revoked for drunken, unruly behavior. Response to Question 2: We do not need sights or sounds of motor boats among folks trying to float peacefully or fish. I personally saw a motor boat cause waves that dumped a canoe with two young boys in it. John Boat motors have their place. 40 hp does not. Boats need to be tightly regulated. Response to Question 3: We don't need guides to help folks explore caves. Novices, especially in swim suits, do not venture far into them. And when there's no guide (if they've been on a guided tour) they might come back on their own and get in trouble. Also the term, "Resource-Based Waterways," bothers me. Response to Question 4: Akers to Round Spring is our favorite, and we like to float in the fall - it's quieter then and lovely. In the summer, on weekends, I think patrols should remove obviously drunken folks from the River. Or ban Alcohol in the boats/canoes.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63051
3825	Response to Question 1: A. Remove the Jetmotor from the Ozark Scenic Riverways. Limit the motor size to a 10 horse prop-motor. Response to Question 2: Lowering the horse-power of the motorboats.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63941
3826	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: unrestricted usage and access Response to Question 3: restricted access and usage Response to Question 4: Upper Jacks Fork, since the river is filling up with gravel, the floating is not good and fish are dying out. It seems it would help the economy if we would us the gravel in the rivers as a resourse and improve our rivers. Response to Question 5: provide more resourses to recreationest. Plans to make rivers safer for families.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65438
3827	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: (No Action) Do not limit use of boating or camping Response to Question 3: Parts A-B-C should Not be included Response to Question 4: On Current River I use Blue Spring - Log Yard & Roberts Fields for camping boating & fishing. On Jack Fork at Bay Creek I use for camping & Hunting (No Action) Response to Question 5: More Resourse for canoeing, boating, camping, fishing and hunting. Park Service, Locals, tourriest should work togeather to keep riverways clean and safe for all.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65588
3828	Response to Question 3: the proposed resolution regarding the limitation of 20 horsepower motors on the river, or by lowering this horsepower would be a tragedy that would curtail the use of boats ability to tour the river with more than one or two passengers. Our family has been navigating that waterway for nearly one hundred years your proposal seems too restrictive and misguided.	7/14/2009	No			TX	77304
3829	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: It is fine like it is. Response to Question 5: Let the people that live in the County's around have more a voice in how the Park is used. We use are River for years. We Live Here.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63633
3830	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 hp. rate at the pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: you need 40 h.p. at the pump to be Able to get your family up the River. And it will make less wake for the conoe's. Response to Question 4: I enjoy all of the river, and would like it like it is now. Response to Question 5: more road access, & better ramp's	7/7/2009	No			MO	64119
3831	Response to Question 1: No-Action, The best way to solve problems is more enforcement. We boat from gooseneck to Big Springs we don't encounter floaters & we boat with our 3 kids who live for the River. We own a 60/40 more. & we don't want changes. Response to Question 2: I don't believe we need a limit on horsepower because A few people act crazy but it shouldn't affect us all. The good people who care & take care of our River. Response to Question 3: Absolutley no alternatives at all. You dont go to Branson & tell the locals they can't go to a show because tourist bring more money so don't tell us we can't go to the River as we please. Response to Question 4: Gooseneck to Big Springs. We camp up from Hunter every year mutiple times with our 3 young kids & It would break our hearts & theirs if we couldnt. Response to Question 5: Tourist & Floaters need to respect that we're locals & we run on the River in boats. The Boats need to respect the Floaters & we need more enforcement & we wouldn't have this problem.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63937
3832	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: I think the no-action plan is what will work well in the future because it is working well now. This plan strikes a balance between civilian recreational use and park service management. Response to Question 3: I think the other alternatives exclude too many groups of river users. Response to Question 4: My husband and I have family in the grassy and Logyard areas. We want to be able to continue to use our 40 hp engine with our families in these areas. Response to Question 5: I think the less government intervention the better.	7/7/2009	No			MO	63901
3833	Response to Question 1: No Action Provide more resources for river users Response to Question 2: Free recreatonal usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access Response to Question 4: I use all the river & would like to see less restrictions instead of more Response to Question 5: More access to the river. Leave the 40 HP limit at the Jet	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
3834	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - w/No Horsepower Limits Response to Question 2: more cave tours at round springs Response to Question 3: no horsepower limits on jet boats. They do not pollute the river. The motors are emission free A larger motor is actually safer. Response to Question 4: My family enjoys boat riding on current river. If boats are not allowed, there would be so much of it we couldn't see because we couldn't get to it. Response to Question 5: Manage Alley Springs and Big Springs as Parks but don't try to regulate the river & open land where people hunt.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560
3835	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: More services Response to Question 3: Do not close roads or river access Definately do not restrict horse power limits for boats. Response to Question 4: If I can't use my boat I can't get to Gravel Springs, Paint Rock, or any of the places I like to go. If HP were reduced to 25 I couldn't take my wife & kids.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65560

3836	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do not restrict boats, fishing or hunting. Response to Question 4: I owned a farm along the current river for years. I don't think the Park Service should promote canoeing. It has changed the atmosphere of the rivers. Boaters are fine. They do not act like canoers.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3837	Response to Question 1: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63361
3838	Response to Question 1: No action is closest. I also would like all motor restrictions lifted Response to Question 2: I feel if horsepower restrictions are continued horse power should be measured at the jet rather than the powerhead. Response to Question 3: I oppose any other restrictions on boaters whether its horsepower restrictions or removing boats from any part of the Ozark national scenic riverways. Response to Question 4: Two Rivers to Big Springs. No action is the closest plan it would be better if horsepower restrictions were removed Response to Question 5: Local opinions should matter more than your once a year visitors.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3839	Response to Question 1: My Idea of the best way to manage ONSR is the No-Action plan. This is the way it has been all my life. If anything I would like to see more educated related projects done with the ONSR so that the children today will know how to make this same decision twenty years from now. Response to Question 2: I feel strongly about the horsepower limitations. The limits should stay the way they are now. Also I feel that all of ONSR should be accessible just as it is now. I think providing more facilities, like campsites, picnic areas, boat ramps, and trails would be a good thing for the ONSR and the economy. Response to Question 3: Limitations on where motor boats, floaters or people go should not be included in the future management of the ONSR. Response to Question 4: Current River is very important to me, especially the Van Buren area including Big Springs. I think alternatives A, B and C are too extreme on many issues they address regarding Current River. Response to Question 5: I think education is very important to consider when managing the ONSR.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63960
3840	Response to Question 1: "NO-ACTION" Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DON'T IMPOSE MORE RESTRICTIONS ON POWERBOATS - THE 40 HP LIMIT IN OUR AREA ALREADY PROVIDES FOR A VERY SAFE ENVIRONMENT - AND ALL OF TODAY'S 4 STROKE MOTORS ARE EXTREMELY QUIET IN THAT SIZE RANGE. Response to Question 4: I STAY IN THE VAN BUREN AREA - AND HAVE BEEN BOATING, FLOATING, FISHING, & CAMPING THERE FOR 40 YEARS. I CAN'T TELL THAT MUCH HAS CHANGED - DESPITE THE USE BY US TERRIBLE HUMANS. I HOPE YOU'LL JUST LEAVE WELL ENOUGH ALONE.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63881
3841	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Don't impose Retrections on Power Boats. I feel the 40 hp limit in the area provides a safe environment. All the Boats are really quite. Response to Question 4: I have stayed in the Van Buren area for years. I am older so I really enjoy boating. I am hoping you will leave things the way they are.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
3842	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: I feel there should not be more Restrictions added the powerboats. I think the 4 Stroke motors are safe and quiet. Response to Question 4: I enjoy camping, fishing, floating, and Boating when I stay in the area. I hope you will leave well enough alone.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
3843	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Don't impose Restrestrictions on Power Boats. The 40 hp Limit in the Area is just fine. I feel it is safe. Response to Question 4: I have stayed in the Van Buren Area. While I stayed there I have camped, fished and floated. I am hoping that you will not add more Restrectrictions and leave everything alone.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
3844	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3845	Response to Question 1: Definetly my choice is A! C will continue the downward spiral of abuse & over use eventually ruining what once was & still should be a pristine & sensitive enviroment. I think parts of B like learning centers are a good idea. People need to be able to x perience the river. Motor boats should be banned, for sure above US 60. Response to Question 2: The park should feature nature & its history & should be managed to control people to minimze damage & noise. Horses should be banned or at least have limits of access & numbers. You control #s of canoes why not horses! Response to Question 3: More access that is unmanged/un funded will rapidly destroy the park. People understand limits for the most part for the good of the river. Response to Question 4: Water quality is a fundemental reason Ozark SW is so popular. Making water quality improvements should be priorty #1 - trails, horse poop, oil from motors, too many people camping w/o facilities all contribute & damage the river. Response to Question 5: The riverway is not an island. Its future survival and the quality of visitor experience depends on Park Service exorting influence on all aspects of the surrounding drainage area - timber permits, road development, claning of large tracs of land, bank erosion, etc. all & more must be a part of long range plan.	7/20/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3846	Response to Question 1: No-Action - let thing go as is Response to Question 2: No-Action at this time. Response to Question 3: C Response to Question 4: none at this time Response to Question 5: Keep things as they are - & mointer situation	7/20/2009	No			MO	65571
3847	Response to Question 1: Please take the no-Action Approach Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: C Response to Question 4: None Response to Question 5: We need to let nature take it couse as God intened	7/20/2009	No			MO	65571

3848	Response to Question 1: I think things should stay the way they are or lift HP restrictions for motor boats all together. Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Do not limit motor boat horse power. It would make it too dangerous trying to go up in swift current. Response to Question 4: The ONSR were formed to protect the river but also for recreation. Please do not take away the only recreational activity many families have. Response to Question 5: It will hurt our local economy if you limit horsepower on boats. This decision affects real people.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
3849	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: More trash cans and bathrooms Response to Question 3: Do not limit horse power on the rivers. Jet boats and swimming and fishing are wonderful. Without boats we couldn't get to the good swimming & fishing places. Response to Question 4: All of current river. The alternatives would keep me from getting to the places I want to see. Response to Question 5: let canoes have the Jacks Fork and boats have the Current River	7/20/2009	No			GA	Unknown
3850	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - LEAVE HORSEPOWER 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: NO ACTION! Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, & C Response to Question 4: NO ACITON Response to Question 5: IMPROVE & MAINTAIN BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS. NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEES. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, SUCH AS GRAVEL BARS!	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3851	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: Paint Rock Landing - Only the No-Action is Adequately Log Yard Lainding - Only the No-Action is Adequately Response to Question 5: Make the River more Acessable. With more boat Landings. We Have Helped Canoers, whom had Overturned. And Helped them Retrieve their stuff.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3852	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, and C alternatives Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Fees on Boat Ramps No fees for primitive camping	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3853	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: Paint Rock Landing Log Yard Landing Only the No-Action Addresses them Adequately Response to Question 5: Make the River more Acessable with more boat Ramps. We Have Helped Canoers that had over-turned	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3854	Response to Question 1: No-Action And I would Have No Restrictions on ANY PART of ther river Response to Question 2: No-Action. Anything else would be unsafe travel speed, For emergency Response to Question 3: I feel that A, B, or C should not even be thought of Any Future management of the Riverways. It would be unsafe for a Family of Four to Run anything smaller than a 40 H.P. motor Response to Question 4: I Think all 134 miles are special, I have Been on most of It, and what I haven't Been on I Plan to Someday Response to Question 5: Every Time I visit the Riverways is a experience of a Lifetime I beleive everyone should take a boat Ride UP the River before the determene How it Should be managed.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3855	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION If I was to modify closer to my ideal I would give more access to the public, reopening old roads and make camping areas more accessible. I also do not believe that a person should have any designated campsites or have to pay to camp at campsites, we pay taxes and I believe there are sufficient funds avaiable to keep these site clean and open. Response to Question 2: I believe NO preliminary alternatives should be included in the future management of the national riverways Response to Question 3: I believe all preliminary alternatives should not be included in future management of the national riverways. Response to Question 4: I feel that All of it is special, my family and I spend numerous days on the river from Alley Springs to Gooseneck every year. We also Enjoy walking the trails and visiting the springs and natural sites the Ozark National Riverways has to offer. I STRONGLY am against restrictions of ANY kind, for any amount of time on the riverways. Response to Question 5: I suggest that the Park Service find better ways of being helpful and friendly to the public people, instead of looking for what people are doing wrong or trying to find a reason to punish someone, encourage them to keep it clean, try to help anyway possible in any situation, and work with the public, not against them. Also be more open and let the people know what projects you have going on.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63941
3856	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Leave the river Alone Response to Question 3: to many Restrictions Response to Question 4: We love it All Response to Question 5: We Like the idea of hunting on the river.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3857	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Leave the River alone Response to Question 3: any changes should not be implemented. Response to Question 4: we love the whole river Response to Question 5: Hunter safety programs. Boating safety programs	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3858	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: The no Action Rule Response to Question 3: Change. Response to Question 4: We need more and better Launches Response to Question 5: more hunting and fishing Ideas	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
3859	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Don't add more Restrestrictions on power-boats. The limit are already in place make it safe for the area. The Boats Are not loud either. Response to Question 4: I have camped at Van Buren Area several Times. In may stays there I have been floating, Fishing, and boat Riding. I hope you will not add more Restrestrictions.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63845
3860	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It needs to be rated at the output shaft. The area from round springs to the Powder Mill. They need to leave it like it is. Response to Question 5: More public access to the river & free recreational activities for everyone	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629

3861	Response to Question 1: Plan A Response to Question 2: closing of roads and trails that have been illegally developed. No ATV's Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are important all should be a "preserve". Limited human activity	7/16/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3862	Response to Question 1: No-Action is the closest idea of my idea of the way to manage the ONSR. Stop closing roads and accesses. Provide more NPS agents to control inappropriate, illegal, and destructive behaviors. Response to Question 2: More access to the river by keeping roads open and building ramps and camping grounds so people are not limited to being in areas with large groups. Response to Question 3: No increased restrictions on HP, including rating HP at the powerhead. Discontinue closing roads. They provide access to NPS agents as well as emergency vehicles for rescue along the river. Response to Question 4: Current River - from Jerktail to Van Buren. Jack's Fork-Bay Creek to Two Rivers. Only No-Action protects my freedom to enjoy recreation in the ONSR in the ways my family has for over 50 years. Response to Question 5: No HP restriction changes. Stop closing roads and accesses. Increase NPS agent visibility in high traffic areas. Visibility stops bad behavior!	7/16/2009	No			MO	65775
3863	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Leave things as they are Response to Question 3: Do Not change Horse Power Limits on Boat motors Response to Question 4: Need New Boat Ramp at Round Springs Response to Question 5: more Law enforcement	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629
3864	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is closest to my ideas on how to manage. Ban private motorboats on the Jacks Fork inside the Park Area and on the current, above Two Rivers. Prohibit motorboats and ATV's above Two Rivers and on the Jacks Fork. Response to Question 2: Include Big Spring tract for wilderness designation Emphasize NON-motorized forms of recreation upstream from two Rivers and on the Jacks Fork. Focus equestrian (horse) trails & riding more on areas where they do not cross the river - Prohibit larger structures & future additional human/permanent habitats. Response to Question 3: Allowing additional access points to the Rivers. One official access point which is "developed" is on every 6 - 10 river miles. Close old private roads & "driveways" leading to gravel bars on the river. Alternative C has many bad ideas. Makes the area into a developed recreational park. Response to Question 4: ON Gravel bars - Permit camping. Educate users through literature, personal contact on low-impact camping away from official campgrounds (official = Pulltite - Alley Spring, etc.) I mainly use the river upstream from Owls Bend Powder Mill). Response to Question 5: Education & enforcement. Some good ideas in Alternate B Limit total allowed canoe rentals by zones between Memorial day, Labor Day weekends to slightly more than is used today. Permits for weekend river camping might be necessary during peak weekends in the future.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65725
3865	Response to Question 1: The No Action alternative is my choice. Quit closing roads and accesses to the river. Put more agents to stop illegal behavior. Response to Question 2: We need easier access to the river. Better maintained boat ramps. Stop closing campgrounds, so people have the choice of camping in smaller groups. Response to Question 3: I think the HP restrictions are wrong. Changing how HP is rated is wrong. Closing accesses is wrong. These accesses are used by visitors emergency vehicles and NPS agents. Response to Question 4: Current River from Jerktail to Van Buren. Jack's Fork from Bay Creek to Two Rivers. Any changes will impede my family's traditional use of the river. Response to Question 5: Do not change HP restrictions. Stop closing roads, accesses and campgrounds. Build more campgrounds. More NPS agent visible presence.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65784
3866	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Bath rooms Response to Question 3: Keep open to public Response to Question 4: Bay Creek Two Rivers on Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: No action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63021
3867	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: more law enforcement restrooms Response to Question 3: Keep open to public Response to Question 4: Bay Creek/Two Rivers Response to Question 5: no action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63055
3868	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Restrooms Response to Question 3: Keep open to people Response to Question 4: Bay Creek/Tw Rivers on Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: No action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63021
3869	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPROVE AND MAINTAIN BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS. NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEES. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
3870	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the Power head. It should be Rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: Area from Round Spring to Powder Mill. The "No Action" Alternative Addresses This Area best. Response to Question 5: More public River Accesses. free Recreational Activities to everyone	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
3871	Response to Question 1: no action alternative Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It needs to be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: The area from Round Springs to the Powder Mill. They need to leave it like it is. Response to Question 5: more public access to the river and free recreational activities for everyone.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629

3872	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It should be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: Area from Round Spring to Powder Mill. The "No-Action" alternative addresses this area best. Response to Question 5: More public river accesses. Free recreational activities to everyone.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
3873	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Leave things as they are Now. Response to Question 3: Do Not change Horse Power Limits on Boat motors Response to Question 4: Need new Boat Ramp at Round Springs. Response to Question 5: More Law enforcemett.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629
3874	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Change Leave alone!!! Response to Question 3: Do Not Change Horse Powe Limits on Boat motors. Response to Question 4: New Boat Ramp at Round Springs Response to Question 5: More Law enforcement.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629
3875	Response to Question 1: Yes - No Action. Leave all man made trails intact. They are there because they served a purpose of enjoying the rivers. Response to Question 2: I don't feel too strongly but more park activities for tourists (and natives) would be nice. Response to Question 3: Do not close roads and trails. Do not exclude use of motorized boats Response to Question 5: The rivers seem to be shallower than before. From talking to others, they beleive its because the rock/stone have not been harvested as it was in years past.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65588
3876	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: Restriction of useage - include trails & roads Response to Question 5: Enforcement of current rules & regulation with respect to rowdyness on river - make a family atmosphere.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560-0397
3877	Response to Question 1: No-Action. leave horsepower ratings at the pump. Thanks	7/16/2009	No			MO	65571
3878	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Any new plans should include use of jet boats with current limits Response to Question 3: Limited access and walk in only Response to Question 4: All should include multiple use Response to Question 5: Better RV camping facilities	7/16/2009	No			MO	65566
3879	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: I Like it the way it is Now. Response to Question 3: Any Change in Horse Power on Boat Motors Response to Question 4: It's fine as is Response to Question 5: more Law enforcement	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629
3880	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
3881	Response to Question 1: I PREFER ALTERNATIVE A, KEEPING COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS TO A MINIMUM. OVERNIGHT GRAVEL BAR CAMPING SHOULD BE PERMITTED ONLY IF COMMERCIAL OPERATORS RETURN CAMPS TO PRE-CAMP CONDITIONS UPON LEAVING. Response to Question 2: WILDERNESS STATUS FOR BIG SPRING. Response to Question 3: MINIMAL MOTORIZED ACTIVITY. NO LARGE HORSE TRAIL OPERATIONS CONTAMINATING THE RIVER. NO COMMERCIAL FLOAT TRIPS, OR OVERNIGHT CAMP TRIPS W/ MORE THAN A CERTAIN NUMBER OF POEPL (6?) WITHOUT A SPECIAL PERMIT, RENEWED OR NOT RENEWED IF DAMAGE IS DONE. Response to Question 4: I LIVE NORTH OF JAM-UP CAVE. I WOULD NOT LIKE TO SEE COMMERCIALY GUIDED TRIPS TO THE CAVE. Response to Question 5: MAKE THE COMMERCIAL PERMITS CONTINGENT ON NOT EFFECTING WATER QUALITY, ? WILDLIFE, ? TREES, OR ?? DAMAGE THE ENVIRONMENT WITH TRASH, ETC.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65548
3882	Response to Question 1: No Action! This alternative provides the best option for area residents who use the park primarily for boat access. I would improve it by adding developed access in the Lower Current (west side) where floaters do not frequent. I would also modify the regulations to allow the 60 HP engines, rated at the powerhead. This would allow the use of the popular motors being used today, including those used by the Park Serive. Response to Question 2: No Comment Response to Question 3: No decrease in horsepower should be included. The plan should be about increasing opportunities with reasonable protection for the Park. No additional lands should be given Wilderness Status because past experience has proved that it restricts access to all but a small portion of the population. The plan should be about increasing opportunities to appreciate and enjoy the Park and rivers. Response to Question 4: My biggest concern is not addressed by any alternative. That is the lack of adequate and developed access on the Lower Current Segement (West Side) including Cedar Springs, Grubbs landing and gooseneck. These areas do not have all the floaters such as tubes and canoes. If access was better boaters would stay away from the more populated access. Response to Question 5: While the Park Service has the job of managing and protecting the Park for all citizens, it is the local residents who feel true ownership of the river. It is a part of our daily lives, history & our heritage.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63941
3883	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Boats should ALWAYS be able to be on the river. Who do people turn to when hurt or need help & there's no park service around . . . the john boats w/motors. Most are always willing to help. Response to Question 3: No more restrictions on anything. Just maintain as is. Response to Question 4: Current & Jack's Fork Rivers - Just leave as is. Response to Question 5: Alley Springs Park: Clear the park of trees & bushes along the spring so you can walk thru the park & enjoy seeing the spring like we use to. Maintain it better: neither water faucet @ pavillion or bathroom worked - water faucet broke & water running constantly - bat crap all over tables &	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466

	floor & bats on ceiling.						
3884	<p>Superintendent Reed Detring Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 Dear Sir or Madam: As a longtime friend of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and a member of an organization that fought for the preservation in the 1960's of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I am in favor of a management plan for ONSR that achieves the following: * Substantially decreases the number of access points and close illegally developed roads/trails. * Limits motorized vehicles to official roads and bans ATVs. * Reduces motorboat horsepower size and limits usage areas for motorboats. Five horsepower is large enough for fishing and moving about while not disturbing wildlife and others enjoying peace and quiet of the outdoors. Motors not allowed in primitive areas. * Enforce scenic and conservation easement terms to deal with and prevent building construction and forest-clearing violations and illegal gravel mining. * Limits numbers of horses and river crossings of horses to prevent impact on grounds and restriction of swimming due to E. Coli contamination. * Designates the back country portion of the old Big Spring State Park as Wilderness Area. * Monitors and restores ecological health of water quality, stream beds and banks, riparian zones and native forest habitat. * Reaffirms priorities originally established in law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. I am strongly against the following: * Commercial operations and development that has any negative impact on the Current or Jacks Fork and tributaries. Sincerely, ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Linda Hanley I've been floating these rivers for over 35 yrs & see how much harm has been done by overuse & abuses of the area. Please help save this area NOW! Mac Johnson, Retired Editor 6900 East Zumwalt Road Hartsburg, MO 65039-9759 Missouri conservationist & long-time floater on Current River (since 1961) Ellen Hiatt 10128 Maple Drive Overland Park, KS 66207 The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a wonderful resource for people today & future generations. I appreciate your support. Martha Hall 17102 East 45th Terrace Court South Independence, MO 64055 I ma a member of Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club which was instrumental in protecting these rivers and the area surrounding them. We paddle streams to enjoy nature and get away from too much "civilization." I love this area and want to see it protected for years to come! Nancy B. Doucette 1117 East Shore Drive West Palm Beach, FL 33406 P.S. These Rivers are my favorite place in this country. I hope to paddle them every year until I die. They are no where near as nice as they used to be. Barbara J. Stevenin 3505 Shawnee Mission Parkway Fairway, KS 66205 We must reverse the deterioration of these rivers! Stephen V. Wilson 3700 SW 22nd Street Blue Springs, MO 64015 I have been canoeing the current and jack's fork at least twice per year for the last 36 yrs. and it is simply not the quality experience it used to be. Carolyn Pugh 1602 West Spruce Olathe, KS 66061 I am a member of the Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club (owner). We support an environmentally safe riverway. I hope those in charge of deciding the management plan will want to preserve this natural environment of the rivers and limit the intrusion of commercial development and the negative impact it has on the riverways. Judith A. Guyn 448 East 80th Terr. Kansas City, MO 64131-2119 816-363-0925 jaguyn@aol.com Reed--thanks for coming to the meeting @ the Kansas City Discovery Center. It was helpful to hear the NPS "side". We have since contacted our congressman to request additional funding for you. Vernita Allen 1305 East 76th Street Kansas City, MO 64131 I have canoed these streams for over 40 years, and worked to pass the Scenic Rivers Act. I have been disappointed to see the deterioration in conditions on the streams and have asked my Senators and Representative to provide sufficient funds to enforce rules to maintain the rivers. V.A. Barbara Chase We have canoed the Ozark Streams many times and have seen the deterioration that has taken place over the years. John Rion 26820 West 107th Street Olathe, KS 66061 We are regular users & have witnessed the decline of the area!! Susan Carlson Kansas City, MO Please consider these proposals. Water is Life Karen S. Fahrmeier 5900 Hedges Avenue Raytown, MO 64133 KarenSueF@excite.com I have canoed & camped on these rivers over many years & it is sad to see what over use & misuse is doing to them!! Karen J. Palmer I have been paddling on these rivers since 1976, and each year I see more damage. Margot Signer I have been canoing Ozark Nat'l Scening Waterways for 40 years and value the beauty and peace of the primitive areas Oscar Hawksley, PhD 54 Hawthorne Hill Drive Warrensburg, MO 64093 I served as Chairman (appointed by Sec. of Interior) of the Citizen's Advisory Commission for the Riverways for 5 of the 10 years of its existence stipulated by th original Act. As a participant in the drafting of the inital Management Plan, I feel that the above guidelines are reasonable and appropriate for management of the Riverways today. OH George F. Muehlback The beauty and serenity of this area must not be allowed to be destroyed. Sooner or later the youth of this country will put down their electric games and venture outside and there must be something left for them to see and enjoy. Janet Alexander The ONSR is a National Park. It needs our attention NOW to preserve it.</p>	7/22/2009	Yes	142	Sierra Club, Missouri Chapter	MO	64014
3885	<p>Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action - 40 HP. Limit Rated at Pump Response to Question 3: none Response to Question 4: round Springs to blue springs, This is a area where you can take the family & enjoy the river. This a area we been going to for 50 years. We have grown up in a little piece of Heaven. Please don't take it away. Response to Question 5: Pleas make more boat ramps - Boat access. Round spring & Two rivers, Owls Ben Every Chance we get we are at the river. Enjoying life. We pick up people that are lost, take them back to the Canoe rental, use first aid when they need it. picking up the stuff when they roll over. I would like to see more rangers on the water.</p>	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3886	<p>Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: DO NOT RESTRICT BOATING ANY FURTHER THAN IT ALREADY IS! Response to Question 3: NO FURTHER RESTRICTION OF BOATING! Response to Question 4: JACKS FORKS TO DONIPHAN. IF YOU WISH TO IMPROVE THINGS MAKE YOUR RANGERS MORE VISIBLE ON THE GRAVEL BARS AND GIVE HEAVY FINES FOR LITTERING TO TUBERS & RAFTERS. WE BOATERS ARE TIRED OF CLEANING UP THEIR MESS. Response to Question 5: MAKE YOUR RANGERS MORE VISIBLE. DON'T HIDE THEM IN THE WOODS.</p>	7/28/2009	No			MO	63965

3887	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate H.P. at the Pump Response to Question 2: "No Action" Response to Question 3: ABC With a Family you Need at least 40 HP at the Pump to be safe to get up out of the water Response to Question 4: I like Round Springs to Owls Ben Response to Question 5: Better Boat Ramp	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3888	Response to Question 1: "No Action" Response to Question 2: "None" Response to Question 3: The horse power ratings of an outboard motor should be rated by the output shaft only. Response to Question 4: River boating and un maintained access from Round Springs to Powder Mill. "No Action" is the best alternative. Response to Question 5: The current managment is caplable of providing a good experience for everyone.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3889	Response to Question 1: No Action Alternative Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: The horsepower of an outboard motor should be rated at the output shaft, not the power head. Response to Question 4: Area from Round Springs to Powder Mill. The "no action" alternative would be the best. Response to Question 5: more public river access & free recreational activities for everyone.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3890	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: NO ACTION! Response to Question 3: NO ACTION! should be the choice! Response to Question 4: NO ACTION! Response to Question 5: We live 1 1/2 mi from Two Rivers - 10 yrs ago we purchased a jet boat - & soon learned we could not use it due to congestion of the visitors from other places. Wwe were embarrassed to take our guests due to the drunkenness, nudity, vulgarity, rock throwing, Ignorance!!! The past superintenenent, Noel Poe, tried to get a handle on these problems but was so understaffed he only made a dent in the problem. P.S. We Sold our boat at a big loss!	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
3891	Response to Question 1: No Action Open Gap from Big Springs to Van Buren Response to Question 2: No Action Horsepower measured at the Jet Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B, C should not be included Don't want wilderness Areas, non-motorized zones Response to Question 4: My family enjoy boating and fishing from log yard to Gooseneck. The River is our family recreation from camping - fishing - boating and Giggig year around. Alternatives A, B, C would place to many restrictions and limit our family because of HP restriction. Response to Question 5: Alt. A, B, C restrict Local Resident by HP and Recreation opportunities for 365 days to benefit tourist 24 days - weekends, 4 weeks a month for 3 months. If you are wanting manage your resource address invasive and noxious weeds that are over taking the native vegetation. These weeds are more distructive than boats!!!	7/14/2009	No			MO	63941
3892	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action horsepower measured at the Jet Response to Question 3: A,B,C should not be included Don't want wilderness Areas. Response to Question 4: My Family enjoy boating, fishing, camping and Giggig from Powder Mill to Gooseneck and HP restriction would limit our recreation. Response to Question 5: Alt. A,B,C restrict Local Residents by HP and Recreation for 365 days to benefit tourist 24 days - weekends - 4 weeks - 3-months. Manage your resources by controlling noxious weeds, they are more destructive than Boats!!!	7/14/2009	No			MO	63941
3893	Response to Question 1: No Action Open gap from Big Springs to Van Buren Response to Question 2: No Action Horsepower be measured at the output shaft (Jet). Response to Question 3: Alternative A, B and C should not be included. Don't want wilderness, non-motorized, and seaasonal use zones. Response to Question 4: My Family enjoy boating and fishing from Log yard to Gooseneck. Have growed up in Van Buren and raising my kids and the River is our life. I have seen it restricted 20 yrs ago and don't want further restrictions so my kids can raise there family and enjoy the river. A; B; C Alternatives are to restrictive. Response to Question 5: with Alternative A, B, C would restrict Local Residents by hp restriction, Recreation opportunities all year, to make changes to benefit tourist which are just here for 2 days a week, 4 weeks a month for 3 months which is 24 days compared to 365 days. The Areas that is most conjested is not even in NPS Easement 4 miles @ Van Buren so what good will this do.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63941
3894	Response to Question 1: No Action Necessary Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: At pressent, usage appears appropriate Response to Question 4: Beautiful area w/ high usage which is appropriate at present Response to Question 5: N/A	7/14/2009	No			MO	63028
3895	Response to Question 1: No action is the plan that closely matches my idea of the best way to manage Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 2: No action plan Response to Question 3: All of them except the no action plan. Response to Question 4: I love the entire 134 miles. My favorite areas are near Alley Springs and Blue Springs. Response to Question 5: Improve the boat launches, public restrooms. Please focus on improving what is there.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63755
3896	Response to Question 1: (No-Action) If any change to HP limits, make them bigger. The little motors we run now barely have enough power to push our families up the river. Leave HP rated at the Jet Output. Response to Question 2: Open everything back up! Including roads, horse trails, HP Limits. This is the riverways. Not a Park. The people have managed it for centuries. Leave it, and or put it back that way. Response to Question 3: All of the parts! Leave everything as is! The No-Action alternative is the only one that needs to be an alternative. Response to Question 4: I travel ALL of it. Mostly from Two Rivers up though Current River, and Jacks Fork Both. Response to Question 5: During the summer hours, especially on the weekends, If visitors (canoes, tubes) think they may have problem with Jet Boats from Two Rivers up. They should be required to float above Round Spring, or go on Jacks Fork where few if any Jet Boaters ride.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466
3897	Response to Question 1: (No-Action) Ozark National Scenic Riverways is supposed to belong to the People who use it! Not the Park Service. Stop trying to tell people what they can't do or can do. Response to Question 2: You don't have an alternative that fits this! -Open HP Limits back up so that bigger motors can be run. -Open old road back up that you have already closed. -Open horse trails back up you have already closed. Response to Question 3: -Do not cut down HP Limits. The size motor we are Allowed to run now barely have enough power to push our families - Do Not close roads. People use these roads for hunting, fishing, or just personal recreational time off by themselves. -Do Not close horse paths. A huge portion of money comes from horse back riders. Response to Question 4: Every bit of it I enjoy hunting, fishing, boat riding, floating it.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65466

	Was born and raised here doing it. Doesn't seem right people who may not have even visited here can tell me I cannot do any of this any longer. Response to Question 5: Rangers are supposed to be here to Serve and Protect. They are NOT here to just be looking for someone doing something wrong JUST so they can write a ticket. Which is the ONLY thing any of them do these days.					
3898	Response to Question 1: No Action - Leave the Boats & motors alone!! Regulate How many Tubes are in the River on a daily Basis. The canoes usually doesn't Bother us Locals But the Thousands of Tubers are our Biggest problem. Response to Question 2: No Action!!! You've done enough to the Locals back in the 60's. Just Leave us alone! You Guys came in here and bullied your way into poor uneducated farmers and gave them a choice sell or we'll condemn your land. Theres 5 family farms in my family alone that was taken away from us. Response to Question 3: A B C - Let the Locals have some fun on Current River. Usually my family has to drive around 15 mile down to Chilton to put our Boat in to get away from the tourist. If anything their should be No canoes or Tubers past Big Springs Park Landing. If the Locals are fortune enough they can put in a Big springs Park, But alot of Locals puts in a Chilton Grubb Hollow, Catarack Landings. I only live 1/2 mile from 1 but we have to go 15 miles out of our way. Response to Question 4: We would like to get the Chance to buy or Lease our Family Famrs Back. Right Now They are over grown with mutiply Rose Bushes & Weeds. At one time they were productive farms. ONSR at one point was leting Locals go in & cut the Hay off these Farms but No more! Response to Question 5: Yes. Since our Boats has to have a Number on them so they can be Identified If Need be, I feel like the thousands of Tubes that are Rented should have a Number & marking so if the Need arises us Boaters can have some proof If the Tubers are causing any Trouble, or Lewd behavior in front of our family members. The Locals Loves Current River. We go behind the tourist and pick up their trash so our River wont Look Nasty. We dont care to share Current River with others But the Boaters are always getting bad mouth. The Locals helps the tourist when they are on a Root wad. we help saves their Lives.	6/30/2009	No		MO	63965
3899	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Unrestricted Usage and Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Usage and Access Response to Question 4: Buck Hollow, Blue Springs, Ebb & Flow and Rymers need gravel taken out so the river can be floated wihtout haven to pull the boat most the way! Gravel needs to be removed from the Jacks Fork! Response to Question 5: Provide more resources to recreationists	7/14/2009	No		MO	65438
3900	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: motor limits on Boats Response to Question 4: The whole O.N.S.R. needs to be protected from tourists. Locals should be Allowed imput on the river they live on. No They do not Address them Adequately. Response to Question 5: Visitors should have to by a Permit to float or canoe. Local Landowners should be given tags, to prove they Live there, for their boats free of charge	6/30/2009	No		MO	63965
3901	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE C With this choice Add programs About Traditional Ozark Life. Add "FLOAT CAMPS". Add New gujide Services to help small groups explore caves. Continue to offer All the Activities Found in No-Action Alternative. Response to Question 2: INCLUDE ALL THE NO-ACTION ALTENATIVE Activities. Include guided small group cave tours of Added caves Beyond that of Round Spring cave. Include Living History by opening preserved Farmstead to public Tours & visitation. Add Boater & hunter Safety Classes. Response to Question 3: DO NOT STOP ANY OF THE CURRENT Activities As Canoeing Kayaking motor boating. Do Not Close Roads which have been in existence Longer then the Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park. Simply, Do Not Change Today's Activities But Do & Allow more Activites Listed in ? 1 Response to Question 4: Clean up & Restore Barn at Powder Mill. Open it As A Ozark Living History Fa cility. Open to the public the Farm Stead At Powder Mill As A Living History museum. Volunteers could help with these fa cilities Response to Question 5: Visitors Need More Learning possibilities to Appreciate the History and delicacies of Nature. More interputive opportunatives for Learning. I believe this will help the Park visitor and Local Alike Appreciate the more and would Treat the Park with more Respect.	6/30/2009	No		MO	65466
3902	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - CURRENT RIVER CONDITION ARE FINE. THE RIVER SHOULD BE OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC & BOATING CONDITIONS. "BUSINESS AS USUAL"	7/24/2009	No		MO	63368
3903	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is closest beacuse it encourages quieter, more traditional recreation eg swimming & canoeing & fishing, but I also like the learning activities of B. Response to Question 2: The closing of the illegal access roads Response to Question 3: Anything that encourages motor boats or other motorized activities Response to Question 4: I would like to canoe Jack's Fork. Will I encounter motor boats? Response to Question 5: Missouri has plenty of lakes to serve the needs of those who like motors. Rivers should be reserved for non-motorized sports.	7/24/2009	No		MO	63104
3904	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 4: Van Buren area	7/24/2009	No		MO	63017
3905	Response to Question 1: I SUPPORT THE NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE	7/24/2009	No		MO	63052
3906	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: parts A, B, C Response to Question 4: All is special, NO ACTION is the best Alternative to address Response to Question 5: Register all tubes, canoes in the same manor as boats. Research impact of tourist on the river compaird to locals/boaters to Floaters.	7/24/2009	No		MO	63965

3907	Response to Question 1: No Action! I would improve boat access in the Lower Current (Cedar Springs, Grubbs, & Gooseneck). I would also modify the regulation to allow the 60 HP engines, rated at the power head. This would allow the poplar motors used today, including those used by the Park Service. Response to Question 2: No Comment Response to Question 3: No decrease in engine horse power should be included. The Plan should be about increasing opportunities not decreasing them. I feel no more lands should be given Wilderness status because this limits access to all but a very few people. Response to Question 4: My biggest concern is the lack of adequate boat access on the west side of the Lower Current (Cedar Springs) & the upper Current-Lower Segement (Rocky Creek). Better access to these areas would allow boaters to move away from the more heavily floated areas where tubes & canoes are. Response to Question 5: While the Park Services job is to manage and protect the Park for all citizens, the people who live here are the ones who feel true ownership of the river, not the ones who come here once or twice a year.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63941
3908	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: No-Action, 40 HP. Limit Rated At Pump Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Blue Springs Response to Question 5: more Boat Access Like At Round Springs, & Two Rivers & Owls Bend Put more Rangers & water Patrol on the River Not in Vehicles in Boats & Conoes This is America Not Russia or China. No Charge	7/28/2009	No			MO	63629
3909	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: It would not be wise to change horse power of the outboard motors. Leave like it is Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Powder Mill. The no action alternative is the best for this area. Response to Question 5: More Public accesses to the river.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3910	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: I would like to leave the power of the outboard motor where it is now Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Log Yard. The no action alternative is best. Response to Question 5: We need more accesses not less.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3911	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Dont change the requarment for Horsepower of outboard motors use on the river. Response to Question 4: Round Springs down stream to the Log Yard. Response to Question 5: Make Public accesses and camping more user Frindly	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
3912	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the horsepower at the pump. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives, A, B, C Response to Question 4: I like to fish the river from Acres Ferry to the Arkansas line. Response to Question 5: Better boat ramps to access the river. Better maintained roads along the river.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3913	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A ENFORCE THE LAWS! Response to Question 2: ENFORCING LAWS! STOP ATV'S! Response to Question 4: JAM UP CAVE - VERY IMPORTANT. I AM NOT SURE IF THE ALTERNATIVES ADDRESS THE NEED TO PROTECT BECAUSE I DON'T SEE ENFORCEMENT. Response to Question 5: JUST ENFORCE THE LAWS. MAYBE MORE QUALIFIED PERSONEL WOULD HELP	7/24/2009	No			MO	65438
3914	Response to Question 1: NO! WASN'T THE OBJECTIVE OF ONSR TO PRESERVE THE PRISTINE BEAUTY OF THE AREA - IF SO THEN THAT OBJECTIVE HAS TO INCLUDE FIRST AND FOREMOST THE QUALITY OF THE RIVERS & SPRINGS - FROM WHAT I HAVE READ IN THE ALTERNATIVES WATER QUALITY SEEMS TO BE A DISTANT CONCERN COMPARED TO APPEASING SPECIAL INTERST GROUPS BE IT MOTOR BOATS, ATV'S, HORSBACK RIDERS OR EVEN A CRUSH OF CANOES & KAYAKS. A IS A BETTER ALTERNATIVE THAN B OR C - IT JUST DOESN'T GO FAR ENOUGH. Response to Question 2: BIG SPRING AREA WILDERNESS DESIGNATION - AND THEN ENFORCE IT! Response to Question 3: MORE DEVELOPEMENT - ONSR HAS ALREADY BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY DEGRADED BY INAPPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES (MOTORIZED VEHICLES & WATER POLLUTED BY HORSES) Response to Question 4: ALL 134 ALL ARE SPECIAL TO ME - TO HEAR THE BIRDS SING & SQUIRLS CHATTER INSTEAD OF SOUNDS OF CIVILAZITION - TO TAKE A SWIM FROM A GRAVEL BAR CAMPSITE WITHOUT THE WATER BEING CONTAMINATED FROM HORSES SOMEWHERE UPSTREAM - TO FLOAT QUIETLY & ENJOY THE BEAUTY WITHOUT BEING THREATNED BY DRUNKS OR SUBJECTED TO NUDITY Response to Question 5: THE TIME IS PAST DUE FOR MOTO BOATS, MOTORIZED VEHICLES OF ALL KINDS & HORSEBACK RIDING TO BE BANNED FROM THE PARK - MAYBE EVEN TIME FOR A LOTTERS SYSTEM FOR PADDLERS LIKE ON SOME RIVERS OUT WEST	7/24/2009	No			MO	65746
3915	Response to Question 1: I do not like any of the alternatives Response to Question 2: None of these Response to Question 3: none of these should be included Response to Question 4: I enjoy all of the River. I want all of these places open for me when or if I choose too use these resourcses it is my right as an american citizen to enjoy what God as created as well as my right as a human being Response to Question 5: I think within reason people should be left alone to enjoy it as they see fit. Within the boundaries of the law (of course)	7/24/2009	No			MO	65588
3916	Response to Question 1: NO Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: ALL Response to Question 4: ALL PLACES CURRENTLY USED BY EQUESTERANS Response to Question 5: LEAVE THINGS LIKE THEY ARE	7/24/2009	No			MO	65560
3917	Response to Question 1: No. I do not want any changes made to our Rivers. Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: all of these. Response to Question 4: I enjoy going to the mouth of Rocky with my family and I enjoy letting my children play in the River. I don't want anything to change. Response to Question 5: Leave our rivers alone.	7/24/2009	No			MO	65588
3918	Response to Question 1: I support the No-Action alternative.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63052

3919	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Leave HP rating @ the pump 40 hp for boat motors Response to Question 2: None of other plans. Leave it alone. The only thing would be Response to Question 3: No changes Necessary Alternatives A, B, & C should not be included Response to Question 4: Leave it alone - No changes Necessary. Response to Question 5: Our family & friends have used this river for their whole lives - we pride ourselves on keeping the river clean & beautiful as always - it is our recreation. Anyone who abuses the river & tries to change it - we don't want.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63638
3920	Response to Question 1: No-Action - Allowing the boats & higher hp to remain for the Local People to enjoy. Response to Question 2: More patrolling in the heavy float areas, visible where floaters are able to see Patrol Officers. Response to Question 3: Lowering the hp on boats, that would be a huge cost for the Local People. 40 & up below Big Springs 40 & up above Waymeyer. Response to Question 4: Below Big Springs area, my family enjoys the river for entertainment, fishing & boat riding, that is about the only area that allows 115 hp to boat ride. No the alternatives are not adequate. Response to Question 5: Limit & patrol the tubes & canoes. It's so crowded up river we don't go there. The boats try & stay clear of this crowded 2 mile stretch.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63965
3921	Response to Question 1: Rate H.P. At the pump No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Less than 40 H.P. At the Jet pump would make it more unsafe with a load with family. Response to Question 4: We love all of the River ways, and if this goes into effect we will just be very un happy. I have been on Scenic River ways for 32 years Response to Question 5: The people & the park service help both sides out. And Better boat ramp's	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3922	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate the Horse Power at the Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C Response to Question 4: I like to fish the River All the way From the Head of it to the Arkansas Line Response to Question 5: Boat Ramps to Access the River Better and Roads Cleared & maintian Better All Along the River	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3923	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 HP at the jet Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt ABC Response to Question 4: No Alt 40 Hp at the jet Response to Question 5: better boat ramps	7/8/2009	No			MO	63624
3924	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate it at 40 hrp at the pump. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A. B. C Response to Question 4: Use different Parts of it. No Action is Best Response to Question 5: No Canoe's more landing.	7/8/2009	No			MO	65566
3925	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt A-B-C- Response to Question 4: Several Different Parts of the River Response to Question 5: More & Improve Boat Ramps & Parking.	7/8/2009	No			MO	65565
3926	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: Would like to see concrete Boat Ramp at Jerktail Landing	7/8/2009	No			MO	63037
3927	Response to Question 1: 1. No Action 2. More River Education for school children. 3. More considerations for Local Tax payers Response to Question 2: 1. Education Response to Question 3: 1. The changing of Boat moter sizes 2. Elimanation of gravel Bar camp sites. Response to Question 4: 1. Sinking Creek camping 2. No! Response to Question 5: 1. NPS needs to work closly with the Locals, on camping, Litering, River controll (people), and Just General over-all public Relations.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3928	Response to Question 1: Rate horse power at the pump. "No Action" Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B & C - lowering the horse power, will make boating up and down the river Not as safe. Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Van Buren. Lowering the horse power will make it unsafe for boater's, the boat wouldn't have enough power to get up on top and plane out. Response to Question 5: It would be nice to be able to put our boats in with hanging up on the gravel bars. Boat ramps in a few areas around Powder Mill and Log Yard would be good.	7/8/2009	No			MS	63638
3929	Response to Question 1: No Change I like riding up river setting on gravel bar relaxing & watching people float down the river.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63834
3930	Did not respond to any of the questions.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63638
3931	Did not respond to any of the questions.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65466
3932	Did not respond to any of the questions.	7/6/2009	No			MO	65466

3933	Did not respond to any of the questions.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63074
3934	Did not respond to any of the questions.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63031
3935	Response to Question 1: No Action - Keep Rivers open Response to Question 2: Unlimited access to all Rivers Response to Question 3: Restrictions Response to Question 4: more public access roads Response to Question 5: more recreational usage & Access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63109
3936	Response to Question 1: My preference is no action. More River Roads. Response to Question 2: unrestricted access to all rivers Response to Question 3: Restricted access & usage Response to Question 4: I usse these rivers (all of them) and would like more Public Roads Response to Question 5: more recreational access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63117
3937	Response to Question 1: No Action - we need more Resources added to the current recreational opportunites Response to Question 2: Free Access to All Rivers Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usages and Access Response to Question 4: I use the upper Jacks Fork and Current Rivers and would like more publice Acess Roads Response to Question 5: more recreational usage & Access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63109
3938	Response to Question 1: No Action - I would like to SEE EVEN MORE RESOURCES Added - more Roads to the Rivers, more boat Ramps, Etc. Response to Question 2: Free usage & free access - The way the economy is, people need to have free use of their public land and rivers. Response to Question 3: Restricted access. Response to Question 4: Campgrounds - we need more that cost nothing and do away with number of tents per campsite. Response to Question 5: I think you should add additional camp areas & additional access to the rivers & creeks at no charge.	7/6/2009	No			MO	63010
3939	Response to Question 1: No-action, provide more resources to present facilities Response to Question 2: free access and usage to all rivers Response to Question 3: restricrcted access should not be included Response to Question 4: the riverways themselves are impotant to me. Response to Question 5: add boat ramps (paved) and more dumpsters	7/6/2009	No			MO	63143
3940	Response to Question 1: More Places to Present recreational Access Response to Question 2: free recreation usage and access. Response to Question 3: Restricted usage and access Response to Question 4: Jack Fork River Response to Question 5: More Facilities	7/6/2009	No			MO	63028
3941	Response to Question 1: No more action Response to Question 2: free & better access and more access Response to Question 3: any restrictions Response to Question 4: Two rivers - love them both Response to Question 5: more handicap accesses & bathrooms	7/6/2009	No			MO	63128
3942	Response to Question 1: no action - add better facilities, bathrooms, dumpsters ect. Response to Question 2: Free usage Response to Question 3: Any restrictions should not be included Response to Question 4: Jerktail & Bay Creek area Response to Question 5: Add more bathrooms & other facilities	7/6/2009	No			MO	63128
3943	Response to Question 1: No-action, add handicap accesses & bathrooms Response to Question 2: Free usage Response to Question 3: Any restrictions should not be included Response to Question 4: Two rivers is special to me and my family Response to Question 5: Add additional accesses and up-to-date bathrooms	7/6/2009	No			MO	63005-6546
3944	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: horses (owned) ATV and jeeps out of river. Response to Question 3: Restricted Access Response to Question 4: They are all important to me, I want access to all the riverways Response to Question 5: Add additional accesses - and some for the handicapped	7/6/2009	No			MO	63026
3945	Response to Question 1: I SUPPORT THE "NO-ACTION" ALTERNATIVE. I AM A TAX PAYER AND REGISTERED VOTOR AND I ENJOY BOATING ON CURRENT RIVER, AND HAVE FOR THE PAST 42 YEARS. I WOULD LIKE TO CONTINUE USING THE RIVER WITH MY BOAT AND 40 H.P. MOTOR. ALSO REDUCING HORSEPOWER AND ELIMINATING BOATING WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF VAN BUREN AND SURROUNDING AREAS. Response to Question 2: LESS REGULATIONS Response to Question 3: REDUCTION OF HORSEPOWER AND/OR ELIMINATING BOATING Response to Question 4: POWDER MILL (HWY 106) TO GOOSNECK. TWO OF THESE ALTERNATIVES(A & B) WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW ME ACCESS TO AREAS ABOVE VAN BUREN WITH OUR 40 H.P. MOTOR. ALSO WE USE THE RIVER YEAR ROUND AND FEEL THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO BETTER ACCOMODATE CONJESTED CONDITIONS THAT OCCUR A FEW WEEKS DURING THE SUMMER MONTHS. Response to Question 5: 1. ELIMINATE HORSEPOWER RESTRICTION ON THE SHORT SECTION OF RIVER FROM THE SOUTH END OF THE VAN BUREN GAP TO THE BIG SPRING LANDING. THIS WILL ALLOW MORE ACCESS POINTS FOR LARGER BOATS WHICH WILL HELP REDUCE CONJESTION AT BIG SPRING LANDING. 2. KEEP MEASURING JET MOTOR HORSEPOWER AT THE OUTPUT SHAFT OR PUMP 3. PROVIDE MORE BOAT RAMP ACCESS.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63965

3946	Response to Question 1: No Action - more resources Response to Question 2: Free access to All Rivers Response to Question 3: Restricted use Response to Question 4: I use these rivers & enjoy them - keep access free & unrestricted Response to Question 5: more usage, roads & access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63109
3947	Response to Question 1: No Action - more access & free use of rivers Response to Question 2: Free Access to Rivers Response to Question 3: Any restrictions should not be included Response to Question 4: more Access Roads on both rivers Response to Question 5: more usage & access	7/6/2009	No			MO	63116
3948	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION Response to Question 2: more River access points, concessionstands on River bank Response to Question 3: No Limitation on outboard motors Response to Question 4: From Alley to Two Rivers and from Round Spring to Van Buren and Van Buren to Big Spring (No gap") Response to Question 5: No Nude boating or floating	7/6/2009	No			MO	63965
3949	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION, EXCEPT TO BAN HORSES, ATVS Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATION USAGE & ACCESS Response to Question 3: NONE OF THE PLANS. NO ACTION, EXCEPT TO BAN HORSES, ATVS. Response to Question 4: 134 MILES. NO ACTION, EXCEPT TO BAN HORSES, ATVS. Response to Question 5: NO ACTION, EXCEPT TO BAN HORSES, ATVS	7/6/2009	No			MO	63109
3950	Response to Question 1: No action required. Would like more resources added to current rec. Areas Response to Question 2: Free recreation usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & access Response to Question 4: BAY CREEK RIVER ACCESS. unlimited access Response to Question 5: MORE ACCESS	7/6/2009	No			MO	63028
3951	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren, but Leave all areas un-changed Response to Question 5: If you have something or anyone that is highly abusing what we have in place Now or Jeopardizing the Safety of others, take care of that problem ONLY. Leave everyone else alone to enjoy the river.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63638
3952	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION REMOVE ALL HORSEPOWER LIMITS Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: ALL NO-ACTION Response to Question 5: NO ACTION	7/8/2009	No			MO	63801
3953	Response to Question 1: Rate H.P at the Pump No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All . . . A, B, & C. Restricted access to the river and lower H.P. makes it more dangerous for boaters and canoers. The boat will not get up on plane as well and will cause a bigger wake on the canoers. Response to Question 4: All, but especially Round Springs to Owls Bend for boat riding. Response to Question 5: To improve the rowdy & lewd behavior as mentioned in the Park Service article, I suggest more law enforcement. The majority of the problem is from the canoers not the local boat riders.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3954	Response to Question 1: No Action 40 HP rated at the Pump Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: All . . . A, B, & C. Restricted access to the river and lower H.P makes it more dangerous for boaters and canoers. The boats will not get up on plane as well and will cause a bigger wake on the canoers Response to Question 4: All Response to Question 5: More law enforcement to improve pollution and the lewd behavior. The majority of the problem is the canoers. Not the local boat owners.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3955	Response to Question 1: No action 40 HP rated at the pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: All . . . AB & C. Lower HP makes boats & canoers less safe. Response to Question 4: All Response to Question 5: Improve boat ramps Better parking	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3956	Response to Question 1: No action Rate HP at the pump. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: All . . . AB & C Response to Question 4: All Response to Question 5: More law enforcement	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3957	Response to Question 1: Rate H.P. at the Pump "No Action" Response to Question 2: "No Action" Response to Question 3: A-B-C Restict Access to the River & lower H.P makes the boats less Safe, with a load for are Family Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Owls Ben for Boat Riding & Fishing Round Springs up for Gigging For Riding & Fishing. Lowering the motor size will make it unsafe for our children. it will not get up on plane as good. and will make a bigger wake on the Conoe's Response to Question 5: Better Boat Ramp's For Round Springs. More Law inforcement. About the Park Service article in the New's Paper, ther right about the Roudy & lewd behavior & trash problem. The city people come to the country and think they can do anything they want to. Proff is you can go to Shannon County court house & check the address's of the people who are getting the tickets	7/8/2009	No			MO	63629
3958	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives ABC Response to Question 4: No Action on All Response to Question 5: I boat to fish but I dont want to limit my access and I have a 40 hp Johnson	7/8/2009	No			MO	63633
3959	Response to Question 1: I love boating on Current River. I would like to keep the current management plan.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63935

3960	Response to Question 1: No action! I feel the river is fine the way it is now. As a boat owner and a person who loves to tube, I think they both can co-exist. We are lucky to have such a beautiful river for all to enjoy. Response to Question 2: Listen carefully to the local peoples' suggestions. And by the way, I am not a local resident, I just enjoy coming to river as much as possible.	7/8/2009	No			MO	63834
3961	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative ABC Response to Question 4: Whole River Response to Question 5: Fix Ramps, Roads	7/8/2009	No			MO	63601
3962	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Leave Rules alone Response to Question 3: Horse power Limits Response to Question 4: The Entire River Response to Question 5: Leave it As-is	7/8/2009	No			MO	63901
3963	A.) Maintain A "Family Friendly" environment. B.) Restrict Maximum Horsepower to 40 hp. C.) Establish & enforce Speed Limits in Those Areas Primarily utilized by Canoes & Floaters. D.) Strictly enforce Laws regarding D.U.I. E.) More Arrests & Fines for Public drunkenness & drug usage. F.) Restrict Noise Levels.	8/26/2009	No			MO	63901
3964	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: "Big Spring tract would not be proposed for Wilderness designation" Response to Question 3: All of A: All sections focus on more control by Riverways personnel All of B: All sections focus on more Riverways management All of C: Too vague; Guided recreation? No thanks. Response to Question 4: All parts of the ONSR are equally special Response to Question 5: Clarify statutes re resources through workshops/public meetings perhaps at beginning of season. Warn rather than cite for minor equipment offenses. Citations early and often for major offenses: alcohol abuse, reckless boating, profanity disturbing to others	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
3965	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL USE AND ACCESS AS IS CURRENTLY PERMITTED Response to Question 3: DO NOT CHANGE THE RESTRICTIONS OR ACCESS AS THEY NOW STAND. Response to Question 4: WE ENJOY TAKING OUR KIDS AND GRANDKIDS ON CURRENT RIVER FROM WATERCRESS SOUTH FOR 10-12 MILES. WE WATCH WILDLIFE, FISH, COOKOUT AND WE CLEAN-UP. WE ALSO ENJOY THE COMPANY OF OTHER FOLKS WHO RESPECT THE RIVER. Response to Question 5: ENFORCE THE RULES ALREADY ESTABLISHED. LITTERING, INTOXICATION, DRUG USE, OBSCENE LANGUAGE ARE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS AND ARE NOT RELATED TO 40 HB 3 CYLINDER MOTORS WHICH ARE LEGAL.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
3966	Response to Question 1: A. I like the idea of limited engine sizes on boats & I'd love to see LESS tubers & drunk rafters. Making sure you have a handle on this issue is important. Response to Question 2: It would be a shame if you guys got too involved but I would love to see more control to how many people are out on the river. Response to Question 3: My only concern is how much you guys want to control it. Too much control would not be good for everyone involved. Response to Question 4: My biggest concern is the amount of drunk floaters that are allowed on the river. The numbers are clearly out of hand. I would love to see limits on how many people can tube & where they can tube.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63304
3967	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Opening the Area up for more Access or use, would Not be A good thing. Making a Wilderness Area would NOT be good. Change is NOT Always a good thing! Response to Question 4: We checked with the NPS in Van Buren in 2004 about boat motor restrictions & use. We were told that 40 hp in the Van Buren Area would be the way to go. We purchase a boat & motor to comply & even Purchased a cabin to stay & even house the boat. I've invested a good sum of money to use this Area of the NPS (current River) Response to Question 5: Open the trophy trout Area up so fishermen can use bait. I used to fish for suckers with worms on the trophy Area. Now we CANNOT catch the Native suckers. It is 9 miles of water supposedly protection A Non-Native Species (ex: Trout)	7/9/2009	No			MO	65560
3968	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION 1) OPEN FIELDS - 2) PROVIDE DEER FOOD Response to Question 2: NO ACTION 1) NO ROAD CLOSINGS 2)IMPROVE & MAINTAIN BOAT RAMPS Response to Question 3: A, B, & c Response to Question 5: 1) NO CAMPING FEES	7/16/2009	No			MO	63873
3969	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action! Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Upper Current No Response to Question 5: No!! To many Rangers!	6/25/2009	No			OK	74434
3970	Response to Question 1: No Action The park should leave Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: Upper Current No Response to Question 5: No	6/25/2009	No			MO	65501
3971	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B & C Response to Question 4: Upper Current River No Response to Question 5: Don't take tax payers land then Ban them from it.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65401
3972	Response to Question 1: no action leave locals alone Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: a, b, c Response to Question 4: Upper Current River No Response to Question 5: dont limit HP on Jon boats	6/25/2009	No			MO	65479

3973	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Upper Current River No Response to Question 5: dont limit HP on Jon Boats	6/25/2009	No			MO	65479
3974	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Upper Current No Response to Question 5: No, Too many rangers	6/25/2009	No			OK	74403
3975	Response to Question 1: No Action Leave the local people alone. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: Upper Current River No Response to Question 5: Stop harassing the tourist. Reduce the # of Rangers. Running up & Down the Roads. Wasting Tax payers Dollars.	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
3976	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 5: More Ranger or water Patrol prescence & enforcement of existing regulations. Ban violators for infractions especially repeat offenders. Stiffer fines for Littering, fighting, & lewd behaviors. Ban them from the river. Attend behavior classes etc.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63901
3977	Response to Question 1: No-Action - my ideal way to manage the ONSR would be to put it back the way it was before modifications were put into place. But, since that is not possible I prefer to leave it just the way it is. Response to Question 2: I feel strongly about leaving it the way it is & enforcing the rules & laws that are already in effect. Response to Question 3: I feel strongly that the motor limits should not be lowered any lower than they already are Response to Question 4: I was born & raised on Current River. My children grew up loving & respecting the river. So all of it is a concern to me. Once again, the OnSR should start enforcing the rules & regulations already in place. If they did (on all the river, not just the park areas such as Big Springs)there would be no need to do anything else.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63937
3978	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/26/2009	No			MO	63638
3979	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: From Paint Rock to Blue Springs Response to Question 5: No Action	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3980	Response to Question 1: YES. NO ACTION Response to Question 2: JUST LEAVE IT AS IS. Response to Question 3: I AM AGAINST MAKING THE BIG SPRINGS AREA A WILDLIFE WILDERNESS REFUGE. IT IS CURRENTLY A 5,000 AC REFUGE & IT WILL ONLY OPEN IT FOR HUNTING BY MAKING IT A WILDERNESS AREA. THERE IS NO NEED TO MAKE MORE PUBLIC HUNTING IN OUR AREA THAN WE ALREADY HAVE. IF DEER NUMBERS NEED REDUCED TRY MANAGED HUNTS & HANDICAP HUNTING FOR DISABLE PEOPLE. Response to Question 4: ITS ALL SPECIAL THINK ABOUT THOSE OF US THAT USE THE AREA DAILY & WHAT WE WANT NOT WHAT PEOPLE WHO COME HEAR ONE OR TWO WEEKENDS A YEAR WANT. Response to Question 5: MOST PEOPLE I TALK WITH FEEL THE PARK IN ONLY HAVING MEETINGS AS A REQUIREMENT & HAVE ALREADY DETERMINED WHAT ACTION THEY WILL TAKE. SUPRRISE US, LISTEN & DO THE BEST FOR US LOCALS & THE RESOURCE. THANKS.	7/1/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3981	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/26/2009	No			MO	65466
3982	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/26/2009	No			MO	65438
3983	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/26/2009	No			MO	65438
3984	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/26/2009	No			MO	65588
3985	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/26/2009	No			MO	65466
3986	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Vanburen Yes Response to Question 5: Leave things the way they are now	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown

3987	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Restrictions would cause congestion & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: More patrol of riverways during peek seasons	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3988	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS Response to Question 3: RESTRICTED RECREATIONAL USAGE & ACCESS Response to Question 4: PERSONAL COMMENT Response to Question 5: MORE RECREATIONAL USAGE FACILITIES	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3989	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
3990	Did not respond to any of the questions.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63901
3991	Front side of park form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
3992	Front side of park form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
3993	Front side of park form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
3994	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: free Recreational Usage Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: Leave Alone No Action Response to Question 5: more usage facilities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3995	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more Recreational Usage facilities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3996	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Usage & Access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more usage facilities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3997	Response to Question 1: no Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational usage & Access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more Recreational Usage facilities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3998	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: No Action	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
3999	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restricted Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: more Recreational Usage facilities	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4000	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 5: Ways to discourage littering. Would not be opposed to issuing fines for littering.	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4001	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: unlimited usage of Facility! Response to Question 3: Any Limit on Park usage! Response to Question 5: make more access point's to the Park and River!!!	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4002	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Make Park more accesable to more People Response to Question 3: Any Limits on Park usage! Response to Question 5: more Boat Ramps on River!!	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown

4003	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Horse powered boats should be allowed as they are now. Response to Question 4: Log Yard Area and Powder Mill Area	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4004	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: B And C Response to Question 4: Log Yard	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4005	Front side of Park Form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4006	Front Side of Park Form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4007	Front side of Park Form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63957
4008	Front side of Park Form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
4009	Front side of park form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
4010	Front side of Park Form only.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
4011	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Nothing should be changed Response to Question 3: We should be able to use the land/river as is. Response to Question 4: Leave the river the way it is. Dont change anything Response to Question 5: Park rangers should be tougher on those who pollute the river.	7/31/2009	No			LA	70401
4012	Response to Question 1: no action - motors to remain 40 HP @ jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No action - Do Not restrict HP on motors at Van Buren below 40 HP at jet.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63830
4013	Response to Question 1: No action - motors to remain 40 HP at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No Action - open 40 HP Limit Area to No HP restriction in the Gap between the Bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63830
4014	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE OF ALTERNATIVES A, B OR C. NO ACTION ONLY Response to Question 3: NONE OF A, B OR C Response to Question 5: MAKE PARK RANGER VISABLE	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4015	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4016	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Leave the motor Law alone Response to Question 5: No	7/31/2009	No			MO	63941
4017	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: NONE	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4018	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: dont want any limiting on H.p. of the boat & motors Response to Question 4: the entire river Response to Question 5: Need to limit the number of tubes. Stop the littering	7/31/2009	No			MO	65588

4019	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Not Controlling the size motors used on Current River Response to Question 4: Bland Hollow - It was taken away from our family in the 60's. We should be able to Lease it or Buy it Back Response to Question 5: Limit the Tubes - Mark the Tubes with Numbers so they can be Identified	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
4020	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: They should be the same as they are now Response to Question 3: They should all be left the same as they are now Response to Question 4: They are all special to me because I use most of the River during different times of the year. Response to Question 5: That are motors be 40 horse at the Jet pump not the power head and that the canoers are informed about how are boats operate before they go on the River	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4021	Response to Question 1: No Action Is Needed Response to Question 2: No Actions or Changes Are Needed. Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreational useage Response to Question 4: The Van Buren Area, the restrictions would cause great congestions of Areas, which would make more Dangerous situations and Conditions Response to Question 5: More Patrols In Riverway Areas of Large Groups During Peek Seasaons or Peek Recreational Use Days.	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4022	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Recreation Response to Question 4: Van Buren - Restrictions would cause congestions & dangerous conditions Response to Question 5: More patrol on Riverways during peak seasons	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4023	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. I would prefer to have no motorized traffic above "Two Rivers." Response to Question 2: -Limiting motorized traffic and horsepower. -Limiting horse activities immediately adjacent to rivers. -Preserving/restoring natural areas. -Limiting canoes available for rent. Response to Question 3: No additional developed areaas - campsites, picnic areas, boat ramps, etc. Response to Question 4: The upper Current (above Two Rivers) and the Jack's Fork are special. Alternative A appears to address concerns. I spent many vacations in the Big Spring area in the 1950s. Preserving the Big Spring tract would be excellent.	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4024	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: Less Government involvement is what we would like to see in all phases of the park.	6/30/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4025	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: I don't feel that there should be a limit on pumps w/ motors and, the use of the River should stay as is Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are special: it should be left alone, as is so that other people, and future generations can enjoy the River Response to Question 5: If anything, the park Rangers should be more pro-active and assertive in there efforts to keep the river clean and litter free	7/31/2009	No			LA	70401
4026	Response to Question 1: No Action. Additional boat ramp away from tubes and canoes access Response to Question 2: More control on number of tubes and canoes from concessions- Response to Question 3: No change on horse power for motors- Response to Question 5: Seperate tube and boat access. More parking for boat trailers -	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4027	Response to Question 1: No Action More primitive camping areas along the river where there is no access point for tubes & canoes to be launched. Response to Question 2: boat ramps available & maintained in present locations. More restrictions on amount of tubers & canoers on the river. Remove downed trees in the river. Response to Question 3: No change on the horse power on the boat motors. Response to Question 4: Paint Rock Landing to Van Buren. Response to Question 5: More campsites - preserving local activities and camping alone the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4028	Response to Question 1: No-Action More boat ramps where there is no access point where tubes & canoes don't interfere with boaters trying to access the river. Response to Question 2: More boat ramps. Current boat ramps repaired and maintained. Response to Question 3: There should be no area where there are no boats allowed. There have been many incidents on the river where individuals have been assisted or rescued by people in motor boats. No more limitations then already in effect for the horsepower on motor boats. Response to Question 4: We enjoy using all the areas. Response to Question 5: Stricter restrictions on the number of Canoes & tubes allowed on the river. More parking areas for the boat trailers at Waymeyer.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4029	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: no Action Response to Question 3: No Limit 40 power at the pump. Response to Question 4: The land and river need to be left open to the public. Response to Question 5: Trash in river. More Park Rangers on the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4030	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the HP on the Boats & Motors Response to Question 4: The four mile stretch is my most concern. I have been informed that the NPS does not have control over this area. But this is the area that needs more law enforcement. I feel like the only change that is necessary to keep things running smooth is presence of law enforcemet in the entire area where floaters & Boaters are present. Response to Question 5: Added law enforcement to the entire river. State level county level and federal level. Maybe even require concessionaires to have some type of legal representation accompanying the floaters, throughout their trip.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4031	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: No limits on motors Response to Question 4: Additional Boat Ramps are needed Response to Question 5: Additional law enforcement during high traffic weekends especially in the 4 mile gap	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501

4032	Response to Question 1: no Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: HP on the Boat & Motors Do not change Response to Question 4: all of the River Response to Question 5: Stop the Trashing of the River To many canoes & Tubes at one time.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65203
4033	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do Not limit the motors Response to Question 4: I would like to see Additional Boat Ramps Response to Question 5: Additional law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4034	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 4: Big Spring And Down	7/31/2009	No			MO	65814
4035	Response to Question 1: no Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: HP on Boats & motors Closeing the Land Down to the Public Response to Question 4: I use the whole River and I would Like to See it Not Chang Response to Question 5: I would Like to see the Tubes & canoes monitored by the Park. instead of A Free for All! More Law working the strech, witch I no the Park can't Help that!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4036	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 5: More visible law enforcement in 4 mile stretch	7/31/2009	No			TN	38128
4037	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: upper River/No Response to Question 5: more law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			TN	38128
4038	Response to Question 1: no Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: All of the River. No they do Not Response to Question 5: To see more Park Ranger Law inforcement and Water Patrol officers on the river.	7/31/2009	No			TN	38083
4039	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do not need to limit the Motor Size Response to Question 4: The Four Mile gap needs more attention the litter is piling up & the people are mean & rude Response to Question 5: more law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	65248
4040	Response to Question 1: no Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Hore Power on the motors Response to Question 4: All of the River Response to Question 5: Keep the Public From Dumping cans and Trash Raise the fines on Littering	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501
4041	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the Horse Power on the Boat & Motors, it should remain as it is currently Response to Question 4: The Boat Ramp at Waymeyer Response to Question 5: I would like to see more littering tickets given	7/31/2009	No			MO	63546
4042	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: All of it/No because of the drinking and littering Response to Question 5: More law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4043	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt A. Response to Question 4: None! Response to Question 5: more Law Enforcement on Tubers!	7/31/2009	No			MO	63846
4044	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: From Owls Bend to Pen Oak Response to Question 5: More visible Law Enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4045	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: Bass Rock No alternatives address the issue of trash & people rock jumpers. Response to Question 5: More law enforcement patrolling to catch people doing things that are tearing up the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4046	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Alternatives do not address the real issue of pollution on the riverways which is trash being dumped on the river. Response to Question 5: More law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4047	Response to Question 1: Take no Action - Leave motor max at 40 HP at Jet Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: N/A Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Open area between Bridge and Big Springs to no HP restriction	7/31/2009	No			AR	72422

4048	Response to Question 1: No action - Motors to remain 40 HP at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take no action - Open the 40 HP limit in the Gap between the Bridge & Big Springs to No Hp Restriction	7/31/2009	No			MO	63873
4049	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 5: With the way the economy is, people/families are running out of ways to vacation, if there arent any campgrounds, then these people wont have anything left, cuz they wont be able to afford to go anywhere else.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63084
4050	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Alternatives not addressed adequately Response to Question 5: The people who live in the area should be in charge of their environment	7/24/2009	No			IL	62237
4051	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: ALL- Response to Question 4: Alternatives Not Addressed Adequately Response to Question 5: The residents of the area are the ones should be included in managing their environment	7/24/2009	No			IL	62237
4052	Response to Question 1: (NO-ACTION) THIS IS THE CLOSEST TO MY IDEA OF THE BEST WAY TO MANAGE ONSR. IT APEARS THAT ALL OF THE OTHER ALTERNATIVES PUNISH THE BOATERS. I FEEL THIS IS GREATLY UNFAIR. IT IS MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE THAT THE FLOATERS HAVE THE LEAST RESPECT FOR THE LAND AND CAUSE IT MORE HARM THAN THE BOATER. MANY BOATERS LIKE ME FIND THEMSELVES CLEANING UP AFTER THE FLOATERS LITTER MOST EVERY WEEKEND. Response to Question 3: THERE SHOULD BE NO LIMIT PUT ON BOATING. THE BOATERS BY MAJORITY RESPECT THE RIVER AND ALL IT OFFERS MUCH MORE THAN THE FLOATERS. THE ORGANIZE EFFORTS TO KEEP THE RIVER CLEAN BY REMOVING LITTER FROM THE RIVER BOTTOM. THEY ARE THE REPEAT ENTHUSIASTS OF THE RIVER. THEY WANT TO TAKE CARE OF THE RIVER BECAUSE THEY ARE THE ONES WHO ENJOY THE RIVER EVERY WEEK END AND MANY ALL YEAR LONG, UNLIKE THE FLOATER WHO RENTS A & R TUBE TWICE A YEAR. Response to Question 4: NO ACTION FROM TWO RIVERS TO GOOSENECK. DO NOT LIMIT THE BOATER HE CARE MORE FOR OUR RIVER THAN MOST. Response to Question 5: I THINK MORE LAW EFFORCEMENT SHOULD BE FOCUSSED IN THE AREAS WITH HEAVY FLOATER TRAFFIC. IT APPEARS TO ME THE CLASS OF PEOPLE THAT ARE FLOATING ON OUR RIVER HAS GONE DOWN IN THE PAST FEW YEARS. I HAVE BEEN CUSSD, FLIPPED OFF, SPRAYED BY WATER CANNONS, HIT BY BEER CANS THAT HAVE BEEN THROWN AT ME, AND HAVE HAD TO INDUR THIS MOST WEEKEND. THE MAJORITY OFF THE FLOATERS ARE THERE FOR BIG PARTY WHERE GET WAY TOO DRUNK, DO DRUGS, AND EXPOSE THEMSELVES IN PUBLIC. AS A KID GROWING UP ON THE RIVER, I SAW ALOT OF THINGS A KID SHOULDN'T SEE THAT WAS ALL DONE BY FLOATERS. WE NEED MORE LAW EFFORCEMENT TO CUT DOWN THE PARTYING AND ATTRACT A BETTER CLASS OF PEOPLE.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63736
4053	June 16, 2009 Dear _____ I am writing to express my concern over the National Parks Service's Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. The General Management Plan (GMP) identifies four preliminary alternative concepts; a No-Action Alternative, and three Alternatives (A,B,C). Alternative A and B effectively eliminate boating on the Upper Current-South Segment (from Waymeyer to Two Rivers) by reducing outboard motors from the current limit of 40 horsepower to 25 horsepower. On page 4 of the GMP it states, "The upper Current River (North Segment) is a high- density canoe use area due in part to the river's shallow depth and winding course." This section (above Two Rivers) currently has a 25 horsepower limit and little boat traffic. Approximately one-third of an outboard engine's horsepower is used to power a jet boat's pump. A jet pump allows running shallow water and avoids the cost of propeller replacement. A jet is less harmful to the fish and plant life than is a propeller. A 25 horsepower jet boat will have approximately the same speed and power as a 15 horsepower outboard propeller. You can not take a family, or group of four adults with gear; easily, enjoyably or safely up the river with a 25 horsepower jet. The entire Upper Current-North Segment has very little boating traffic. Alternatives A and B would drastically reduce boating on the South Segment of the Upper Current. This would effectively eliminate recreational boating on the entire Upper Current. Proposal C allows a 40 horsepower engine but changes the rating on the horsepower limit to be measured at the powerhead. The majority of boaters have an engine that is titled by the State of Missouri as a 40 horsepower engine. These engines come directly from the manufacture with a jet pump attached. They are rated 40 horsepower output. The GMP is now proposing to redefine the horsepower rating on engines to be at the powerhead, a change from previous policy. This seemingly innocuous change would in fact outlaw the vast majority of engines currently on the river. The proposal would cost thousands of dollars of monetary damages on each boater, if forced to sell their motors. Van Buren is a small community of less than 1,000 residents and relies on tourism to support its finances. The river has its highest density of usage by the tourists from Mid- June (when the river warms) to Labor Day. These 10 weekends are the lifeblood of survival for the gas stations, motels, restaurants, convenience stores and other businesses. Whatever the number of complaints received from the tourists on the 10 busy weekends (20 days out of the year), it does not justify the draconian step of reducing/eliminating boating throughout the year. While some boats are brought in for weekend use, the majority are owned by residents who use them for recreation, fishing, and gigging. There are NO problems on the river during the 345 days of "Non Tourist" season. With utmost respect, I believe some self inspection needs to be done by the National Park Service. The two primary facilities to put boats into the river are at the bridge and Watercrest Park. Both of these facilities require one to go through the heavy tubing/canoeing traffic to get up river. There are very few tubes or canoes above Waymeyer to Log Yard (approximately 10 miles). If the Park Service would provide parking and a usable boat ramp at Waymeyer or above, there would automatically be separation of users. The boaters would go up river from the tubers/canoeists that would go down the river. There are very few complaints from tourists concerning the river from Log Yard to Waymeyer. The community is extremely proud of its heritage and river. The town	7/6/2009	Yes	14		MO	63965

	through its Operation Clean Stream prides itself in self policing the river. Trash and refuse is picked up from the river, restoring it to what the town expects. Our city realizes the importance of the river and wants to take care of it. This GMP is such a sensitive subject that on Monday, June 15 at an informal hearing at the Van Buren Community Center, over 200 people showed up expressing their concerns. The only viable option is the No-Action alternative. Let's all respect everyone's right to use the river and not further curtail our enjoyment through another round of rules and regulations. I respectfully request your support on this action. Sincerely, _____ (Signature) _____ (Print Name) _____ (Print Street Address) _____ (Print City, State, and Zip Code)					
4054	September 9, 2009 Mr. Reed Detring, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 Dear Mr. Detring, This letter is to submit my support for Alternative A as the most appropriate proposal for the preservation of the Current and Jacks Fork national rivers. Missouri is blessed with the beautiful and tranquil Ozark Mountains, forests, and streams. It is essential that our generations living today protect these natural gems for the future. To allow noisy and dangerous motorboats and all-terrain-vehicles to degrade the quality of our rivers and their banks and gravel bars is contrary to the dream of the leaders and citizens who chose our two Ozark streams to be the nation's first federally protected rivers. To allow literally two-or three hundred horses on an individual commercial trail ride to trample down and destroy the land along the rivers and to contaminate the water is also contrary to the plans for a national rivers system. Please protect the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers with a strong management plan. Sincerely, ADDITIONAL COMMENT: Cheryl Petrael-Harre 1030 North Rock Hill Road St. Louis, MO 63119 P.S. As long as camping, floating & horseback riding can continue under reasonable conditions, I'm for it all. Thank you for all your hard work.	9/14/2009	Yes	9		MO 63301
4055	7/27/09 Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways PO Box 490 Van Buren MO 63965 Dear Superintendent: I have a number of concerns about the deterioration of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. Overall I am in favor of the "A" Trial alternatives for the future use of the areas. We ought to ban the excess river access points and close those which are not authorized and restore them with native vegetative cover. Horse trials must be redesigned so as to be set back from rivers and creeks at a sufficient distance to preclude pollution problems. ATV's, dirt bikes and similar recreational vehicles should be banned in the park except on legally designated state and country roads. Mobile campers must be restricted to official park campgrounds designed to accommodate such camping units. The frequency and number of floaters need to be curtailed during periods of heavy use as well as recreational power boats during heavy use of area. Finally, let's do our best to enhance and preserve these wonderful areas. Sincerely yours,	7/29/2009	Yes	8		MO 63123-6283
4056	July ___, 2009 To: _____ Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways Dear _____ I am appalled to read about the degraded condition of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and am writing today to join in the campaign to save them. I believe that all unofficial and extraneous river access roads should be permanently closed. There should be no more than 15-20 developed access points on the entire 134 mile length of the river. ATVs and dirt bikes should be banned in the Riverways except on the legally-designated state and county roads within the boundaries of the park. There are too many commercial horse facilities having massive trail rides that attract huge numbers of riders and horses. There should be a very limited number of riders allowed and the trails should be redesigned to be set back from the rivers, creeks and sinkholes in order to prevent e coli contamination. In addition, the number of equestrian river crossings must be reduced to mitigate damage to the fragile aquatic habitat on river and creek bottoms. Mobile campers should be restricted to official park campgrounds designed to accommodate such camping units. Effective noise control measures should be enforced wherever visitors play music or radios on gravel bars. The use of recreational power boats should be prohibited above Two Rivers, a 10 hp limit between Two Rivers and Van Buren and a 25hp limit below Van Buren where the river channel widens. Power boats create loud noise, disruptive wakes, and sometimes present a danger to swimmers and other boaters. Sincerely,	7/29/2009	Yes	5		MO 64145
4057	Dear I would like to share my thoughts regarding the General Management Plan proposed by the National Park Service. I find myself wondering, "Why we are in this situation?" I have been told in 2006, 371 complaints were filed with the National Park Service (NPS) concerning the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. What the NPS has led me to believe is that these 371 complaints resulted in the three proposed alternatives (A, B, C) in their General Management Plan. The other alternative is the No-Action alternative (leave things as they are). A phone call to the NPS in Van Buren confirmed there were approximately 1.8 million people who utilized the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in 2007 for all recreational uses. The 371 complaints received total one complaint per 4,852 visitors or less than .02% of the overall visitor population. How can such a small vocal minority correspond to boaters losing their options on the river? The NPS works closely with another agency, the Missouri Water Patrol. Some of the complaints received by the NPS were in regards to lewd behavior, underage drinking, and illegal drugs. One responsibility of the NPS is to prevent these sorts of acts from occurring. I pose this question, if you are driving on the highway and you see an officer parked on the side of the road, would you speed? The obvious answer is no. Could better visibility reduce the occurrence of these acts? The NPS needs to put down the Bushnell's, leave the bushes at Mill Creek, and get in people's sight. If the NPS was more visible with its agents, visitor compliance would be greater, resulting in fewer complaints. Another complaint received is in regards to pollution on the waterways. Do we have scientific study of the Current River concluding that pollution is occurring from the exhaust from boats engines? What is the pollution factor from the tubers? I would also like to discuss the complaints regarding the confliction of user groups; specifically, boaters and floaters. The people of Van Buren have two main access points on the river: Watercrest and the bridge. Both of these facilities force us to go through heavy amounts of floater traffic to get upriver. However; once above Waymeyer, there are very few tubes or canoes. If the Park Service provided parking and an adequate boat ramp at Waymeyer, there would instantaneously be a separation of users. This would undoubtedly cut back on complaints. Most locals and boating visitors have a boat that is a 40 hp engine. We use this river for recreational uses year round: fishing, entertaining, gigging, or simply floating. Depending on which alternative is passed, we could be forced to reduce our motor size to 25 horsepower or, under another proposal, purchase a motor that is rated 40 horsepower at the powerhead. I think a fish will outrun me going upstream as we all know a 25hp engine isn't going to push a family in an 18' boat. So what exactly is the reasoning for a severe horsepower restriction? Is there even a reasoning? Or is it a percent of the complaints were earmarked toward the boaters? An extreme change like this will cost most boaters a new motor, and a new boat. Van Buren's community	7/27/2009	Yes	2		MO 63965

	desperately needs the tourism revenue it receives. Instead of proposing more rules and regulations to fix the minuscule complaints that are received during the summer, let's keep the present plan, the NO-Action alternative, and do a better job of enforcing it.						
4058	September 8, 2009 Reed Detring, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965 Dear Superintendent Detring: I enjoy camping, hiking, canoeing, fishing, and just being in our great Missouri outdoors. As a life-long resident of Southeast Missouri and a user of the Current and Jack's Fork rivers, I would like to make a few comments on the planned new management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Current and Jack's Fork Rivers need increased protection from development and overuse to preserve their natural and unspoiled character, at least what is left of it. While on canoe trips along these two beautiful rivers in recent years, I have observed many disturbing problems that I believe need to be addressed in any new management plan. 1. Building and development along the rivers' edges needs to limited or even reduced if possible. While floating along these rivers, it is not uncommon to see houses and campgrounds right on the edge of the rivers. These locations often show evidence of increased erosion of the rivers banks and the building of decks and boat access areas right out to the rivers edge. The campgrounds are often undeveloped, just a bunch of campers pulled up near the river. These developments cause damage to the rivers and their ecosystems. I have seen people in the river at these areas bathing with soap. A more disturbing development, to me, was what seemed like miles of horse stables within easy view of the Jack's Fork River near Eminence. These definitely disturbed the natural beauty of the river and without a doubt added greatly to the pollution of this natural area. 2. The use of the rivers by large trail rides and off-road vehicles needs to curbed or stopped. These uses lead to the development of illegal dirt roads and river access points that spoil this natural area and cause damage to the rivers and the surrounding ecosystems. The uncontrolled use of off-road vehicles can also create a dangerous situation for campers on gravel bars. 3. On the lower Current River near Van Buren and Doniphan, the use of numerous large and over-powered boats creates destructive and unsafe situations. These boats zoom up and down the river at high speeds causing damage to the shore and creating a dangerous situation for other users of the river.	9/10/2009	Yes	2		MO	63960
4059	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: Lowering h.p. on outboard motors. Response to Question 4: Round springs to Jerktail. No-action. Response to Question 5: More input and information from local towns.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63663
4060	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is my ideal plan with its float trips, fishing, gravel bar experience such as what was experienced in the 1960's on the river. Response to Question 2: Closing all unauthorized roads, management of the horse trails - less horses - that are changing the eco-system of the river. Ban ATV's. Response to Question 3: Canoe & raft traffic must be limited. There are far too many people on a 134 mile river on any summer weekend. Response to Question 4: Keep Big Springs Natural Area as a wilderness area for generations to come. Response to Question 5: Health of these beautiful rivers should be the 1st priority. They are Missouri's best attraction like beaches or mountains. We have floatable rivers!	7/24/2009	No			MO	63124
4061	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A Response to Question 5: Enforce littering	7/24/2009	No			MO	63119
4062	Response to Question 1: No Action, Leave Horse power Rating 40 HP At the pump of motor. Response to Question 2: (No Action) Response to Question 3: Alternatives, A, B and C Response to Question 4: No Action, There is more Fish and wildlife then Ever! Response to Question 5: Improve & maintain Boat Ramps open Fields No Closed No Boat Ramps Fees No Fees for Primitive Camping, Like Gravel Bars.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
4063	Response to Question 1: No Action, Leaves Horse Power Rating 40 Hp At the pump of motor. Response to Question 2: (No Action) Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action, there is more Fish and wildlife then Ever! Response to Question 5: Improve & maintain Boat Ramps open Fields No Closed Roads No Boat Ramps Fees No Fees for Primitive Camping, like Gravel Bars.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
4064	Response to Question 1: No Action. Leave Horse power Rating 40 HP At the pump of motor Response to Question 2: (No Action) Response to Question 3: Alternatives, A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action, There is more Fish and wildlife then Ever! Response to Question 5: Improve & maintain Boat Ramps Open Fields No Closed Roads No Boat Ramps Fees No Fees for Primitive Camping, Like Gravel Bars.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
4065	Response to Question 1: No Action Please keep 40 horse motors, at the pump, on the river. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action. I like the whole river as it is now.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63601
4066	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Alternatives not adressed adequately Response to Question 5: The local people should be taken into consideration in the management and control of their property & enviroment	7/24/2009	No			IL	62237
4067	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are special, and should be accesable for everyone to enjoy and use. Response to Question 5: Keep access open to all parts of riverway for everyone to use.	7/24/2009	No			IN	46342

4068	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: NO-ACTION NEEDED	7/24/2009	No			MO	65560
4069	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 Hp to out put shaft	7/20/2009	No			MO	65453
4070	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no limiting on camping sites, river usage, or horse power on boat motors. No Action would do this. Response to Question 3: I want to be able to use the river or roads as I do today. Response to Question 4: Mouth of Rocky @ Roberts Fields, I may not be able access swimming holes when I wish.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
4071	Response to Question 1: i have sent a letter * Response to Question 3: No motor vehicles in or Around the River. Keep the horses out of the river. Response to Question 4: Manpower to enforce the current laws, No NAZI tactics just Natural encouragement for the youngins to remember this is everybodys river Response to Question 5: lots of places for boats & ATV's in MO - shouldn't be on the current river. poling worked for a thousand years. try it.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63301
4072	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Horse power Restrictions other than current Restrictions Response to Question 4: No! Area Restricted to 40 HP between Big Springs and Van Buren Should be opened to Allow Larger outboards to use Van Burens Launching Ramp & other facilities Response to Question 5: No Action	7/20/2009	No			MO	63901
4073	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: More Ranger presence	7/20/2009	No			MO	63960
4074	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Alternates nod addressed adequatly Response to Question 5: The local people should be taken into consideradation in the management and control of their property & enviroment	7/24/2009	No			MO	63084
4075	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alt. A Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: more water patrol enforcement-	7/24/2009	No			MO	63119
4076	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: NONE Response to Question 5: Leave them as they are, the more you mess with it the worse it gets. Really should give the Land Back to the people you took it from. In my opinion.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
4077	Response to Question 1: The Rist one - No-Action - we want NO added government control of our lives! Also - Leave the motor limits as they are now! Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: There should NOT be any added restrictions. Response to Question 4: ALL areas are important to us local people. Response to Question 5: NO added government control!!!	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
4078	Response to Question 1: The first one - No-Action. We want NO more added government control of our lives. AND - leave the motor limits as they now are! Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: There should NOT be any added restrictions Response to Question 4: All areas are important to us local people Response to Question 5: NO added government control -	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
4079	Response to Question 1: No Action - Alternative. Response to Question 2: No restrictions on recreation in the ONSR. The ONSR was founded for people to enjoy the natrual beauty in the Ozarks. Response to Question 3: Restricted usage & access Response to Question 4: horseback riding, boatriing & floating & would like to continue them!! Response to Question 5: ho hiding in the bushes. Be out in the open.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
4080	Response to Question 1: I strongly favor the No-Action Alternative. Remove or at least increase horsepower limits for motor boats. There should be no fee for primitive camping. Hp rated at jet pump Let's go back to pre-'84 park management. Strictly enforce those rules instead of creating more restrictive rules. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do not limit our access to the river or the roads. Don't limit our activities. Response to Question 4: Upper end of Current and Jacks Fork to Big Spring and Chilton Response to Question 5: No public intoxication on waterways, no glass. No nudity or lewd behavior. No fires left unattended. No littering	7/20/2009	No			MO	63638
4081	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: limitations to camping, tubing or boating on the river. Roads for hunting or just riding with my family.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
4082	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: no limitation to rivers and roads Response to Question 3: Any limitations . . . boat motors, access to camp sites, roads for hunting.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65438

4083	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: 1st one - No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B, and C Response to Question 4: 1 - No Action Response to Question 5: None at this time	7/20/2009	No			MO	65466
4084	Response to Question 1: No action should be taken. Response to Question 2: None of the Alternatives A, B or C. Response to Question 3: All of A, B or C should Not be. Response to Question 4: All locations are important to me. And none of the Alternatives address them. Response to Question 5: Cleaner bathroom facilities.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63873
4085	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: ABC Response to Question 4: ALL OF IT. Response to Question 5: Improve the Boat Ramps!	7/31/2009	No			TN	38053
4086	Response to Question 1: No Action should be taken. Response to Question 2: None of the alternatives A, B or C. Response to Question 3: All of A, B or C should Not be. Response to Question 4: All locations are important to me. And None of the alternatives address them. Response to Question 5: Better, more accessible boat ramps. Cleaner better bathroom facilities.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65714
4087	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: All of it. Response to Question 5: More information and demonstrations on the early years and ways of this area.	7/31/2009	No			TN	38053
4088	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limiting the Motor Horse power Response to Question 4: The four mile gap is the area of my most concern Response to Question 5: Added law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501
4089	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: I do not think changing limits on Motors will improve anything, just the opposite. Response to Question 4: The four mile gap where the level of law enforcement is not available. Response to Question 5: I think additional law enforcement is necessary to control the weekend crowds.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63533
4090	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: I feel strongly that the riverways should remain as they are. In these hard times small communities such as Van Buren & Eminence cannot survive without the boaters. These communities count on the boaters year round not just seasonal. Response to Question 3: There should not be anymore limitations put on outboard motors Response to Question 4: The purposed alternatives would hurt more than help the riverways. The No-Action is the only alternative to help. Response to Question 5: There needs to be more boat ramp access. Waymeyer needs a better ramp & there needs to be a boat ramp access above Waymeyer. More restroom facility.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4091	Response to Question 1: No action: Keep HP rating 40 hp Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, C Response to Question 4: No action: leave the river the way it is . . . Response to Question 5: Need more Restrooms facilities: update and add boat ramps: more places to hook up campers.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63877
4092	Response to Question 1: No action. horse power will make no difference to anyone other than costing me money.	7/13/2009	No			MO	63881
4093	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: I feel strongly that NONE of Alternatives A, B or C should be included on future plans. NO ACTION is the best plan. Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C should not be for the public; therefore, I think the public should have all forms of access to both the land & river. Response to Question 4: All of OSNR is special to me. We visit the attractions, drive the roadways to enjoy the scenery. We have camped on both BS Park & other primitive camping areas. We enjoy the river in all seasons. Response to Question 5: I personally think the Park Rangers should be seen on the river just as the Hwy Patrol on our highways. It is past time for the Park Rangers to get out of the bushes & show their presence.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4094	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: We should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limit on the pump on motors. Response to Question 4: All of it is special. Leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river. Response to Question 5: Park rangers should be seen on the river. Get tougher on people trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			AL	36444
4095	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None of the preliminary alternatives should be included in the future Response to Question 3: I think we should be able to use the land and river the way it is now. No limiting 40 horse at the pump on the motors. Response to Question 4: All of the 134 miles is special to me. Leave it alone and let everyone enjoy every part of it. Response to Question 5: Get stricter about the trash in the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4096	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: It's Fine the way it is Response to Question 3: A.B.C Response to Question 4: Grubb Holler, Leave it Like it is. The Bathrooms could Be cleaned more often Leave the Boat Ramp and camping open Response to Question 5: I have a 150 H.P. Boat. If you have a H.P limit Below the Park, I will have to Put in at the Van Buren Bridge Because I can't Afford A New Boat and Motor. The floaters Don't want me there, And I don't want to Be There.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965

4097	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Grubbs Hollower Response to Question 5: these people use the river year round	7/31/2009	No			MO	63855
4098	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None of the Alternatives A, B or C. No Action - BEST PLAN Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C should NOT be considered for future plans. NO ACTION - BEST PLAN Response to Question 4: Enjoy ALL of ONSR. Response to Question 5: Make Park Rangers Visable.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63638
4099	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Reducing 40 hp at pump on moter	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4100	Response to Question 1: No Action - Motors to remain 40 HP at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No action - open 40 HP limit area to NO HP restriction in the gap between the bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63851
4101	Response to Question 1: No action & motors to remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take no action and change the hp limit area to no Restriction in the Gap Between bridge & Big Springs	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
4102	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - Motors Remain 40 HP at the Jet. Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: NONE Response to Question 4: NO Response to Question 5: No Action - Open 40 HP limit from the Bridge to Big Springs to No Restrictions.	7/31/2009	No			AR	72419
4103	Response to Question 1: I think there shouldn't be anything changed. No-Action Response to Question 2: None should be included in the future management. Response to Question 3: I feel strongly A, B or C Should not be included in the future management. We should have all access to the land or river. Response to Question 4: Its all special, to me & my family. My kids have been raised on this river & land. It has been a family outing and we love to fish, boat ride, camp and enjoy God's wonder. We love to float the river as well. Any change would be wrong for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Response to Question 5: I feel we need more Park Rangers out and about on the river and campsites to keep an eye on all whom are on the river & campsites. I have been on the river alot and fail to see any park rangers.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4104	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: I Strongley disagree with A, B, C Alternitives. No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C should Not be included in Future management. Everyone should Be Allowed Access to the land and river. Response to Question 4: Any where on current River is a Special place to my family and friends we love to Boat and Fish these changes Are Not right and Take Away our rights as U.S. Citizens. Leave it Alone it is Fine. Response to Question 5: I Also Feel the park ranges should be seen more on the river in boats Not just in There vehicles All the Time. We Never see Ranges as much on the river as we should.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4105	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION!! Leave it alone - no modifacation needed. Response to Question 2: No part of the preliminary alternatives. Response to Question 3: I feel the land and river should be left the way they are for everyone to enjoy. I grew up here enjoying the park and river and would like for my kids to be able to enjoy them the same as I have No Limiting the power on the motors. Response to Question 4: All of the ONSR is special to me and should be left the way it is right now so every one can enjoy the land and river. I feel that None of the alternatives address them adequately. Response to Question 5: I think the park service should be seen on the river not hiding in the bushes. The more they are seen maybe people would think twice before doing something to harm our river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4106	Response to Question 1: No-Action Additional Boat ramps where there is no access of tubes & canoes that interfere with boaters trying to access the river. Response to Question 2: Repair current boat ramps. Construct a boat ramp above Waymeyer, so boaters will have access to the river without interference of Canoes & Tubes. Response to Question 3: No stricter horsepower limits on boat motors. No Area where boats are not allowed. Response to Question 4: All areas. Response to Question 5: More camping areas along the river. More parking areas for boat trailers at Waymeyer.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4107	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: None - No action Response to Question 3: The river Needs to be used in a safe manor, but Also for the Locals as well as the Public. Response to Question 4: The river Needs left to Nature Response to Question 5: Everyone should be Allowed the pleasure of the river, Rangers should Not hide in the bushes. It's O.K. to police the river. Also Safety comes first.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63640
4108	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None - No Action Response to Question 3: The river should be used like it was back in the 70's. Response to Question 4: The River should stay the same As it is make no changes. Response to Question 5: I think the Park Serves should not hide in the brush and take pictures or vido. I think they should be out in plane plan sight. (When you seen a COP you don't speed). Everyone here is here to have a good time.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65742
4109	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Everyone should be able to use the river and land as is now. Response to Question 4: Left as is with no limitations Response to Question 5: Park Service should be visibile at all times	7/31/2009	No			MO	63640

4110	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: None No-action! Response to Question 3: The river should stay as is! Response to Question 4: The complete river is special to me! I enjoy everything about the river. Response to Question 5: More park rangers on the river. Stop people throwing trash in the river.	7/31/2009	No			LA	70403
4111	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: I dont think there should be a limit to the boat motors and the use of the river for floaters should stay the way it is. Response to Question 4: All 134 miles of the river are great and should be left alone so future floaters can enjoy the river the same way we have. Response to Question 5: Park Rangers should be more cautious of people littering in the rivers.	7/31/2009	No			LA	70454
4112	Response to Question 1: No Action. Additional boat ramps away from Tubes and Canoes access. Response to Question 2: Less tubes and canoes on river Response to Question 3: Leave motors horse power as is. Response to Question 5: Separate tube and boat access	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4113	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: We hunt and fish on Alot of Riverways - we Like them Loft Alone Response to Question 5: No	7/31/2009	No			MO	63941
4114	Response to Question 1: No-Action Additional Boat ramps where there is no interference of Canoes & tubes accessing the river. Response to Question 2: Maintaining current boat ramps. A boat ramp above Waymeyer. Response to Question 3: No area should restrict boats from being allowed. Horepower limits should be left as they are. Response to Question 4: All areas. Response to Question 5: More camping areas. More parking areas for boat trailers.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63901
4115	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Changing the Hp on the boat and motors Response to Question 4: all of the river Response to Question 5: Stop the littering on the waters and limit the canoes and tubbers at one time.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63023
4116	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: We the people can use the land and river as is on todays standards Response to Question 4: No, leave the river the way, No change at all! Response to Question 5: The rangers or personal should of had more tranning as to speaking with public. The rangers are people than puts there pants on the same as I, one leg @ a time	7/31/2009	No			MO	63834
4117	Response to Question 1: C-Remove H.P. limits in off season. Response to Question 2: More boat ramps. Response to Question 3: Wilderness. Response to Question 4: From Powder Mill down should have access added on both sides of River for move convenience and less congestion. Response to Question 5: What I see is the main problem on Current River is the number of tubes and canoes. They are grouped together, 95% are put in the river at the same boat ramp. The boats should be patrolled & not limited H.P. Alchol needs to be prohibited on the water.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63941
4118	Response to Question 1: No-Action Is The Best Alternative. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Should not be Included. Response to Question 4: From Big Springs Park Down. No-Action Is Best. Response to Question 5: Take the Drugs and Alcohol off the River.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4119	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Limiting the Boat & Motor size on the rivers. It should stay as it is. Response to Question 4: The Four Mile Gap Response to Question 5: Additional Law Enforcement through out the entire River present during high traffic Days.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501
4120	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: limitations on the horse power Response to Question 4: The areas that are not being patrolled by the Park Service like the 4 mile gap Response to Question 5: We need visual law enforcement on all areas of the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63501
4121	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, & C Response to Question 4: Restriction on motors and eliminating tubers would greatly effect the local economy. No-Action would address this adequately! Response to Question 5: Take No-Action!	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965
4122	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION - I would like to see the gap between bridge and Big Springs to be opened up to motors bigger than 40 hp. Response to Question 2: NO ACTION of the alternatives should be included in the future because no motor restrictions are going to help the Current River. Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: Chilton boat dock Big Spring boat dock Bridge boat dock Response to Question 5: To have the tubers and canoeres take a breathalyzer after they leave the river to see if they are even capable of making a complaint about boaters.	7/20/2009	No			MO	63965
4123	Response to Question 1: No Action! Keep horsepower rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action. I enjoy all parts of the river and hope that my children will be able to do the same. Response to Question 5: None	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
4124	Response to Question 1: Alternative C is closest to what I believe to be the best way. The land inside the park was taken from the families that lived there for generations to create a recreational area for the public and to preserve the rivers. "C" is the only option that, to me, balances the need to preserve the rivers with the promise of a recreational area for the public to use.	7/24/2009	No			UN	Unknown

4125	Response to Question 1: No Action: Keep horse power rating 40 hp at the pump for boat motors. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B, and C Response to Question 4: No Action: I have been on the river since I was born and I want my kids to be able to enjoy it in the same way I have. Response to Question 5: No	7/24/2009	No			MO	63638
4126	Response to Question 1: No-Action, is the closest alternative to what I believe is the best way to manage the Riverways. However, I do believe there should be more restrictions on the floaters on the river. I understand there is conflict b/t the boaters & floaters, I would suggest requiring a boating course & licensing for boaters. Response to Question 3: Limits on boating on the Riverways is not going to benefit anyone or improve the Riverways. People should have the freedom to enjoy this beautiful gift. As previously stated, requiring a boating course & licensing would help eliminate the problems with boaters. Response to Question 4: Current River from Two Rivers to Goose Neck. Response to Question 5: The boating course & licensing along w/restrictions on floating. The restrictions on floating I would suggest to include alcohol consumption limits, floater/boater education, & curfew.	7/24/2009	No			MO	63736
4127	Response to Question 1: No action Provide more resources for river users Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage & access Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access Response to Question 4: I use all the river & would like to see less restrictions instead of more Response to Question 5: More access to the river. Leave the 40 HP limit at the jet.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
4128	Response to Question 1: No Action Provide more resources for river users Response to Question 2: Free recreation usage & access Response to Question 3: Restrcked recreational usage and access Response to Question 4: I use all the river & would like to see less restrictions instead of more Response to Question 5: More access to the river. Leave the 40 hp limit at the jet.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
4129	Response to Question 1: No Action Provide More Resources for River Users Response to Question 2: Free Rereational Usage and Access Response to Question 3: Restrcked Recreational Usage and Access Response to Question 4: I Use All the River And Would Like To See Less Restrictons instead of more Response to Question 5: More Access to the River Leave the 40 HP Limit At The Jet	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
4130	Response to Question 1: no action, keep access's open & possibly make more accessible Response to Question 2: free use of river & camping Response to Question 3: Restrictions on access & usage Response to Question 4: The entire riverway should be less restricted & more accessible Response to Question 5: Manpower should be used on river itself to ensure an enjoyable experience not marred by rude obnoxious behavior.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
4131	Response to Question 1: No-Action is the best option. There could be less restrictions to it though Response to Question 2: More access to different parts of the river. Response to Question 3: Restricted recreational usage & access. Response to Question 4: All of the river. Keep the restrictions down. Response to Question 5: Keep the jetboats on the river and let the visitors be able to jump off bluffs.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65560
4132	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: There should be No limits on Horse power on motors Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Van Buren They should leave it like it is or lift Horse power restrictions Response to Question 5: more public river accesses	7/16/2009	No			MO	63601
4133	Response to Question 1: No action - Keep open or reopen roads and river access in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Educate locals and visitors on how to share the river and how to cooperate when they are using the same stretch of water. Response to Question 2: Development of more camping areas, parking, and boat ramps to ease crowding. Keep a high level of officers to control the conduct of floaters & boaters in high traffic areas. Response to Question 3: Make no changes in horsepower regulations. Don't reduce hp or change rating to the powerhead. Roads and river access Should remain open. Park Service Agents should get out of the brush so the can be seen. Response to Question 4: Current River - Round Springs to Van Buren Jack's For - Bay Creek to Two Rivers No Action is the only alternative that is acceptable. I don't operate my motorboat in areas where alot of Canoes or tubes are present but I do use those parts of the river the other 340 Days. Response to Question 5: Patrol the river heavily on the on the 25 to 30 heavy use days and in the areas where floaters and boaters are using the same part of the river. Keep the horsepower rating as they are. Any changes will lead to adjustments by boaters and a new set of issues to deal with.	7/16/2009	No			MO	65466
4134	Response to Question 1: Alternative A. A nature/education/visitor center would help people to learn about the history of the area. Also, plants and animals. Classes on fishing, hunting, canoeing, camping and backpacking would educate people in the proper etiquette in the outdoors. Response to Question 2: Closing illegal roads and trails. However, without the proper manpower to enforce the rules closings will be wasted energy. Educating the public is important. Wilderness designation is important. Response to Question 3: Alternative C seems to lead to overdevelopment. History has shown that too many people are not good stewards of nature or public facilities. Money for employees and maintenance and activity development is always difficult to obtain or keep in the budget. In view of the money factor less development is probably better.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63128
4135	Response to Question 1: THE NO ACTION PROPOSAL IS IN MY OPINION THE BEST OPTION. BETTER ENFORCEMENT OF CURRENT LAWS ON BOTH FLOATERS AND BOATERS WOULD BE MY SUGGESTION. Response to Question 2: NO CHANGE. Response to Question 3: ANY PART THAT REMOVES OR FURTHER LOWERS THE CURRENT MOTOR HORSEPOWER LIMIT. Response to Question 4: THE VAN BUREN AREA OF THE CURRENT RIVER. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. Response to Question 5: NOT AT THIS TIME.	7/16/2009	No			MO	63017
4136	Response to Question 1: No-Action Alternative Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Rating the horse power of an outboard motor at the power head. It should be rated at the output shaft Response to Question 4: Area from Round Springs to Powder Mill. The No-Action alternative. Is best for this area. Response to Question 5: more pubil river accesses Free recreational activities to everyone	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629

4137	Response to Question 1: No action alternative Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Rating the horsepower of an outboard motor at the power head. It needs to be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 4: The area from Round Spring to Van Buren They need to leave it like it is. Response to Question 5: more public access to the River Free Recreational activities for everyone	7/16/2009	No			MO	63629
4138	Response to Question 1: no action Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: Do not change the Power on the Boat motors Response to Question 4: no certain area Response to Question 5: I think there should be more Law enforcement	7/31/2009	No			MN	56727
4139	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE - NO ACTION Response to Question 3: WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO USE ALL THE LAND AND RIVER AS IS NOW. NO LIMIT ON THE PUMP ON MOTOR Response to Question 4: ALL OF IT IS SPECIAL - LEAVE THE WAY IT IS SO EVERYBODY CAN ENJOY ALL OF THE LAND AND RIVER Response to Question 5: PARK RANGERS SHOULD BE SEEN ON THE RIVER GET TOUGHER ON PEOPLE TRASHING THE RIVER	7/31/2009	No			AL	36445
4140	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION ONLY Response to Question 3: NONE OF A, B OR C. Response to Question 4: Enjoy All Aspects of Park & River	7/31/2009	No			MO	63965
4141	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: NONE - NO ACTION Response to Question 3: We should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limit on the pump on motors. Response to Question 4: All of it is special. - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river. Response to Question 5: Park rangers should be seen on the river. Get tougher on people trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63880
4142	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 2: NONE - NO ACTION Response to Question 3: We should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limit on the pump on motors. Response to Question 4: All of it is special. - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river. Response to Question 5: Park rangers should be seen on the river. Get tougher on people trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63880
4143	Response to Question 1: No-Action - I think that there should be an alternative in place that has an increase in horsepower as an option. Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 5: more visible law-enforcement, instead of co-vert hiding in the weeds	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4144	Response to Question 1: No Action - Motors to remain 40 HP & the Jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: No-Action Open the Hp Restriction in the Gap between the Bridge & Big Springs to No limit.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63852
4145	Response to Question 1: No action. Motors remain 40 hp at jet Response to Question 2: NA Response to Question 3: NA Response to Question 4: None Response to Question 5: Take no action on horse power restriction below 40 hp	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
4146	Response to Question 1: No action - motors remain 40 HP @ Jet Response to Question 2: N/A Response to Question 3: N/A Response to Question 4: N/A Response to Question 5: take no action on restricting outboard motor HP Below 40 Hp	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
4147	Response to Question 1: No Action - Leave motors 40 Hp at the Jet Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No Action - Open the 40 HP limit between the Bridge and Big Springs to No Restrictions	7/31/2009	No			AR	72315
4148	Response to Question 1: No-Action Motors stay 40 HP At Jet. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: None Response to Question 4: No Response to Question 5: Take No Action Open 40 HP limit between the Bridge & Big Springs to No Restrictions	7/31/2009	No			MO	63877
4149	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 3: I do not want to see ATV's, power motor boats, or horseback Riding allowed	7/10/2009	No			MO	63119
4150	Response to Question 1: Alt. A. Response to Question 3: Please No ATV's, power motor boats, or horsebike Riders	7/10/2009	No			MO	63017
4151	Response to Question 1: No Action. Remove horsepower restrictions on boat motors and have more friendly staff available. Response to Question 2: Unrestricted Access & Use. Response to Question 3: Restricted Access & Use. Response to Question 4: I want to be able to camp on gravel bars, and keep the present roads and trails. No more Wilderness Areas are necessary. Response to Question 5: More friendly staff who are visible in the park and who are not here to harass the public, but to help the people.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65438
4152	Response to Question 1: (No Action) My family uses the upper part of the River Alot from Cedar Grove to Aker's with our 25 hp. motors. We have gave up Already from May 30th to Sept 15 Keep our fishing Area open Response to Question 2: Stop Catering to a select group of People!! Leave the River for fishing and Recreation Response to Question 3: The upper part of the River. Where you want no motors at all. Local people	7/10/2009	No			MO	65479

	try to stay out of the way of Canoes and Give them Room. Response to Question 4: No Action Needs to be taken from Cedar Grove to Aker's My family and friends use this part very often for family Recreation with our Boat And 25 hp motor. think about this. Response to Question 5: Keep your Agreement to Leave the River open for Everyone to use.						
4153	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATE "A" WOULD BE MY CHOICE. THESE RIVERWAYS ARE BEST SEEN USING A PADDLE, THERE ARE PLENTY OF ACCESS POINTS. SEEING NEARLY ANY SECTION OF THESE RIVERS BY PADDLE IS NOT DIFFICULT. THIS WOULD KEEP THEM PRISTINE Response to Question 2: KEEPING MOTOR BOATS OFF OF THE UPPER SECTIONS OF RIVER Response to Question 3: ESTABLISHING AN ENVIROMENT OF OVER POPULATION ON THE UPPER SECTIONS OF THE RIVER. THIS WOULD THREATEN THE RIVER ECO-SYSTEM AND DRIVE FISH AND OTHER WILDLIFE FROM THE AREA Response to Question 4: ALTERNATIVE "A" PROVIDES A HIGH LEVEL OF PROTECTION FROM MONTAUK STATE PARK TO ROUND SPRING Response to Question 5: THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONCERN OF THESE RIVERS! OVER THE YEARS THE NPS IN CONCERT WITH OTHER CONCERNED GROUPS HAVE DONE A SUPERB JOB IN MAINTAINING THE NATURAL BEAUTY AND WILDLIFE ALONG THESE STREAMS. LETS CONTINUE TO MAKE THEM SUSTAINABLE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.	7/10/2009	No			IL	62234
4154	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None of them Response to Question 3: All of them Response to Question 4: All 134 miles Response to Question 5: More River Access Maintained by the NPS. No horsepower limits on Any part of the River.	7/10/2009	No			MO	63901
4155	Response to Question 1: No-Action Rate the Horsepower at the output shaft	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
4156	Response to Question 1: No-Action, Keep the horse power rated at the out put shaft.	7/10/2009	No			MO	63638
4157	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None - Leave the river alone - no changes. Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren 17 Bridge to 2 Rivers Response to Question 5: Please leave the rivers as they are.	7/10/2009	No			MO	63701
4158	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None - leave the rivers as is. Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren Alley Springs to Two Rivers Response to Question 5: We don't believe there should be any changes to the rivers.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65466
4159	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None-leave rivers as they are Response to Question 3: A, B & C Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren Alley to Two Rivers Response to Question 5: Leave the rivers as they are - no action should be taken.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65548
4160	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: none of the above can we please Leave the Rivers alone Response to Question 3: A. B. C. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren 17 Bridge to 2 Rivers Jacks Fork Response to Question 5: Please the rivers are great the way thy are please Leave alone	7/10/2009	No			MO	65466
4161	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free Recreational Usage & Access Response to Question 3: Restrict Usage & Access Response to Question 4: I want to be able to use a 40 HP motor. Response to Question 5: Better Restroom facilities.	7/10/2009	No			MO	65560
4162	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Polution management of the river, in particular the area near Eminence. The polution caused by the horses from the trail rides pose a health threat to humans. This is a problem caused by a private business. Response to Question 3: The park service should not change the Horse Power of motor boats in any part of the rivers. This diversly effects the locals - this is their home! The current HP causes no problems to tourists, yet allows families to go up & down the river. Response to Question 4: My family own's a cabin approx. 8 miles below Round Springs. We use our motor boat almost daily. Changing the HP would not allow us enough power to take our family up river. Response to Question 5: The wild Horses are not a problem - the gov. thins them out as needed. However, the horses from the private owned trail rides are polluting the Jacks Fork river. The Park Service should mandate no horses in the river & fine those who take their horses there. The trail ride business should be fenced off so horses can't get to the river - so many feet from the river so if a rise occures the manure wouldn't pollute the river	7/10/2009	No			MO	65203
4163	Response to Question 1: Need more ATV & UTV Trails/should be able to opperate on gravel bars/Add to River designation & Recreation/opne exsiting trails	7/10/2009	No			MO	63650
4164	Response to Question 1: Need more ATV & UTV Trails/should be able to drive on gravel bars/Add to River Designation & Recreation	7/10/2009	No			MO	65583

4165	Response to Question 1: No-Action. 40 hp. at the pump	7/10/2009	No			MO	65464
4166	Response to Question 1: No-Action: If the ONSR wants to change anything it should be ticketing the people that break the law. Put more rangers out to keep the people from littering our rivers & bringing illegal drugs to our area. Do Not put any limitations to people with motorized boats that enjoy the rivers. We are the people that take care of our rivers. Response to Question 2: Open current closed roads to the rivers, take any motor limitations off the rivers. (No-Action Plan Response to Question 3: No limitations for public access to our rivers & roads to rivers. No Horse Power limitations for Motorized Boats Response to Question 4: The Current & Jacks Fork Rivers have been apart of my whole life living in Carter & Shannon Counties. I enjoy & go to the rivers camping & boating. Do not remove or take away our right to go to the rivers. Response to Question 5: If people are doing illegal things on our rivers whether locals or tourist they should be punished. I believe the ONRS should not ever take away the public to enjoy going or using the current & Jack's fork Rivers.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
4167	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DON'T CUT H.P. BELOW 40 Response to Question 5: QUIT DEVELOPING	7/28/2009	No			MO	65802
4168	Response to Question 1: I feel the No-Action alternative is the best way to manage the riverways, because I think ther are already too many restrictions being put on the Current River. What happened to this being a free country? Response to Question 2: The No-Action alternative strongly should be put in future management plans. Response to Question 3: I feel alternatives A, B, and C should not be in future management plans. Response to Question 4: I live near the current river by Van Buren, MO and I feel the alternatives A, B, and C put too many limitations on the river and would take away the enjoyment of going to the river. Response to Question 5: I think there should be a more adequete boat landing at the Weyemeyer put in point.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63640
4169	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPROVE AND MAINTAIN BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS. NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEES. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	8/5/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4170	Response to Question 1: No-Action We live in this area 365 days a year & raise our families to appreciate the rivers & land around us. We cannot out vote people from the cities, because we don't have the numbers & they are here a week or weekend a year & they is not right. Response to Question 4: upper Current River & upper Jack's fork River Response to Question 5: Keep roads open, more camping areas Keep so you can take your family picnicing, fishing, & swimming boating & canoeing. I appreciate the park for keeping areas clean. Thanks	7/28/2009	No			MO	65438
4171	Response to Question 1: No Action, No limited horse power Response to Question 2: No Limited horse power Response to Question 5: Have everyone pick up their trash!	7/28/2009	No			MO	63638
4172	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B- or C Response to Question 5: Put the Park Rangers on the River Not Just Driving around the Roads	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
4173	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 5: We Never see a Park Ranger on the Rivers.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63936
4174	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DO NOT CUT HORSEPOWER LIMITS BELOW 40 H.P. Response to Question 4: NO ACITON Response to Question 5: NOT EVERYPLACE NEEDS DEVELOPED	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
4175	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION ON H.P. LIMIT OF 40	7/28/2009	No			MO	65571
4176	Response to Question 1: No Action should be taken. Response to Question 2: None of the alternatives A, B, or C. Response to Question 3: All of A, B, or C should not be. Response to Question 4: All locations are important to me. And none of the alternatives address them. Response to Question 5: Better, cleaner bathroom faciltys. More, better boat ramps.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63873
4177	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: DON'T CUT MOTOR H.P. BELOW 40 H.P.	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466

4178	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DON'T CUT HORSEPOWER BELOW 40 H.P. Response to Question 5: LEAVE RURAL AREAS ALONE FOR THE LOCALS	7/28/2009	No			MO	65793
4179	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: MOTORS FROM ROUND SPRINGS DOWN SHOULD BE LEFT AT 40 H.P. Response to Question 4: NO ACTION	7/28/2009	No			MO	65793
4180	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DON'T CUT HORSE POWER LIMITS ON CURRENT RIVER Response to Question 4: QUIT BLOCKING ROADS Response to Question 5: LEAVE RURAL AREAS ALONE	7/28/2009	No			KS	67133
4181	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: MOTORS SHOULD NOT BE LESS THAN 40 H.P. Response to Question 4: CURRENT RIVER, NO ACTION	7/28/2009	No			MO	65466
4182	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: MOTORS SHOULD BE LEFT AT 40 H.P. FROM ROUND SPRINGS DOWN	7/28/2009	No			MO	65793
4183	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NONE Response to Question 3: DONT CUT MOTOR LIMITS BELOW 40 H.P. Response to Question 4: LEAVE OUR ROADS & RURAL ACCESS OPEN Response to Question 5: QUIT SHUTTING ROADS OFF	7/28/2009	No			MO	65571
4184	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. Access should be made available to all Tax paying citizens. IT IS A Beautiful Area And should be shared. Response to Question 2: Free Access & usage to All citizens. Response to Question 3: Further Restrictions relating to Access & usage. Response to Question 4: Buck Hollow to Rymers Is the most beautiful Area of the Jack's Fork. A wonderful bluff at every turn. Response to Question 5: 1) Law Enforcement Agents should be seen on the River more, Not Just hidden. 2) Continued free Access & usage.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
4185	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: The park is fine the way it is. It's been operated this way for years, dont fix whats not broken! Response to Question 3: No restrictions on the current horse power. Response to Question 4: From Round Springs to Van Buren. Yes they address them directly! Response to Question 5: We have Rangers and Water patrol, if they made them selves more visable it would help keep things more peaceful. Their paid to be there anyway!	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
4186	Response to Question 1: No action Is probably as close to ideal as it is going to get! I have personally witnessed local "gravel bar" campers help floaters who over turned on many occassions, once I believe there could have easily been two fatalities if not for the campers. There is enough room for all of us! The large majority of the users show common courtesy to each other. If boaters think there are too many canoes then let the boaters go else where. If to canoe folks can't tolerate to boaters, they can find another stream - Supply & demand! Response to Question 3: No Primitive Zones - 90% of the population would have No access to primitive areas. Let people use their Land. Have strong No litter, No violence Laws with Fewer more proffessional law enforcement people. No more punks dressed up like "Rambo" hiding in the brush while women go to the brush to use the outdoors toilet facilities. Have the Rangers try to be helpful - Not a pain in the butt. People should be able to camp, use boats, motors, generators, vehicles, wherever they want. If campers leave a mess at their camp sites - bust their butts, hit them with a fine they won't forget! Don't close any more Roads! Let the people use the old established roads that you have closed in the past. Thanks for this opportunity Response to Question 5:	6/30/2009	No			MO	65560
4187	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Rate Motor H.P. at the Jet Pump or do Not Limit H.P. Response to Question 3: This is Not A Wilderness Area, I live 3 mi. from Current River, we should Not Have to Pay Camping fee's on Gravlle Bar's. Response to Question 4: We do Not Need Anymore Restrictions on the river. Response to Question 5: We Need No More Regulations on the Riverway's. This Is The Taxpayers Land and Water, do Not Restrect It. It should be open to Everone.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4188	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE C is closest. Response to Question 2: EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW FACILITIES TO ACCOMODATE PEOPLE AND THEIR RECREATIONAL INTERESTS. MORE CAMPING FACILITIES - ESPECIALLY WITH ELECTRIC AND WATER ACCESS. MORE TRAILS, AND AN OFF-ROAD AREA DESIGNATED FOR ATV'S AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLES. Response to Question 3: MORE PRIMITIVE AREAS AND WILDERNESS AREAS. WE DO NOT SEE HOW THAT WOULD BENEFIT THE PARK FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE VISITORS Response to Question 4: NOT REALLY ADDRESSED. WE HAVE EASEMENTS FOR ELECTRIC LINES THROUGH THE PARKS IN OUR AREA. SOME ROADS ARE CLOSED WITH BERMS. THIS MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO MAINTAIN OUR ELECTRIC LINES. THE MORE RESTRICTIVE ONSR IS, THE MORE DIFFICULT IT IS FOR US. Response to Question 5: GIVE PEOPLE MORE ACCESS. THERE IS A VAST AMOUNT OF LAND THAT IS NOT BEING UTILIZED. THERE WILL ALWAYS BE "PROBLEM VISITORS" NO MATTER WHAT. THE MAJORITY OF VISITORS ARE RESPECTABLE - CREATE NEW JOBS BY BUILDING AND DEVELOPING AREAS SUITABLE FOR RECREACTIONAL USE.	6/30/2009	No		Howell-Oregon Electric Cooperative	MO	65775
4189	Response to Question 1: A. No Jet boats! Period! There is absolutely no reason to all this pollution - noise, fumes, waves & dangerous speed. Response to Question 2: More trails. MTN Bikes - not ATV's. Response to Question 3: Stop more development. What's the deal by the no trespassing Alton Boat Club??? Response to Question 4: I think overall, you've done a great job for the river. Response to Question 5: N/A	6/30/2009	No			MO	63650

4190	Response to Question 1: --ALTERNATIVE A --ELIMINATE POWERED BOATS --ELIMINATE ALCHOHOL EXCEPT IN DESIGNATED AREAS Response to Question 2: --KEEP IT NATURAL, QUIET, AND SLOW PACED. --LEARNING CENTERS AND "DISCOVEREY SITES". Response to Question 3: FURTHER COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF ANY KIND. LET THE STATE LAND SOUTH OF TWO RIVERS BE DEVELOPED/MOTORIZED/EQUESTRIAN, ETC. Response to Question 4: --CEDAR GROVE TO TWO RIVERS. --ALTERNATIVE A DOES. Response to Question 5: I THINK FOLKS CAN BE ON THE RIVER WITHOUT ALCHOHOL FOR A DAY. SAVE IT FOR THE CAMP GROUND. ELIMINATE THE NUISANCE, NOISE, AND TRASH AND INCREASE SAFETY BY NOT ALLOWING ALCHOHOL ON THE RIVERS.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63109
4191	Response to Question 1: No-Action The Rivers and land were taken from locals for Public use and now the Public can't be satisfied - when is it gonna be enough? Response to Question 2: Access to old homesteads & cemeteries is important. Commercial operators and overnight float trips are okay but not a must. They should not be a rule for public use areas. Response to Question 3: Wilderness Areas - We realize there are those who trash and ruin. There always will be. But when did plants and animals become more important than 'We the People?' Response to Question 4: Blue Springs to Van Buren Response to Question 5: From a local standpoint of view there is already a large area of land inaccessible. Please do not make more of it so.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
4192	Response to Question 1: I believe alternative "A" is the best for the protection of the current and it's watershed. Response to Question 4: I have great concern for the upper current. My father and I own a cabin on the current adjoining Montauk State Park. Response to Question 5: Beavers are destroying far too many large trees protecting the river banks. The beaver population should be reduced by an extended winter traping season.	6/30/2009	No			IL	62898
4193	Response to Question 1: NO-ACTION Response to Question 2: None. Response to Question 3: Do not limit boat/motor Horsepower my family enjoys this activity & it would do away with our family fun. Response to Question 4: We love the whole river. The alternatives severely restrict our use & enjoyment. Response to Question 5: We can't go on the Jacks Fork because the canoers have drugs & are cussing and going topless.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
4194	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: A-B-C Response to Question 4: upper current NO Response to Question 5: If the park service is to be involved they need to realize they are taking away from our enjoyment of God's nature! As in swimming ropes & jumping off rocks!	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
4195	Response to Question 1: No Action Because It Is fine the way It Is If You Lower the HP Limit More onoes will Be fliped Because small HP make a Bigger wake Response to Question 2: none Response to Question 3: A, B, C, Altenitives Response to Question 4: alley to two River on Jacks fork & Akers to Big Springs on Current. Response to Question 5: Rangers ar Dick Heads to Most People or stupid stuff when they Got a Job to do not save the world	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
4196	Response to Question 1: I like the primitive (alt A) if you continue to protect the horse trails. If you designate trails, in Dent County around Cedar Grove, give alternative routes. Do Not reduce the # of trails in this area. Response to Question 2: I am most interested in horse back riding. (Not necessarily The organized Rides, but small groups going in and riding for a day.) Response to Question 3: I feel motorized activities are among the less useful aspects of our parks. Response to Question 4: I mentioned Cedar Grove. Response to Question 5: Actually, I prefer Not making any changes. It works well as it is. Park service does a good job. If it must change, I would like the same (not less) horse trails	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
4197	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternative A	6/25/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4198	Response to Question 1: No Action Keep Boat way they are Response to Question 2: Non Response to Question 3: A, B, & C alternatives Response to Question 4: Alley to Two Rives Jack Forks Akers to Big Sprigs Current Response to Question 5: more Rangers to watch all on Rivers more Camp Site on Both Rivers	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
4199	Response to Question 1: No-Action 40 HP Lower Jet unit Response to Question 2: No closing of roads or trails or Landings or camping sites. Do not charge for Primitive camping sites Along Rivers. Response to Question 4: I have many special places within the ONSR boundries. I'm concerned mostly about Not seeing enough Rangers that patrol areas. I'd like to see more on Rivers patrolling & around camping areas. People would feel safer these days when rivers are patrolled more. Stop the ones that are violators & let the ones who are not left to enjoy the rest. Response to Question 5: Promote programs & education on the "running" of Jet boats. Explain "why" a jet boat has to run faster in shallow water (like on shoals) in order to "stay on top" of water. Promote good sportsman ship from everyone. We're All here to enjoy the Rivers	6/30/2009	No			MO	65466
4200	Response to Question 1: Yes, Alternative A is close. There are sections of the Jacks Fork that water quality is already impared so enforcement, monitoring and research must be increased. Also, promotion of the protection of spring recharge areas and the overall watershed. Response to Question 2: A reduction of human and domestic animal (e.g., horses) impacts on the rivers as well as a reduction in motorized forms of recreation. Wilderness designation for the Big Spring tract should be included. Response to Question 3: The NPS must not increase its tolerance for resource impacts. Restoration of impared environments and natural settings is the wrong approach and sometime not possible for many years. Response to Question 4: The Upper Jacks Fork and the North segment of the Upper Current River. Alternative A is the best. Response to Question 5: A full recognition that prevention of imparement is essential and that restoration is some times not feasible. Also, a more active role in the protection of the entire watershed.	6/30/2009	No			MO	65201

4201	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: A family can not run with a limitation of 25 hp up river	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4202	Response to Question 1: Alternative C, but leave the motor unlimited from Big Springs to Gooseneck. There is very little, if any canoeing or tubing on that stretch of river. Response to Question 2: There should be more primitive camping areas, Permanent boat ramps @ Pin Oak, @ Big Tree camp ground, @ Paint Rock with some Primitive camping. Response to Question 3: Wilderness designation	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
4203	Response to Question 1: No-Action - leave as is. Leave motors @ 40 hp @ the Pump. Less than that will not get your boat up the river. Better yet, go back to before 1964 Regulations, if you want to modify something. Response to Question 2: Leave as is. Let locals continue to take care of and use river - Don't turn it into something we can't use even tho we live here; Pay local taxes and support local businesses by going to the river on a daily/weekly basis, not just once a year like tourists. Response to Question 3: A B C. None of these. No Action - Better yet go back to before 1964. We take care of our River ourselves. Always clean up after others and always leave it better than we found it. Always. We are better stewards than the tourists who come in 1x. Response to Question 4: esp. Cardareva Gravel Bar. Log Yard - River from Salem to Van Buren. Others Spring Holler, Ant Hole, Paint Rock, Gravel Springs. Alternatives A-B-C w/prevent us from enjoying our special parts of our river that we use, our children enjoy and our grandchildren. We live here - we don't tell people in KC or St. Louis how to manage & enjoy what's there. Response to Question 5: Leave it better/cleaner than you found it every time. Management - leave as is; Do not want or need Alternative A-B-or C. Leave motors rated @ 40 HP At the pump. The river belongs to all of us to enjoy, Not just a few	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4204	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION NEEDED Response to Question 2: NO HORSEPOWER LIMITS Response to Question 3: QUIT TAKING RIGHT AWAY FROM THE PUBLIC Response to Question 4: LIKE TO BE ABLE TO RUN FROM BIG SPRINGS TO VAN BUREN WITH NO HORSEPOWER LIMITS Response to Question 5: GIVE IT TO THE FOREST SERVICE, THEY DON'T HAVE PROBLEMS FROM GOOSENECK DOWN.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63901
4205	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: I think there should be no H.P. limit from Round Spring to Goose Neck. Response to Question 3: I am satisfied with everything else except the H.P. limit on the NO ACTION Proposal. Response to Question 4: I have property along the river, and I would like to see No limit on H.P. I would like to run from V.B. to Big Springs and utilize the facilities of the Lodge and Pavillion traveling by boat. Response to Question 5: I think the Law enforcement of Riverways should treat people (visitors) with respect, as they also would like to be treated.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63937
4206	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: We want to be able to run our 40 hp boat rated at the pump on the river from Eminence to Van Buren Response to Question 5: We try to keep the rivers clean so people want to come back to our area. This helps to support our local economy	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4207	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: I run from Powder Mill to Rivers end in Doniphan my boat is a 40 hp and I cant afford to go get a new motor Current River is my favorite River to Run and the closest Response to Question 5: we try to keep our rivers as clean as possible It isn't the locals that cause the problems. if water patrol done their job right we wouldn't have to worry about it.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63638
4208	Response to Question 1: C or leave as is Response to Question 2: Interpretation and Education. Mixed-Use Response to Question 3: Nonmotorized Boating oportunties Response to Question 4: Alternative C- Powder Mill Alternative A - Lower current Response to Question 5: Educating the Floaters and Canoeing Take care of what you Have taken from the people Canoe on the Jacks fork Boating on the Current Natural look pretty Bad at the national Parks Like Alley Springs	6/30/2009	No			MO	65588
4209	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A Response to Question 2: BIG SPRING WILDERNESS, DE-EMPHASIZE MOTORIZED RECREATION, CLOSE ILLEGAL TRAILS AND ROADS, REDUCE NUMBERS OF WEEKEND FLOATERS Response to Question 3: MOTORIZED RECREATION BOTH ATV AND BOATS Response to Question 4: JACKS FORK FROM PRONGS DOWN TO ALLEY SPRING, ALT A. OK CURRENT - BABIST CAMP TO TWO RIVERS ALT. A OK Response to Question 5: DE-EMPHASIZE MOTORIZED RECREATION, NO MOTOR ZONES, LIMIT PARTY FLOATERS ON WEEKENDS, PERMIT SYSTEM IF NECESSARY	6/30/2009	No			UT	84738
4210	Response to Question 1: ALTERNATIVE A IS PRETTY MUCH HOW I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE AREA . . . HORSES AND ATV, AND OFFROAD VEHICLES HAVE CAUSED EXTENSIVE EROSION IN THE UPPER CURRENT RIVER . . . IT NEEDS TO BE STOPPED AND TRAILS REPAIRED. MOTORIZED BOATS AND VEHICLES - NOT ALLOWED Response to Question 2: NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IS MY BIG THING . . . , BUT ALL THE PARTS ARE IMPORTANT NATURAL LAND BASED MANAGEMENT ZONE Response to Question 3: ALL PARTS ARE IMPORTANT BUT ALTERNATIVE C IS NOT TO MY LIKING Response to Question 4: I AM IN FAVOR OF ALTERNATIVE A FOR THE UPPER CURRENT RIVER IF ALTERNATIVE A IS THE DECISION - I THINK IT WILL ADDRESS MY CONCERNS Response to Question 5: DESIGNATED HORSE TRAILS NEED TO BE ESTABLISHED AND MAINTAINED TO CONTROL EROSION. OUTFITTERS SHOULD HELP MANAGE THE TRAILS. DESIGNATED RIVER CROSSINGS MUST BE ESTABLISHED TO MINIMIZE EROSION NO MOTORIZED VEHICLES ALLOWED OFF THE ROADS - OR CROSSING THE STREAM	6/30/2009	No			MO	65401
4211	Response to Question 1: The No-Action plan is the best way to manage the park activities. Enforcement of current laws and rules would be best. Response to Question 2: No changes from current management. Response to Question 3: The horsepower motor regulations currently in place should have NO CHANGE. It would be unsafe to decrease the horsepower from 40 below Round Spring due to the nature of the river. Unlimited horsepower below Big Spring is ideal. Please do not change the current regulations. Response to Question 4: None. Response to Question 5:	6/30/2009	No			MO	63017

	Increase law enforcement prescence to enforce fishing and permit laws. Perhaps a small yearly tax on motor Boats (5 or \$10) could help fund this.						
4212	Response to Question 1: Yes - No Action is the closest. Should change Hp to 25 both Above & below Akers. Response to Question 2: None of them Response to Question 3: All of them Response to Question 4: North & South of Akers - leave the campground alone. increase the Hp to 25 hp both north & south of Akers. Response to Question 5: Listen to the local people & cater to them instead of city people who Abuse the system!	6/23/2009	No			MO	65479
4213	Response to Question 1: Yes. No Action is the closest. North of Akers & South of Akers should be @ least 25 Hp. It is impossible to get up & down the river. Response to Question 2: None of them Response to Question 3: All of them Response to Question 4: North of Akers & South of Akers. Campsite @ Akers should be left alone! Horsepower should be uped to 25 hp both up & down. Response to Question 5: Focus on the people who live here - not city people who abuse our rivers!	6/23/2009	No			MO	65479
4214	Response to Question 1: No-action Response to Question 2: None of them Response to Question 3: all of tlem Response to Question 4: The 25 Hp should stay the same in North Boundry of akers and should be 25 Hp South. Response to Question 5: National River ways should be more for locatels and not the drunks and pot smokers.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65479
4215	Response to Question 1: Yes - No action or change the Hp to 25 north of Akers & below Akers. Response to Question 2: None of them Response to Question 3: All of them Response to Question 4: North of Akers & South of Akers - Need @ least 25 Hp motors both ways. Campsites need to be left open! - Without fees Response to Question 5: National Riverways should cater more to country fokes & not just city fokes who mis-use the rivers.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65479
4216	Response to Question 1: Yes, No action. No action is the closest but I believe it should be 25 hp on the North Boundary to Akers and Akers to Round Spring. Going Non-motorized in my opinion is not an option At all! Response to Question 2: None of them! Response to Question 3: All of them! Response to Question 4: The alternatives do not address them @ all! Shutting us off of the river is un-American and un-Missourian! Response to Question 5: I think the National Riverways should make it nicer for those of us that live here to enjoy the rivers & inforce laws on all the drunks & dope adicts on the rivers!	6/23/2009	No			MO	65479
4217	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65588
4218	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION. SET A TIGHTER LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF CANOES PUT IN. POSSIBLY SET LIMIT BASED ON RATIO OF RENTALS RELEASING CANOES THAT DAY VS. RAFTS & TUBES Response to Question 2: LIMIT HORSES USING RIVER CROSSINGS Response to Question 3: REGULATING JOHN BOATS Response to Question 4: TWO RIVERS TO GOOSENECK & FROM 17 BRIDGE ON JACKS FORK DOWN Response to Question 5: SIMILAR "LAUNCH" CHECKS FOR JOHN BOATS, LIKE CANOES GO THROUGH AT ALLEY BRIDGE PUT IN . . . COULD LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF "LEWD" BEHAVIOR THAT VISITORS EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65438
4219	Response to Question 1: I BELIEVE THE BEST PLAN IS B. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE NON-MOTORIZED SECTIONS OF THE RIVER AND MORE PRIMITIVE MANAGEMENT. BUT THERE SHOULD BE A COMPROMISE B/W THE TWO ENDS OF THE SPECTRUM. Response to Question 2: SEASONAL HP RESTRICTIONS. IF THE RIVER BECOMES NON-MOTORIZED TO 2 RIVERS DURING GIGGING & FISHING SEASONS, FISHING PRESSURE WILL BE CONCENTRATED DOWNSTREAM, HURTING DOWNSTREAM POPULATIONS. Response to Question 3: BLANKET NON-MOTORIZED RESTRICTIONS ON THE UPPER STRETCHES. NO MORE DEVELOPEMENT EITHER Response to Question 4: NO COMMENT Response to Question 5: NO COMMENT	6/23/2009	No			MO	65608
4220	Response to Question 1: No Action 60-40 Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Any Part that is 60-40 Response to Question 5: Leave it alone	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
4221	Response to Question 1: No-Action - All the way!!!! Response to Question 2: limit canoes to Jacks fork and Moter Boats to the Current. Response to Question 3: Never take Moter Boats off the river. A, B, & C. Response to Question 4: From two rivers and below it should be float at your own risk. Response to Question 5: Jacks fork - canoes only Current river - Just Moter Boats Joint floaters and Boats from two rivers and below.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
4222	Response to Question 1: No Action Unlimited horsepower Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: To many changes Response to Question 4: All of them Response to Question 5: more access to River	6/23/2009	No			MO	65692
4223	Response to Question 1: No Action Unlimited Horsepower or Rate horsepower at the Jet Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: way to many changes Response to Question 4: All areas are special Response to Question 5: Better Access to the river	6/23/2009	No			MO	65606
4224	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horsepower At The Pump or Unlimited Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: To many Changes And never To our Benefit Response to Question 4: All of them Response to Question 5: More And Better Acess to River With Less Restrictions	6/23/2009	No			MO	65438

4225	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate Horsepower At the Pump Or Unlimit Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: To many changes and never To our Benefit Response to Question 4: All of Them Response to Question 5: Better Access to River with Less Restrictions	6/23/2009	No			MO	65438
4226	Response to Question 1: No Action Take the horse Powe Limit away Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A, B, C, Alternatives Response to Question 4: Alley To Two Rivers on Jacks Fork Akers To Big Springs on Current Response to Question 5: Rangers being visable better accesses Free recreation	6/25/2009	No			MO	65466
4227	Response to Question 1: No Action. Local People should be able to use the river as they have become accustomed to. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Round Spring Lower Landing and below should permit 40 H.P. Jet outboard access	6/25/2009	No			MO	65560
4228	Response to Question 1: No Action is necessary. the Newer outboards Are very Enviromentaly consious. And your park Ranger Patrol Service Does a great Job with Boaters and floaters	6/22/2009	No			MO	65804
4229	Response to Question 1: No change - add trails from Akers Ferry to the North boundary to the authorized list for horse use. Response to Question 2: Less patrol more public aid. Why wasn't there an open forum to discuss issues possibly write them on butcher block to get real public input. Response to Question 3: restrictive control on horses, canoes, etc. You waste more man hours on policing petty rules you have developed to create jobs than on developing the park. Response to Question 4: North end - No, they do not. No horse trails are authorized above Akers Response to Question 5: Put in a historic site built like when the ONSR was developed.	6/22/2009	No			MO	65501
4230	Response to Question 1: Keep it as natural as possible least invasive by human population Response to Question 2: Careful monitoring to see that the virgin states (as much as possible in today's world) is preserved to its fullest extent. Response to Question 3: motor boat or any motor vehicle usage in, near, or close to the river Response to Question 4: I'm concerned about the total 134 miles to keep it as close to its "natural state" as possible. Arkansas state motto the rivers connect ALL states. Response to Question 5: strategy: Educate the public with FACTS & address their concerns with factual info & cause & effect synarios. We have only borrowed this planet from our children, we need to care for it & nurture it so it can provide for & be enjoyed by future generations	6/23/2009	No			AR	72740
4231	Response to Question 1: Please do Not change the HP for boats in the area. Response to Question 2: Please Do NOT CHANGE THE HP! Response to Question 5: Please leave the HP the same.	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4232	Response to Question 1: Alternative A Response to Question 2: No HP north of Round Spring Response to Question 3: Alternatives C & D Response to Question 4: Akers Ferry Area Boat noise both jet boats & giggers destroy the natural tranquility of the Area Response to Question 5: More natural & historical opportunities	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4233	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: This is terrible about the HP on Boats Response to Question 4: The boat HP limit is awful! Response to Question 5: The gravel should be hauled out! The HP limit should stay the same. If the canoers don't like the boats then don't come to Shannon Co.	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4234	Response to Question 1: Alternative "A" Response to Question 2: Lower Horsepower motors, No motor N of Round Spring Living history demonstrations Response to Question 3: Alternatives C & D Response to Question 4: Akers Ferry area No or lower hp motors or electric only. No camping on banks (any property extends to center of river Response to Question 5: Discourage heavy drinking & prohibit loud music (or any type of Amplified music in float Boats.	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4235	Response to Question 1: Yes - Alternatve A: non-motorized riverways. Response to Question 2: designation of a wilderness area. Response to Question 3: seasonal hp restrictions/Alt. C. Response to Question 4: All 134 miles are special and need to be properly managed with a Conservation focus so that future recreationists can enjoy the primitive nature of our Ozarks' waterways. Response to Question 5: Provide cultural learning experiences so visitors and locals alike are reminded about what a unique treasure we are surrounded by in the Ozarks.	6/23/2009	No			UN	Unknown
4236	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, c Response to Question 4: All of it, leave it alone Response to Question 5: open all river access	6/23/2009	No			MO	65560
4237	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: All parts are important to me they need to take No-Action Response to Question 5: Open all River access	6/23/2009	No			MO	65560
4238	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, c Response to Question 4: All of it leave it to the ppl. Response to Question 5: Open all River and natural Spring accesses	6/23/2009	No			MO	65560

4239	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: No action. Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: Yes, no action addresses them all. Response to Question 5: Canoeing classes.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65571
4240	Response to Question 1: I prefer No Action, Reason for this, I don't feel out Boats have, or will any time in the future cause any trouble. Response to Question 2: I feel the N.P.S. Need to concentrate harder on managing the regulation and management of what we have here already. Without adding more to there plate. Response to Question 3: Restriction of horsepower, and closing Roads. its Been a proven fact the Jet Boating is the Safest Recreational vehicle in the State of MO. Proven By research that there has only Been 1 death cause By Jet Boating Ever! Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Two rivers. there Needs to Be No Action taken there. Response to Question 5: N.P.S. needs to take into consideration that we Need our Boats and all river accesses for Rescue and Medical purposes.	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
4241	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action The River belongs to God and the ppl he created Response to Question 3: A, B, C Jet Boats should remain Horsepower should remain the same and the management should consider leaving it Alone - No-Action Response to Question 4: Any of it is important leve it alone No-Action Response to Question 5: You should open all accsess to the riverways and springs	6/23/2009	No			MO	65560
4242	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C No-Action Response to Question 4: Any part of it is important to me No-Action-leave it alone Response to Question 5: You should open all access to the riverways & springs	6/23/2009	No			MO	65560
4243	Response to Question 1: No Action No Horse Power Limits on Current River Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: No Action is best on All Response to Question 5: No Action No More problems Than you Have in These Areas Maybe you should send your Rangers for More Training and give Them Some People Skills Training Need Better parking Area At Paint Rock Landing Need Electric at Log Yard Camp-ground If you are going with A, B, & or C you may as well Dam up the River at Van Buren and Make a New Lake out of Current River	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
4244	Response to Question 1: No Action (Remove all Present Restrictions) Response to Question 2: un-limited usage of Recreational Park!! Response to Question 3: Any Limit of usage of River. Response to Question 5: More access points to River, and Park Area.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4245	Response to Question 1: Rate H.P. at Pump No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: All of it Response to Question 5: More Road Access leave Road open	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4246	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: Education Response to Question 3: Restricting use of the river to those who live there would be unfair. Response to Question 5: possibly limit where Boaters can travel on holiday weekends (memorial, 4th July, Labor Day)	7/14/2009	No			MO	63016
4247	Response to Question 1: No action - rate horsepower at pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: extra road access is needed	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4248	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Keeping existing roads open and keeping current h.p limits. Response to Question 3: Lowering h.p on boat motor's and closing roads. Response to Question 4: Sinking creek to Two River's. No-Action. Response to Question 5: More survey's and input from local town's.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63633
4249	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION, LEAVE HORSEPOWER RATING 40 HP AT THE PUMP OF MOTOR. Response to Question 2: (NO ACTION) Response to Question 3: ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C Response to Question 4: NO ACTION, THERE IS MORE FISH AND WILDLIFE THEN EVER! Response to Question 5: IMPROVE AND MAINTAIN BOAT RAMPS. OPEN FIELDS. NO CLOSED ROADS. NO BOAT RAMP FEES. NO FEES FOR PRIMITIVE CAMPING, LIKE GRAVEL BARS.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63901
4250	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: More ranger led programs such as exploring caves and more primitive camps sights. Response to Question 3: Lowering outboard horse power. Response to Question 4: Owls Bend to Log Yard. No Action Response to Question 5: Let local people have more in put of management decisions.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63638
4251	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Allow some gravel to be removed from the river. Response to Question 2: Keep the present horse power limit, any less h.p and I can not boat my family up the river. Response to Question 3: Lowering h.p on outboards and closing existing roads. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren. No-Action. Response to Question 5: Keep local people involved and find a way to remove some gravel from the river.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65440
4252	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: No-Action. Keep present h.p limit on outboards. Response to Question 3: Lowering the h.p limit and closing roads and trails. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Two rivers. No-Action. Response to Question 5: Local input & infomation.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63633

4253	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: The park service needs to be more involved in cleaning etc. the facilities. Response to Question 3: I believe plan A & B should Not be included as well as restrictions on outboard motors Response to Question 4: The parts that are special to me are Round Springs to the Log Yard. No action addresses these places. Response to Question 5: I strongly do Not like plan A, B or C.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65721
4254	Response to Question 1: No-Action! Response to Question 2: No-Action! Response to Question 3: A.B.C alternatives! Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Van Buren Response to Question 5: No-Action!	7/14/2009	No			MO	65440
4255	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: the park service needs to be more involved. Response to Question 3: I believe Plan A and Plan B should not be included as well as restrictions on outboard motors. Response to Question 4: The areas are Round Springs to the Log Yard. The No Action alternative addresses those areas. Response to Question 5: Park service needs to patrol campgrounds more often.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65440
4256	Response to Question 1: no Action Response to Question 2: no Action Response to Question 3: no Action Response to Question 4: Leave it Alone. Response to Question 5: Leave it Alone.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63901
4257	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: We Love the River and don't want any change. Response to Question 4: The Entire River is the way we Like it. Response to Question 5: any safety programs would be good	7/14/2009	No			MI	48423
4258	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION . . . If it was to be made closer to my idea I would open up more accesses to the National Scenic Riverways. This would Include more public boat ramps on the rivers and old roads that have been gated off or shut off completely; reopened. Response to Question 2: I DO NOT FEEL THAT ANY PARTS OF THE PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL RIVERWAYS. Response to Question 3: I BELIEVE THAT ALL PARTS OF THE PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL RIVERWAYS. Response to Question 4: ALL OF THE RIVERWAYS ARE SPECIAL TO MYSELF AND MY FAMILY. WE HAVE ENJOYED EXPERIANCES ACROSS MOST OF THE RIVERWAYS. FROM CANOEING THE NORTHERN PART OF THE RIVERWAYS TO HIKING AND FISHING IT IS ALL IMPORTANT AND SPECIAL TO MYSELF. NO PART OF THE ALTERNATIVES IN ANY WAY WILL BE HELPING THE NATIONAL RIVERWAYS OR THE PEOPLE WHO USE AND ENJOY THEM. Response to Question 5: I SUGGEST THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE QUIT TRYING TO TAKE AWAY FROM THE PUBLIC PEOPLE. IT IS OURS TO ENJOY AND USE, AND THERE ARE ENOUGH LAWS AND RESTRICTIONS TO GO AROUND ALREADY.	7/14/2009	No			LA	70452
4259	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: The Park Service needs to be more involved in the upkeep of campgrounds, facilities, and boat ramps. Response to Question 3: Plans A & B and restrictions on outboard motors should not be included. Response to Question 4: From Round Springs to the Logyard. Alternatives A, B, C don't address them adequately, but No Action does. Response to Question 5: More input from local people who are going to be affected by changes.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65440
4260	Response to Question 1: No Action Is close to my Idea. The only way I would modify Is to Re open roads that have been closed off as well as River Accesses. Also make Projects the ONSR are doing more open to the public. Response to Question 2: I Believe No Parts of the preliminary alternatives should be included in the future management of the national riverways. Response to Question 3: I believe all parts of the preliminary alternatives should Not be included in the future management of the national riverways. Response to Question 4: Myself and my family enjoy the O.N.S.R mostly from Alley Spring All the way South to Gooseneck and I believe the No Action suits these Places Adequately. I feel that the National Park Service Is doing a fairly good job now and do not think these changes would be good for public use in any way. Response to Question 5: I suggest keeping up the good work as far as how they are managed at the present time. Although I believe that the places where you pay to camp should be free unless they have a paved boat ramp and sufficient parking as well as running water. I also believe that the ONSR should let the public know when and why they are giving out these surveys by advertising it locally.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63941
4261	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: A, B, or C Response to Question 4: The whole 134 miles. No-Action addresses it adequately. Response to Question 5: Take No-Action! Continue to allow tubers on the river and motors. By limiting their use, this will hurt local area economy in many ways.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63901
4262	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: I think that the Park Service needs to be more involved in the up keep of the recreational facilities, boat areas and camp grounds. Response to Question 3: Restrictions on outboard motors. Also plan A & B should NOT be implimented. Response to Question 4: From Round Springs to the Logyard. No-Action does! Response to Question 5: Need more meetings and information with locals who are affected by any of these changes.	7/14/2009	No			MO	65440
4263	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: Do away with Horsepower limits	7/1/2009	No			MO	63648
4264	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 3: Motor boats should not be taken off or have further restrictions upon them. We the people of Carter County along with adjoining counties live here, pay our taxes and respect our community. We should have the right to go to the river & put in where we are accustomed to. Our area is already limited on what we can do for entertainment. And I feel that we should not be	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965

	restricted & put 2nd so the tourists can come in and do as they wish. Response to Question 5: What I see alot of on Current River is the people drinking Alcohol. The tourists come into our town & on the river, They are so drunk, they are not only a bother to the people trying to have a peaceful day they are an endangerment to them selves & the people around them.						
4265	Response to Question 1: No action - A-B & C are Not what I want to ever see implemented on my river. Leave it alone. If it ain't broke don't fix it. Response to Question 2: No Action - Leave as is Response to Question 3: A-B- and C. Take No action Response to Question 4: Cardareva - All the river is special to me Response to Question 5: Leave it alone - No action. Do not want A-B- or C	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
4266	Response to Question 1: No Action Motor Restriction should be lifted Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: other three (A, B, or C) Response to Question 4: all. Response to Question 5: No Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4267	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: all of the A, B, C Response to Question 4: Leave It As No-Action Response to Question 5: No-Action plan - Leave It Alone	7/1/2009	No			MO	63624
4268	Response to Question 1: C I've been riding horses in that area for over 30 years. Destroying our old trails has been the wrong thing to do. Response to Question 2: Adding trails, camping, anything to encourage families to teach their children to love & use the outdoors, rather than do video games. Response to Question 3: Removal of existing commercial services, destroying someone's livelihood. Leave the wild horses alone! Response to Question 4: Horse trails, walking trails, rivers, camping. Leave the wild horses alone! Response to Question 5: More river cleanup activities, such as trash pickup days. Work with MO Dept of Conservation so that more areas like Angeline will not be developed, causing huge runoffs into the rivers, destroying beautiful forested areas and pristine creeks. Thank goodness the orchid glades have not yet been bull-dozed.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63640
4269	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None No-Action Response to Question 3: None No-Action Response to Question 4: None No-Action Response to Question 5: None No-Action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
4270	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Leave things as they are. Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Boats, Bikes Floaters, campers, etc. Response to Question 4: Van Buren Area More Restrictions would hurt economy of Area Response to Question 5: More water safety patrols	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4271	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Leave things as they are Response to Question 3: restrictions on boats, bikes, floaters, campers, etc Response to Question 4: Van Buren Area. more restrictions would hurt economy there Response to Question 5: more water safety patrols	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4272	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Make more park service primitive camp sites along the River and more presence of Park Service personel And water Patrol. Forget the 40 horse Limit on the Lower Section Response to Question 2: Possibly more activities such as the Ozark Heritage days program at Big Springs. Maybe doing some of that on the upper stretch, at Owls Bend Like they used to do, but leave the River alone, except getting the drunnks and dopers off the River making it more Family Friendly Response to Question 3: Adding the 40 horse power Limit From Gooseneck to Big Springs boat Ramp and Removing the 40 horse Limit to the Big Springs Park area so boats could go to Van Buren Response to Question 4: the Traditional camp sites and land access points to the River should Not be closed especially the few spots on the Lower Riverways I.E. Hickory Landing Big Oak Tree Bay Nothing Club house Chilton. More Hunting access on the west side of the River. Response to Question 5: More visible presence of Park Law enforcement without the Swat Team mentality	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4273	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: I Feel No Action is needed At This Time Response to Question 3: Restrictions on Boat & Horse Power should not Be Included Response to Question 4: From the Bay Nothing area to Big Springs. No-action should be taken. Response to Question 5: No	7/1/2009	No			MO	63937
4274	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: More access to river with more boat ramps. better roads and better public info as to how to gain remote access. More trails more public campounds. Response to Question 3: Limiting any access by any group. It is owned by the public for their use. Response to Question 4: I like how things are there are many miles for all groups to enjoy seperately and simultaneously. Response to Question 5: If the problem is with a few affecting the many Don't punish everyone by more rules and regulations. Provide more police to manage the unruly.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4275	Response to Question 1: TAKE NO ACTION Financial Down Falls will occur for Res. If Restritions Are approved.	6/27/2009	No			FL	33931
4276	Response to Question 1: A is the best, emphasizing less development and a return to an environmentally low-impact range of activities. Response to Question 2: There should be limits on numbers of canoes and horses. No ATV's. This pristine region is suffering from overusse. No noisy high-speed power boats. Response to Question 3: Any kind of "development" which draws fun-loving drunks and party animals to the area. Response to Question 4: I am the private landowner with 104 acres near Cedargrove (within the park). When my family sold the scenic easement for the park, we were assured the purpose was to preserve the wild character of the land and to let it "go back to nature" with a ban on development of any kind. Changing this policy would be unfair. Response to Question 5: Have enough personnel (park rangers) to enforce	7/31/2009	No			MO	63119

	regulations such as no horses in rivers and creeks, no ATV's on park trails, etc. Publicize the rules which are currently in force.						
4277	Response to Question 1: No Action: The rivers our for enjoyment for the families that go on them. Maybe need to slow down the boats running with motors for better safety. Response to Question 2: More and better accesses to the rivers. And slow those boats down, specificaly in swimming areas!!!! Response to Question 3: I think that God put the rivers there for people to enjoy and hope they stay that way in the future for all to enjoy. Response to Question 4: I think all areas should be enjoyed by anyone that wants to use them. And I also think the big Horse motors need to be slowed down more. Response to Question 5: Let the people be able to use all the campsites (old & new) and care for them as if they are there home. We want our families for years to come be able to enjoy our rivers. This is why God put them there.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63079
4278	Response to Question 1: I am in favor of the "No Action" Alternative Response to Question 2: Not applicable Response to Question 3: Not applicable Response to Question 4: The Mouth of Rocky - Big Tree - Boat Docks at Van-Buren and Eminence - Keep everything the way it is now Response to Question 5: I think the Local people have always done a good Job taking care of the Rivers, Therefore it should be Kept Just the way it is.	7/31/2009	No			MO	65548
4279	Response to Question 1: Yes, Plan A Best Fits my idea on how the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be manage. Response to Question 2: The closing of illegally developed Trails and Roads and restoreing the Natural conditon of the area. Put limits on over use by horse riders, canoers, and Moterboats Response to Question 3: Opening any areas up to more motorized or horse back travel. Response to Question 4: The Upper Jacks Fork - above Alley Springs. And the Upper Current River - above Round Springs. I think plan A addresses these areas. Response to Question 5: I think more enforcedment of the rules that already exist.	7/31/2009	No			MO	63123
4280	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: unrestricted usage and Access Response to Question 3: Restrictded Access and Usage Response to Question 4: Blue Spings and Rymers needs the Graval cleaned out so we can float without getting out and Pulling the Boats most of the way Response to Question 5: Provide more resouces to recreationits!	7/14/2009	No			MO	65438
4281	Response to Question 1: No-Action. This gives everyone the right to do what they like best to do. I think you will find the larger motor boats go to gravel barges and are much more courteous & keep a cleaner area on the water. Response to Question 5: We have been coming there for years! We always enjoy ourselves. We like the higher power boat so we can get more people on board to take to an away-gravel barge for a little privacy. We may have 20 or more people at our reunion. Think about how long	7/14/2009	No			IL	61554
4282	Response to Question 1: No Action - horsepower should be rated at pump. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: All of it, leave it as is. Response to Question 5: We need more road access, re-open more roads, canoes limited.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4283	Response to Question 1: NO - NOT RESTRICTIVE ENOUGH TO ALLOW PEOPLE TO ENJOY THE RIVERS IN THEIR NATURAL, PEACEFUL STATE Response to Question 2: H.P. LIMITATIONS Response to Question 3: PERSONALLY OWNED CANOES & LOW HP MOTOR PROPELLED WATER CRAFT (JON BOATS) SHOULD ALLOW PEOPLE TO ENJOY THE RIVER & YET NOT RUIN OTHER PEOPLE'S APPRECIATION OF THE AREA. SOME COMMERCIAL (RENTAL) TRAFFIC IS FINE BUT SHOULD BE LIMITED IN A REASONABLE WAY. CURRENT RIVER SHOULD NEVER TAKE ON THE APPEARANCE OF A VENICEAN CANAL Response to Question 4: ALL OF THE RIVER AREA IS SPECIAL - ALTERNATIVES NOT RESTRICTIVE ENOUGH. IT'S TOO BAD YOU CAN'T DO ALL OF CURRENT RIVER, ELEVEN PT., & THE BLACK & ST. FRANCIS WHILE YOU'RE AT IT. SOMEONE NEEDS TO STOP WHAT HAS BECOME SERIOUS ABUSE & MISUSE OF OUR STREAMS. THE UNAPPRECIATIVE MORONS (JET BOATERS - DRUNKEN TUBERS) WILL DO THEIR WORST UNTIL REGULATIONS STOP THEM. SO DO IT - JUST DO IT IN A BIG WAY SO IT WILL ACCOMPLISH WHAT NEEDS DOING. Response to Question 5: IT IS TOO EASY FOR PEOPLE TO BUY & RUN "SHOW OFF" BOATS - ALWAYS FASTER. THIS WILL CONTINUE UNTIL YOU LIMIT THE WHOLE SHEBANG TO 10 TO 12 HP. IF BOATERS HAVE TO RUN FAST FOR FUN, LET THEM GO TO A BIG RIVER OR A LAKE WHERE THEY WON'T RUIN EVERYONE ELSE'S EXPERIENCE. THE RIVER SHOULD NOT BE A RACE TRACK. A 10 HP. WILL GET YOU UP AGAINST THE CURRENT WELL BUT WILL EFFECTIVELY LIMIT THE EFFORTS OF IDIOTS. ALSO LIMIT "COMMERCIAL" INNER TUBE & CANOE FLOATERS (FLOATILLAS) - ENOUGH OF THIS AND THE RIVERS BEGIN TO LOOK LIKE ONE BIG BEER PARTY - THIS DESTROYS THE BEAUTY AND ATMOSPHERE THAT SHOULD BE O.N.S.R. GOOD LUCK - NOBODY TOLD THE JACK ASSES TO BUY A \$10,000 BOAT SO THEY COULD SHOW OFF. LET THEM THEM GO SOMEWHERE ELSE. PEOPLE WHO REALLY APPRECIATE THE RIVER WILL STILL BE THERE - IN ACCEPTABLE BOATS. OR YOU COULD JUST CHANGE O.N.S.R. TO OZARK'S NASTIEST SCENIC RACEWAY?	7/1/2009	No			MO	63902
4284	Response to Question 1: No Action The current 40 horsepower limit should remain Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C I've been on the river tubing, canoeing, camping, boating, fishing and gigging my whole life & that shouldn't change Response to Question 4: Depending on what my family and I are doing we go to different parts of the river. We drive the extra distance because of what we are able to do. Response to Question 5: Some of the ramps are really bad and some of the roads need better maintained.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4285	Response to Question 1: no action Rate horsepower to Jet pump Response to Question 2: no action Response to Question 3: no action Response to Question 4: B B;iff Response to Question 5: boat acess Ramps	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629

4286	Response to Question 1: no action 40 hp at pump Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: alt A B & C Response to Question 4: No action	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4287	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Current River Response to Question 5: people that Live there should get to make the disicions	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
4288	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A, B, C Response to Question 4: Current River Response to Question 5: People that live Here should get to make the desicions	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
4289	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 3: A. B. Response to Question 5: Limit The alcoholic Beverages for canoes, tubes & Boats.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63965
4290	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: Alternatives A, B & C Response to Question 4: The Alteratives A, B & C should not be used anywhere they hinder our river experience Response to Question 5: Put in more ramps & better maintain the ones we have	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4291	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Twin Rocks Response to Question 5: New Boat Ramps	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4292	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION REMOVE ALL HORSEPOWER LIMITS ON RIVER WAYS Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: ALL NO ACTION Response to Question 5: SEND ALL RANGERS BACK TO SCHOOL FOR PEOPLE SKILLS TRAINING AND MAKE THEM MORE VISIBLE ON THE RIVER NO-ACTION INSTALL ELECTRIC & WATER TO ALL PAY TO CAMP SIGHTS	7/1/2009	No			MO	63645
4293	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION REMOVE ALL HORSEPOWER LIMITS ON ALL 134 MILES OF RIVERWAYS Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: NO ACTION Response to Question 4: ALL NO ACTION WE USE AT TIMES ALL 134 MILES OF RIVER Response to Question 5: NEED ELECTRIC & WATER AT ALL PRIMVITVE CAMP SITES I ALSO OWN A CANOE & BOAT NO ACTION LOCAL PEOPLE LIVE IN THESE AREAS BECAUSE OF THESE RIVERS	7/1/2009	No			MO	63957
4294	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: Round Springs Response to Question 5: More Swimming Access	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4295	Response to Question 1: No-Action Rate Horse power to Jet Response to Question 2: No-Action Response to Question 3: No-Action Response to Question 4: Logyard Response to Question 5: Improve Boat Ramp	7/1/2009	No			MO	63629
4296	Response to Question 1: Leave the Area above!! The locals took better care of the River Than the Park has ever Done. Response to Question 3: So much for going Back to what the habitat was in the past (Before Park Service)	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4297	Response to Question 1: No action - horsepower needs to be rated at pump. Response to Question 2: No action Response to Question 3: No action Response to Question 4: all of it Response to Question 5: we need more road access	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4298	Response to Question 1: Leave things like they are now Leave the Roads open let us run our Boats for fishing and plearsure Response to Question 2: Leave thing like our hourse power alone keep our hiking trails open and Keep our riding Trails open and protc our wild Horses Response to Question 3: Do not change the Hors power of our motors Response to Question 4: The part of the river which I use is Two Rivers down River to Owls Bend Response to Question 5: Provide more boat Ramps Like at Two rivers ascess	7/1/2009	No			MO	65438
4299	Response to Question 1: The ideal would be #A But practically Alternative #B is the closest to what can be accomplished Response to Question 2: Visitors should have option to float areas without the sight & sound of motors No jet skis - Keep family friendly - Big Spring should have wilderness tract Keep horses out of water & on trails - close illegal trails - Keep Cave "wild" Enhance education & interpretation - all visitors should see uniform employees Response to Question 3: These areas a fragil & rare - should not tolerate high resource impact Keep glass off rivers Stop/limit drinking & wild parties - Response to Question 4: Big Spring Area should have equal attention & staffing Wilderness Area important but camping & programs important for developed areas - Upper Current needs protection from Resource Damage Response to Question 5: Resolve long standing conflicts with local community - engage families/churches/schools to help protect & care for area thru education - partner w/MDC & others for use & protection	7/1/2009	No			KY	42748

4300	Response to Question 1: No Action - Quit making Recommendations. It is Either Law or it isn't. It Confuses the public. Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: A B & C Put Rangers & Water Patrol on the River with video cameras & Binoculars. No one likes to be spied on. Response to Question 4: Stop trying to close Accesses that the public uses. Flying-W Walter Lip Hole - Sinkin Creek. Response to Question 5: Park Superindent should be Required to stay in that position for a minimum of 10 yrs, instead of 3 or 4 yrs - Making Changes, Retiring, Leaving the Area he's made Changes to & leaving the local Residents deal with the Rules & Regulations he's made but he doesn't have to live with it.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
4301	Response to Question 1: No Action! Response to Question 2: Unlimited recreational use & Access to O.N.S.R. Area. Response to Question 3: Limited recreational use. Response to Question 4: Have O.N.S.R. people on the river in boat, canoe, tube to help, guide people on River. Response to Question 5: Provide more resources for better roads, boat ramps, restrooms, for Areas Along the river.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4302	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Increase park ranger presence on high usage areas of riverways. Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage and access to all scenic riverways areas. Response to Question 3: Any restriction of recreation or access, should not be included. Response to Question 4: I enjoy boating with my family with my 40 hp outboard equipped john boat. I oppose any change to horsepower restrictions. Outboard horsepower limit should continue to be rated at the output shaft. Response to Question 5: Improved access to all park recreational opportunites to the elderly and disabled by ATV and vehicular access by keeping roads open.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
4303	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: I was born & raised on the Jack's Fork River. Closing Roads is the last thing I want to see happen. You can close the roads however this WILL NOT Keep people from driving them. Please don't take away that HONOR. Response to Question 3: All of them. One thing I would like to see happen is Rangers being visibly seen floating and not hiding in the bushes on a Covert Mission. Response to Question 4: Broadfoot Field is where my mother was born. We had a cabin on the Jacks Fork until the government took it away from us. Response to Question 5: Shannon County is very poor. Why would you even think about closing Roads, trails etc. It is our lives you are messing with and we don't like it.	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4304	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION Response to Question 2: NO ACTION Response to Question 3: ABC	7/1/2009	No			MO	65588
4305	Response to Question 1: No action. Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage since our tax dollars already support these areas and no one should miss out on our beuatiful area due to income. Response to Question 3: Restrictions on recreational usage of any type on all areas. Response to Question 4: Round Spring to Two Rivers is an area I use every weekend. Changing the restrictions on horsepower would negatively impact the way my family and I use the riverways. By leaving things as they are we can continue our traditional use. Response to Question 5: Continue allowing the use of motors that are 40 horse at the output shaft and make areas more accessible to all people by better road maintenance and more roads. Also boat launches need to be deeper	7/1/2009	No			MO	65560
4306	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage and access. Response to Question 3: 1. Restricted usage and access. 2. Any action that changes the current management status. Response to Question 4: All places are adequately addressed at this time. Response to Question 5: Place restroom faciltities along river.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63901
4307	Response to Question 1: No Action Rate horse power at pump Response to Question 2: P No Action Response to Question 3: No Action Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: More road acc. & landing	7/1/2009	No			MO	65466
4308	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Charge for any use of River Response to Question 3: Don't Block aces to river Response to Question 4: Protected care burial sites & note Location Response to Question 5: There should be bathrooms along River The river should be used by Locals & Vistors	7/29/2009	No			MO	65466
4309	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: Make it possible for all walks of life to be able to enjoy the riverways to fish hunt swim, canoe & horseback ride. Response to Question 3: Don't block access to secluded parts of the river. Response to Question 4: Jacks Fork River Response to Question 5: More recreational facilities	7/29/2009	No			MO	65466
4310	Response to Question 1: No WHEN IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE FOR LOCAL TO ACCESS RIVER SOME THING IS WRONG WE ARE NOT HERE TO DEYSTROY BUT TO ENJOY Response to Question 2: RIVER ACCESS ROADS OPENED BACK UP MORE BATHROOM AREAS ALONG RIVER OPEN HUNTING AREA Response to Question 3: WHY REBUILD WHAT HAS BEEN DEYSTROYED WHEN LAND WAS TAKEN FROM PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS LEAVE IT ALONE response to Question 5: MAKE IT SO THAT ANYONE LOCAL OR NONLOCAL AND HANDICAPS TO ENJOY HUNTING FISHING HORSE BACK RIDENG.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65466
4311	Response to Question 1: No Action - Establish facilities and resources for recreational use throughout the riverways. Response to Question 2: free recreational usage. Response to Question 3: Restricted access and usage. Response to Question 4: Locate and identify family burial plots so they can be cared for. Document and publish locations. Response to Question 5: More recreational facilities (bathrooms - picnic areas etc).	7/29/2009	No			MO	65466
4312	Response to Question 1: No Action: Add bathroom facilities for guest throughout the riverways. Response to Question 2: Free recreational usage Response to Question 3: Not Restricted usage Response to Question 4: Akers & Round Springs Areas. Protect and care for cemeteries. Response to Question 5: Don't block roads to rivers! Make it more accessable for people to be able to go to river to swim, fish, hunt or canoe.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65466

4313	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: None Response to Question 3: All Response to Question 4: Alternatives not addressed adequately Response to Question 5: The Locals know this Area and need to be listened to and enlisted to control and manage their Environment.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65479
4314	Response to Question 1: Alternative A is very good, with some parts of B mixed in. From the two overviews I like the quieter slower paced part of A and helping improve visitor appreciation of resources in B. Response to Question 2: Close roads and trails that have been illegally developed. Limit horsepower on boats and keep them as far downstream as possible. Response to Question 3: Horseback riding if allowed should be back away from the river.	7/29/2009	No			MO	65810
4315	Response to Question 1: Please no Action	7/29/2009	No			MO	63960
4316	Response to Question 1: No-Action. Stronger enforcement of litter pick-up would be a noticable improvement. Response to Question 3: No changes in motor boat access and motor boat horsepower allowances. Response to Question 4: No action needed.	7/14/2009	No			IN	46307
4317	Response to Question 1: No Action (1) A 40 hp Limit on River from Owls Bend to Gooseneck. (2) More River Access - Boat Ramps & Parking, above Waymeyer, would Eliminate some boat traffic in main tube & canoe float Area of River. (3) Maintain primitive Restroom facilities Along River that is heavily floated By tubes & canoes (4) Strictly enforce Alcohol Limits (5) Strictly Enforce No Cliff Climes & River dives (6) Strictly Enforce litter laws (7) Give classes to floaters on how to secure there gear.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63701
4318	Response to Question 1: NO ACTION! Response to Question 3: NO CHANGES IN MOTORBOAT ACCESS & MOTORBOAT HORSEPOWER ALLOWANCES. Response to Question 4: NO ACTION NEEDED.	7/14/2009	No			IN	46307
4319	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: FREE RECREATIONAL & ACCESS Response to Question 3: RESTRIC & ACCESS Response to Question 4: I WANT TO USE MY MOTER W/LITER HAS 70 HP AT THE PUMP	7/14/2009	No			MO	65559
4320	Response to Question 1: Rate the horse power at the Jet Pump. No Action. Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A.B.C. Response to Question 4: Round Springs to Big Springs is my favorite section of the river. My husband was born & raised their. Also we, got to take our children their also. But it looks like the Park is advertising to the bigger cities, and you can see what that has caused. No need to explain more. Response to Question 5: Don't take our heritage away. Just take care of the problems that has arose since the park took over.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63629
4321	Response to Question 1: Action A - No horses in the river! I had a terrible experience with them in Eminence, filling the waterways, loud music until 1 am and then fireworks!!! I was 2 miles downstream & could hear every word over loudspeakers, During the night a bear visited our campsite scaring me to death as I am sure all wildlife was diverted from the "party zone" downstream Response to Question 2: I am totally against 4-wheelers & bikers on trails even though I myself am a biker. People were jumping off cliffs attempting to capsize our canoe. Horses destroy water quality NO HORSES!	7/14/2009	No			MO	63119-1940
4322	Response to Question 1: It's very simple: NO ACTION!! The river is just as beautiful as it was 20 years ago. By placing restrictions on the horsepower of motors, you are essentially taking away the freedoms we have enjoyed for years. My father just bought a boat with a 40 horse motor. Please do not force him to buy a lower horsepower motor in a government caused recession. Response to Question 2: Possibly more oversight of the river by park rangers. How about doubling fines for drug use? Response to Question 3: Keep everything the same. No restrictions outside the norm for river use. Tubers are good for local business. Do NOT kick them off the river. Response to Question 4: Better oversight in the extremely busy months for drug use. Overall, keep everything the same. Response to Question 5: Stay out of sight as much as possible. Keep the feeling of privateness as we enjoy the pristine waters.	7/14/2009	No			MO	63090
4323	Response to Question 1: A. We both feel alternative "A" is the best. We think programs should be added at the visitor centers to explain the need for better erosion control, water quality, banning of ATVs & power boats except in designated areas. The volume of floaters allowed on weekends may also need to be addressed. Loud partying is also a problem on weekends. Response to Question 2: I believe that there are too many vehicle access points along the two rivers (over 100). These accesses should be reduced to maybe the 20 accesses originally planned by the National Park Service. Also I think a 10 hp limit on boats between the (2 Rivers & Van Buren) should be strictly enforced and 25 hp limit below Van Buren. We did like the educational aspects of the "B" alternative, but not sure how this would be financed. Response to Question 3: Also we feel the equestrian trails are too close to the rivers causing high levels of e coli in the rivers. There are just too many horses and people on weekends. These rides (massive) should be limited in size and the trails placed much further from the rivers, so that erosion & water pollution does not occur. Response to Question 4: Caves - these are sensitive areas. There is one area where you can float into a cave. I don't think power boats should be allowed in here, its too dangerous for floaters (the danger of waves tipping floaters) Response to Question 5: Education is very important. If you ban or limit the use of ATVs or limit the number of floaters, you need to have educational programs to explain the need for this so you can build more support for the Park Service and its final plan.	7/28/2009	No			MO	63119

4324	Response to Question 1: No Action. Wwe want things left as is. Even better, go back to Pre-Regulations. Leave motor rating at the pump, Not the powerhead. No action is what we want down here in our country by the (our) river. Response to Question 2: Again, may I say NO ACTION. Plans - A-B-C are not what we want - they do Not benefit the people in this area who love and use the river and take responsibility for keeping it clean. We Never leave trash, always pick up after others. We help people who are stranded, &/or caught in a storm while floating or who have wrecked their canoes or floaties gone flat. Response to Question 3: A-B- or C. None of these need to be included in the Plan. Rate the motor at the pump, Not the powerhead, so we will have enough power to get upriver w/our family in the boat. No Action! Response to Question 4: Cardareva Gravel Bar, Log Yard, Spring Holler, Martin Hole, Ant Hole, Gravel Springs Salem to Van Buren to Doniphan. Alternatives A-B-C would Not be beneficial to our enjoyment of our river. Our river is special and we take care of it. Relatives come here from other states and are amazed at our river's clear water & beautiful bluffs. Response to Question 5: Leave it better than you found it - EVERY time you are there. Leave motors rated @ the pump, Not the powerhead, so we can enjoy All the spots on the river w/our family that we've known for years and years. Leave Roads and access alone. Quit charging for primitive camp sites. Put vents or Turbines in new outhouses - they are hot boxes you can't stand to use due to heat and odor.	7/1/2009	No			MO	63638
4325	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No more restrictons Response to Question 3: More restrictions, more government involvement! Response to Question 4: All Response to Question 5: NPS should focus on problem people and help the rest of the pople trying to enjoy the outdoors	9/16/2009	No			AR	72832
4326	Response to Question 1: no Action should be Taken Response to Question 2: None of the proposels AB or C Response to Question 3: All of ABC should not be Response to Question 4: All locations south of the Vanburen Bridge Response to Question 5: improve boat Ramps Bathrooms Roads	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965
4327	Response to Question 1: No action	6/22/2009	No			MO	63901
4328	Response to Question 1: No action Response to Question 2: Not to limit recreational use Response to Question 3: limited recreational use Response to Question 5: Enforce current laws on waterways!	9/14/2009	No			MO	65775
4329	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Horsepower Restrictons Response to Question 3: The Right to camp and Boat on the rivers Response to Question 4: Curnet River All of it Response to Question 5: No change of Road closing & Receation	8/19/2009	No			MO	65588
4330	Response to Question 1: No-Action Response to Question 2: No-Action because I want to be able to use the riverways, roads, and camp sites as I do now. Response to Question 3: limiting the horse power on boats. Limiting access to camp sites and rivers. Closing off roads to vehicle use. Response to Question 4: Any camping sites or boat ramps could limit my access to them.	7/20/2009	No			MO	65588
4331	Response to Question 1: No Action Response to Question 2: No Action Response to Question 3: A B C Response to Question 4: No Action Response to Question 5: 40 horsepower at the out put shaft	8/4/2009	No			IL	61534
4332	Question 1. No Action or "A" - "B" and "C" are simply incremental steps to allowing greater crowds. Aren't crowds associated with every problem in Riverways? User conflicts, water and habitat degradation, safety, etc... "A" isn't anti-crowd at all. By simply making the River more diifcult resource to reach you will deter crowding and likely the most problematic portion of crowds. Question 2: Big Springs Wilderness Question 3: "C" This option will require investment to provide access, man-power to police/adminster crowds, build facilities, etc. As certain as the river changes, so too do budgets. Nothing engenders disregard, abuse, vandalism, and carelessness than neglected buildings, roads, and campgrounds. "C" spells trouble b/c NPS couldn't maintain its buildout. Question 4: Private property remaining in the Riverways represents a unique gem in the entire NPS system and adds to the cultural experience of any recreationalist, canoer, etc. Ensure Riverway adminitration and patrol work collaborately with landowners or easements within the Riverways to ensure mutual respoect and interest of private landowners per Riverways Charter. Question 5: Mixed uses (horses, ATV, canoe, boats, etc.) conflict with increased numbers of any one user type. Help resolve conflict by restricting explosion of users in 2 primary categories: canoes and boats. Reduce concessions, control permits, issue user permits through advanced reservation system for out-of-staters; issue boat permits or application/fee permit basis. Fees could support enforcement and cleanup.	6/30/2009	No			IL	60070
4333	Van Buren Open House Ozark National Scenic Riverways Public Comments on Preliminary Alternatives* June 22, 2009 Overview The public comments provided below were recorded on flip charts during the Van Buren Open House, held at the Van Buren Community Center on June 22, 2009. A total of 265 people attended (signed in). At this open house, the public was invited to provide their comments on the Preliminary Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. Here is some information to help you understand what is shown on the transcribed flip charts: • National Park Service employees have typed up this record from the original flipchart pages and every effort was made to type everything as originally written. We apologize in advance if any mistakes were made in transcribing these notes from the original. • At the meetings, most flip chart comments were recorded by National Park Service staff. The name or initials of the recorder(s) is usually noted at the top of the first page. • There were four open house stations, each one labeled for one of the alternatives'No Action Alternative; Alternative A; Alternative B; Alternative C. There were usually two flip charts at each station. (Different labeling and numbering approaches were used by the	6/22/2009	No			MO	63965

<p>recorders to distinguish between the two sets of flipchart notes.) • Each flip chart page was numbered. Next to the number is a letter to identify at which station the comment was recorded (and sometimes which flipchart): o N, NA'No Action alternative station o A'alternative A station o B'alternative B station o C'alternative C station • The recorders sometimes abbreviated words. Some of the common abbreviations are: o HP'horsepower o NPS'National Park Service o BS'Big Spring o VB'Van Buren o LE'law enforcement o JF'Jacks Fork o TR'Two Rivers o RS' Round Spring *Note: Handwritten comments that were placed in the comment boxes at the open houses have been recorded into the comment database separately Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 VAN BUREN Ann Van Huizen Comments: NA-01 Why are there no horse trails identified in any of the plans from Akers Ferry to North Boundary? Recognize and authorize all trails in use from Akers Ferry to North Boundary. There is no expense because we maintain them (horse riders). Concerned about losing business. Don't want to lose trail access. A lot of time donated to maintain those trails. NA-02 Recommend that all water patrol personnel that are qualified to retire, do so. Fill vacancies with people without jobs. Don't think there should be HP restrictions on either river – no scientific studies on the pollution created by the outboard. The newer outboards are low emissions. Have passed the Alaska governing body. From Johnson-Everude E-tec. NA-03 Open southern edge of Van Buren Gap to Big Springs. Change to no-limit. Large boats will go down river and relieve congestion in gap on Saturdays in summer. The boats that moor at Big Springs are not bothered by boats coming by because river has not changed. Hardship on owners of 40 HP if changed to 25 HP. People will have to sell. Clarify where wilderness will be and that it will not include the spring. Don't designate wilderness at Ozark. Too limited. Can't do anything. HP limits would limit some people with limitations from being able to enjoy the river. Jack's Ford is self regulating. 2 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Limitations after gigging In fairness, should have a set of alternatives with more HP options. Concern people get kicked off the river. Setting it up for a few to use the river. Who gave Missouri's authority to NPS to regulate the river? Keep regulating the HP at the pump. Provide more boat access, esp. at Waymeyer. NA-05 Provide electric hook-ups at Log Yard, Owl's Bend, Two Rivers. Better river access and no HP regulation. Would like to clean up old farms and put back in legumes and grasses for wildlife for hunting. Bring open fields back, clean them up. Maintain old roads that provide access to fields. Better maintain boat ramps. No action plan best with unlimited HP. Limit number of canoes and tubes. NA-06 No Action – Restriction of HP above Big Spring removed like it used to be. NPS should better maintain river accesses – roads to the rivers. Grade more often because hauling campers and boats. Need bigger trash receptacles at Log Yard. Leave the cabins along the river alone (scenic easement). Remove HP restrictions. Unblock roads around Blue Spring and Power Mill. 3 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Grubbs had more camping before. NA-07 Need a better boat ramp at Waymeyer. Too steep and not in good condition. Not very accessible. Would like to see HP limitation lifted from Big Spring upstream. Would like to see more permanent access provided at Pin Oak. It would relieve congestion. Leave it like it is. In off-season eliminate HP limits. Would like to see more NPS visibility in high use areas and not "hiding". Be out there and visible. Get out of the bushes and out of cammo. Educate the floaters why the boats run in the channels. NA-08 Have concessioners and NPS teach floaters about how boats have to operate. Boaters help save canoers. They keep river clean. Need electric hookups at the Schoolyard. Need a concrete boat ramp into Log Yard. Leave like it is and open up the Gap between Big Spring to the bridge to no limits. Have rangers at Landing give river safety. Increase restrictions on concessioners (# of canoes, tubes, etc.). Also, need a tax that would fund emergency situations. NA-09 Want No Action and eliminate HP restriction between Big Spring and Van Buren. No Action – river is beautiful as is. Keep HP at 40 at the jet. 4 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Put more fines on littering. Canoers need a crash course on both parties that use the river. Every canoe, tube, raft, etc., need an identifying number. Want the No Action. Don't want more restrictions. NA-10 Landowner on river wants no more restrictions and can't understand the 700 yd. HP restriction right above Big Spring. Leave the HP limitation at the bottom of the jet. Things are working as is. Both rivers – Current and Jack's Ford. Why are motor boaters being singled out? 40 HP motors limit # of people. Limits performance. Churns up sand and silt. Keep current HP rules and remove restrictions. Still do learning centers. Remove the ½ mile stretch on the upper end of Big Spring. NA-11 Remove the HP restrictions from Round Spring to Big Spring to relieve the congestion. Get rid of restrictions. Be consistent in 4-wheel requirement and boat limits. Get rid of HP restriction at upper end of Big Spring. Rest – if not broken don't fix it. There is a 5000 acre Wildlife Refuge at Big Spring been that way for a long time. No hunting there. Don't want to open area to hunting with Wilderness designation. If eliminate trail rides in Shannon County, the economic impacts would be far reaching – other states and counties impacted. NA-12 If eliminate boats and motors, there would be a big economic impact. People would go elsewhere. 5 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 All the boats & access areas are very important for medical rescue. Train canoers to know how to respond to boats. Educate them that boats have to use certain chutes. If go to props, there will be more damage to ecosystem and shoals. They are more dangerous because props can cut. Props can kill wildlife. Jets are safer for wildlife. Trappers will be impacted and won't be able to get to places. Issue of humane treatment to trapped animals. NA-13 Jet boats are the safest boat, proven by research. There's been only one fatal death by a jet boat in Missouri ever. Safest recrentrate law enforcement in problem area. 13 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Get LE Rangers out in the open – a "presence" – visible! Education-why boaters "run channels" (Shute). Against Wilderness Area, a stepping stone to more regulations. By far, more local populations use river. I am for A. No ATVs! Eliminate river crossings. 7 species shell fish gone because of this. Gravel bars, ATVs & jeeps, 4-W drives in river now – STOP! Caves are being abused – Trash/fires in caves. A-4 If visitors have primitive access – need trash cans or education. Leave no trace. Stream team piled up 8 tires, 5 green bags (trash), 8 red bags(cans), a TV and a washing machine – This is trashed. In 20 years there will be nothing left. More L.E. rangers "present... The more accesses the more trash, more families kept away, more vandalism. If primitive – "hike in" (Park outside the camp area) – No vehicle camping. Howell – Oregon – poor communication btw H.O. and OZARK. Drove in river cut down trees in river when line 80' high. Cut down paropas? (pawpas) and small trees – now sliding into river. Prefer No Action – reason: access points and boaters on river: needed for medical purpose (emergency) i.e. boaters help others and need accesses. No Action – like everything as it is. Except more accesses and more campgrounds and boat ramps. (not all at one spot) All plans except no action, discriminate against the tax payer. Reducing our rights. Prefer No Action because other alternatives too restrictive 14</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Need more access – spread out – not so congested. No restrictions on hp – open gap from B.S to V.B. A-5 Floaters on river May-Sept (3 mos-24 day(weekend)) so why restrict residents the rest of the year?? Tubes need identification: just as all other watercraft. No limits on hp – un-American. They don't limit the hp on my car. Ideal: hop in by boat with my family and ride up the river, picnic, talk with friends. Boaters all help canoes and tubes in distress and will clean up river. Its not the boaters. Leave the boaters and cowboys alone. Add electricity at Log Yard. No noise ordinance (music, vehicles, generators) Who wants to use those trails? I never see anyone on them – compared to river use. Who is wanting "interpretation" & "education"? People are not coming here for that – I don't see them. Just gives a reason for NPS to hire more people. I like to boat, swim, fish and 4-wheel the tram Rd. Wilderness area – No Way! A-6 From Big Spring downstream – No limits to HP. I'm fine with no inboards. I don't wish to see restrictions to camping on Lower Current (B.S. to Gooseneck) More LE Ranger presence! Too few rangers to care & protect especially in upper Jacks. Cave Hole (upper Jacks) a real problem – not an official park site – Expanding – Help. 15 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 We are retirees – we would never come here to live if this river was not protected(with care & thought) – not simply limits. We read the big publication cover to cover – and are still confused about restriction of mechanized equipment(Trucks/ATVs/Power Boats) Who took care of river before park service? Local people took care of it'and still help clean trash & rescue canoers. Its "our home" I have helped many canoeists numerous times. We have few problems btw canoes and boats. I like to run by boat downstream from Two Rivers – few canoes there. I don't want Alt A – because too restrictive for what our family has enjoyed for generations. A-7 Local residents pick-up trash – this is our beloved home Uphold current laws - no water patrol and ranger presence Fine raised for littering/glass. Since there has not been any legislation amendments that created ONSR – how does a bureaucratic administration change the focus of the documented intent of the enabling legislation. A return to focused safe recreation opportunities, with minimal impacts. Management decisions be aligned with original intent and based on documented research and dialog. We need gravel removed from rivers – water level same but filling with gravel. IDEA – Challenge-competing interests. Memorial Day to Labor Day from Round Spring to Mantauk – (motors okay downstream) No motors. Canoeist then know that they have a choice (either a non-motorized or motorized) Do not like to see the Current River turned into a boat race for large boats. I like Alternative A 16 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 I like natural surroundings and Keeping the natural environment I like to be able to camp in quiet solitude. A-8 Post speed limits rather than limit hp. Manage boats by noise level. 17 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 VAN BUREN L. Richardson B-1 Would like to see the area form Big Spring boat ramp to the Gap open to all size motors. Crazy to have the short section from Big Spring to the Gap 40 HP only. Should be opened up to all size motors. In accordance with Indian Treaties, 1817 & 1819, that are still in effect, our people, Cherokee, have no restrictions on river ways. B-2 No horsepower limits but controlled with no wake. Keep speed under control. All concessions should have floater easily identified. Such as tubers – colored & numbered. Locals always help floaters who are in trouble, and pick-up their trash after their visit. Open area from bridge to Big Spring to unlimited horse power. B-3 Would like to see no action, as far as horse power limits. Would like to see the area from the bridge to Big Spring open to all horsepower motors. No Action as far as horsepower limits go. Would also like to see a limited number of tubes and canoes. (Lower from current numbers that concessions have). Does not like trash, drugs and nudity that comes with all the floaters. No Action as far as horsepower limits. B-4 Likes the idea of a learning center. Would like to see ID numbers on tubes and canoes to report complaints of ignorance and law breaking. Present the information on alternatives without having to worry about horsepower limits. 18 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Remove all horsepower limits. Monitor amounts of tubes and canoes because large congestion areas. Floaters need to be easily identified with numbers or colors. B-5 Take drugs and alcohol off river to clean it up. Enforcement of laws. Would like to see a more visible Law Enforcement presence on the river to deter bad behavior. Would like to see no action on horsepower limits. 40 at the jet and not at the head. Will the government provide jobs to people who lose theirs due to horsepower and boating limitations. B-6 Would like to see no action on horsepower, 40 HP at the jet not at the heat. Boaters feel that motorboats are singled out as far as negative comments, and tubers and canoers are not bothered. Feed like floaters do not have to defend anything but boaters have to. Feel that the area from Big Spring to the gap below Van Buren bridge should be opened to all horsepower limits. Jet boat operators (Current & Jacks) have the safest operation record in the State waters. B-7 If horsepower limits are enacted it will cause people to go back to operating props and possibly cause more injuries. Would like to see the old farms maintained as open fields. Cleaned up and accessible. River accesses maintained to easier boating access. Would like to see no action on current horsepower. Would like to see HP rating at the jet and not the head. 19 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Would like to see no action at all. Feels that the area livelihood would suffer from any proposed changes. Would like to see the horsepower rated at the pump and not the head. Feels that the area would go back to props and cause injuries. B-8 Feels that going back to atrop motor would cause more damage to ecosystem and wildlife. Not to mention the danger it would cause people. Would like to not have any limitations placed on rivers as to prevent any damage to all local economies. Leave horses and horse trails alone. Any reduction would cause an economic hardship. Change leash laws for horseback riders. Would like to see more restrooms on the rivers in outlying areas. Would like to have areas, such as Keatons, mowed and brought back to a manicured state and put restroom back. B-9 Would like to have horsepower measured at the prop and not at the head. Any limitation below 40 HP will cause more people to buy boats and more congestion because a 25 HP has a lower weight and people limit, causing more boats. Would like to see no horsepower limitation, feels it is un-American. There are no horsepower limits on vehicles. Enforce laws – not horsepower. Needs to be more education in the area of tubers, canoers, boaters and horse riders. Everyone should be educated and be able to enjoy the resources. How to share and co-operate. Would like to see the area from Big Spring to Van Buren Bridge opened up to all horsepower. B-10 Should not place seasonal limitations on boat operators. 20 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Would like to see if there is a way to limit the amount of junk (trash) people can take in canoes and tubes. Would like to see more law enforcement; who review gravel bar campers who leave litter. Would like to see a more visible presence of law enforcement to deter bad behavior. Feels that all alternatives are too restrictive. Reasons: restricting local residents for the purpose of providing tourists their 24 days of enjoyment. Local residents use the resource year round</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>and restrictions only placed on them and not the visiting floaters. B-11 Need more accesses to reduce congestion. Would like to have all river crossings shut down. Restrict ATV & 4-wheel drive. Need more law enforcement of current regulations as far as driving in the river. Remove the restriction from Big Spring to Van Buren Bridge with no horsepower limit. Remove restriction in the off season to no horsepower limits (Oct. 1 to April 30th). See horsepower measured at the jet and not at the motor head. Have law enforcement in canoes and on gravel bars, more visible to deter bad behavior. B-12 Bring in more law enforcement presence during high visitation, which would cause people to take better care of resource. Such as: temporaries on weekends and holidays to float river with other visitors. Need more signs to designate the no swimming in boat access areas and enforcement. Would like to see signs (top, middle & bottom) of Mill Creek area to stop congestion of floaters who stop. Should be on an emergency basis only in easily congested area. B-13 Need to stop tubers from tying together in large groups. 21 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 More handicap access for gravesites and all areas for the elderly. Pave the road all the way to Waymeyer and have more parking and boater access. Should not allow floaters to get on river if it is 4' above normal stage. A visible law enforcement presence. Not hiding, but visible to help or/and deter bad behavior. B-14 Should be high fines for littering. 22 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 VAN BUREN C. Runge B1-1 No Action between Two Rivers and Round Spring. Tubers and canoes are a lot of the income for locals. I like to drive my boat. No Action on HP from TR to RS. I would lose a lot of money because my boat would be worth nothing. Thousands of \$ would be lost. Would like the tubes & canoes to go to Jacks Ford if they have a problem with the jet boats. It is researched that jet boats are the safest type of boating. There has only been one death in the history of jet boating. No Action – I don't see how running our boats have hurt anything. Need to look at – there has been a lot of canoers and tubers hurt on these rivers that needed medical attention that would have never got it in time without boaters. Its been researched that there has been only one death caused by jet boats in MO. I feel that boats are being discriminated against by trying to take them away. I would have to buy a new boat – my boat would be worthless. If they take my boat away – I could only run in the gap where the trouble is anyway. No HP limits. There is no limits on the highway. It is un-American. I should be cited if I'm speeding. B1-2 No HP restrictions. I don't think the comments from 2006 is represented (360) of the 1.8 million users on the river ways. No actions. I would like to use the river for the same uses I always have. More Park Rangers needed. It would cut down on illegal acts. We are forced to have two access points (boats) making us go through canoers & floaters. Please give us a boat ramp with a lot of parking at Waymeyer. No Action on HP. Give limitations back before 1984. People came for the rivers. If you take away the taxes from boats, etc., you're taking away from the people here. The boats would be worth nothing. The boat dealers would have nothing. The river is going to the tourists. Park Rangers should be visible. If they were visible it would keep people from illegal acts. They should talk to people. Are people instructed about the rules and regulations before they go on the river. They need info BEFORE. Have rules & regs at the concessions. 23 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 I would like to see more services at the campgrounds. Currently pay \$5.00 with nothing. Would like picnic tables, trash cans, trash service. Used to bring trash bags & have trash service at Carderera. The way it is now from Big Spring to Van Buren is a good idea (HP). To increase the HP would be dangerous scenario for floaters. There would be too many boats. No Action on HP; leave at 40 at pump. No change development. The river is beautiful as it is. No HP limit at all. They highway patrol does not tell me motor size. The park should not tell me the size of motor as well. There should be no HP limits from Big Spring to Van Buren Gap. B1-3 There should be no HP from Big Spring on up the river. A 40 HP will not move several people in a boat up the river well. No HP change, changing the HP limitations would cause a hardship to local families and economy if their boats became illegal. They will not be in high demand and could not resell because of the decreasing demand due to visitors. "DITTO". Increase the littering fines by 1000%. It is #1 resource concern. If HP is changed the Gap areas in Van Buren & Eminence will be more congested. It would be dangerous. There would be more littering. The resource damage would affect the park. Allow more access points for boats, possibly above & below major canoe/tube areas, i.e., Waymeyer to Big Spring. This would encourage boat users to recreate outside canoe & tube use areas without further restrictions on HP limits. No horses anywhere except on trails away from natural water sources. Personally experienced muddy, poopy, dirty, smelly water on Jacks Fork south of horse camp. Jacks Fork is so beautiful in its natural state to pollute with horses. They should go somewhere else to ride horses then people (only) come to river. I don't like the idea that all the mess is coming down the river. 24 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 There should be no motorized boating/recreation at all on the river. They pollute the river. They are loud, they're stinky. They disrupt people floating down the river. They about blow you away sometimes. B1-4 Against litter. Strictly enforced laws & regs. Have only seen littering enforced at Van Buren; have to pick up trash when go to enjoy river. More policing of the rivers. Because of the trash, glass, rude and drunk boaters. For Jacks Fork would like to enforce the river crossings restrictions. More Rangers on rivers. Moe policing on rivers. I live on river. It is trashed. Minors partying. Drunk drivers getting stuck I rivers. I live across from Ratliffe Hole on Jacks Fork. Would like Cave Hole down or at least enforce rules/laws there. There is graffiti there, drug use. They knock down restrictive poles and drive in river. We have had two thefts & one window busted in cabin. Need preservation in area. There is a federally protected cave there, they jump from it. Would like to see as walk-in only or hike only. Needs signs near caves to educate visitors on cave preservations. Fires being started in caves. More conservation & education. The tubes and canoes have more pollution of the river. Lack of control over the stuff they take. Most of the times the boaters pick up the floating trash. Boaters rescue people who get in root wads. Tubes need identification numbers or stickers. No way to identify if needs help or is doing illegal activities. Why is tube rentals exempt from sales tax? Because they make the most impact on the water but pay no sales tax. Single largest revenue for local economy. B1-5 No HP limits. There is not a problem with the current HP. NPS need to do an impact study before reductions. Lowering HP limits increase the boats on the river. 25 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 VAN BUREN 06/22/09 ALT C - Jim Price, Kim Houf C-1 The Irish Wilderness on the Mark Twain Nat'l Forest management is too restrictive.(i.e. could not adequately enforce eradication efforts on feral hogs.) Against the 40 hp from Big Spring to Southern boundary because it limits/eliminates folks coming from Doniphan. Many do not have 40 hp motors. Van Buren citizens also do not have 40 hp (those that do go down river to areas where there are less tourists) All non-motorized (concession rented) water vessels need to be identified/identifiable with a number or color. C-2 Would like to see 40 hp or less from Log Yard to Big Spring. Motorized boats(big motors) have</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>made floating less enjoyable. To reduce current horse power from current regulations, would prohibit the elderly, disabled from being able to get on the river. (i.e. wouldn't be able to accommodate family without the use of a motorized boat with current horse power) Keep the hp the same because if you have a family of 4 or 5 you can't get them to the gravel bar without making multiple trips-increasing boat traffic. C-3 Put numbers on tubes and canoes to make formal complaints. If you drop the boat hp and you are a long way from your take out, how long would it take you to get back with a lower hp. (i.e. emergency situation) Don't drop the hpj-No Action- keep current regulations. Limit the number of tubers and canoes. No action of hp (don't reduce) C-4 26 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 The majority of trash, intoxication, lewd behavior, noise, comes from floaters, not boaters. No restriction on hp from Round Springs on down river. Need to be able to identify tubes and canoes (including concession) Restrict the number of tubes concessioners can put in daily. More boaters will go to Doniphan or wherever there is no boat hp restriction – causing more congestion at these areas. C-5 Supports the No Action Alternative because: Eliminate the 40 hp restriction from the 'South edge of Van Buren gap to Big Spring' – this would help reduce congested boat parking at Big Spring. Will help Van Buren economy by using boat launch in town. Pleased with variety of current recreation use we offer. We want the tourists to come and enjoy the river but we (locals) don't want to be pushed to the side. C-6 If you drop below 40 hp you will move more slowly and create more wake with the boat, you can't get your family, cooler, etc up river. Do more education to tubers and canoeist about right-of-way respect (this includes boaters too.) Advocate for the law enforcement working the river.(Visibility is good) Keep the 40 hp at jet/output shaft; if at the power head it will not have enough hp for needed recreation use. C-7 If your motor is less than 40 hp my brother and I can't even go fishing (won't get us up river). Reduced hp may impair boat rescues. The bigger the motor the less waves you have – less damage to the river. 27 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 Supports 'No Change' to current regulations because if you have too big of motors up river it will/could cause problems (too much hp for a small area of water) Feels that 90% of trash comes from tubers/canoers (i.e. beer cans) C-8 If I reduce to a 40 hp I can't take(won't) my 5 family members up river. Runs a 115 h & rated 85hp at the jet; this is perfect for my family. Supports the 'No Action' Alternative. (has drug his boat at times with it being an 85hp at the jet) Supports no alcohol on the rivers – this would reduce trash. Do not agree with Alternative C; leave as is – no change. Doesn't agree with Alternative C. Rate the 40 hp at the pump and not at the power head. C-9 No changes on the river; it is beautiful as it is. The 40 hp at the jet. Supports the 'No Action' Alternative. If we reduce 40 hp form Big Spring on South, it will force more people to put in at Doniphan which is already congested/crowded. Smaller hp engine causes more damage to river bank. Jet boats are the safest boat in the State of MO. There is only one death for MO related to a jet boat – that was on the Meramac River. C-10 If you impose more hp restriction its going to cause boaters to congest to certain put-ins. There is no data that supports that a 25 hp is safer to operate or eco-friendlier than any other hp. (so why limit?) 28 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 No need for new government programs (ranger led programs, hunter safety courses) it's a waste of money. We're trying to cut back on gov't programs. (No need to increase staff). Don't agree with bringing more park rangers – bigger gov't is not what we need. C-11 The boat 40 hp restriction located at Big Springs to 700-800 yard up river should be abolished. Jet boats are not dangerous to tubers. I don't want to increase law enforcement. They need to be more visual and not in the weeds. Keep the 40 hp measured at the jet. Lift all hp regulations. I think its un-American to be able to limit me on the river or highway. C-12 No more new boat accesses particularly at Waymeyer. Feels that there are too many boats currently on the river. I want to see more alternatives. Current alternatives are too restrictive. I want no restrictions. Comment cards are leading (they try to get me to say what you want to hear.) Reduce the amount of tubes and canoes. C-13 No more hp restrictions from Van Buren Bridge on South. Hp restrictions are the devil... Larger hp has more control with more power(safer). The highway patrol does not tell you what size of an engine you can have; why should the park service tell us what size motor on our boats. 29 Van Buren Open House 6/22/09 There should be a time schedule as to how canoes and tubes are put on the river per hour. Too crowded. Higher profile on river patrol instead of in the bushes. C-14 Eliminate the 40 hp from Big Spring and Granite Quarry. Eliminate the "Natural" Mgmt. Zone south of Cataract Landing because it does not allow camping on gravel bars. Impose the same blood alcohol content to floaters (tubers and canoers) as you do with boaters. Not in favor Wilderness area because too restrictive. Implement a management plan for that specific area with your goals and objectives for that specific area. C-15 Does not support Alternative C because too many restrictions. Needs to be modern for more boat landings, open up gravel bars, no hp restrictions. Boat hp – unrestricted. Boat launch area moved from Waymeyer to Pin Oak. The pa... EDITED for Length</p>						
4334	<p>Eminence Open House Ozark National Scenic Riverways Public Comment on Preliminary Alternatives* June 23, 2009 Overview The public comments provided below were recorded on flip charts during the Eminence Open House, held at the Eminence High School gym on June 23, 2009. A total of 323 people attended (signed in). At this open house, the public was invited to provide their comments on the Preliminary Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. Here is some information to help you understand what is shown on the transcribed flip charts: • National Park Service employees have typed up this record from the original flipchart pages and every effort was made to type everything as originally written. We apologize in advance if any mistakes were made in transcribing these notes from the original. • At the meetings, most flip chart comments were recorded by National Park Service staff. The name or initials of the recorder(s) is usually noted at the top of the first page. • There were four open house stations, each one labeled for one of the alternatives'No Action Alternative; Alternative A; Alternative B; Alternative C. There were usually two flip charts at each station. (Different labeling and numbering approaches were used by the recorders to distinguish between the two sets of flipchart notes.) • Each flip chart page was numbered. Next to the number is a letter to identify at which station the comment was recorded (and sometimes which flipchart): o N, NA'No Action alternative station o A'alternative A station o B'alternative B station o C'alternative C station • The recorders sometimes abbreviated words. Some of the common abbreviations are: o HP'horsepower o NPS'National Park Service o BS'Big Spring o VB'Van Buren o LE'law enforcement o JF'Jacks Fork o TR'Two Rivers o RS' Round Spring *Note: Handwritten comments that were placed in the comment boxes at the open houses have been recorded into the comment database separately Eminence Open House 6/23/09 EMINENCE 06/23/09: Greg Moss, Rick Drummond, and Brett Painter NA-01 Leave It</p>	6/22/2009	No			MO	65466

Alone We need more (LE) Rangers (For General LE) Locals feel they have no voice Leave the River Alone (Motorboats) The river itself should regulate the size of the motors (i.e, No Limits) Why should anyone have any say so on our local rivers? NA-02 • Education of Tubers & Canoers on jet boat operations (Esp. around drowned trees, root wads, shoals, etc.) • Who does rescues if you take our motors away (or reduce size limits) o Smaller boats flip easier • Jet boats are the most safe recreation vehicle in MO (By Dale Counts) & MO water patrol. • Local jet boats rescue more tubers than any NPS ranger. NA-03 • No Horsepower Restrictions o Lower HP creates a bigger wake o No pollution difference with HP • NPS needs to pay taxes on their lands • Leave Rivers alone: no more regs; enforce what you got! • Stop canoeists from polluting rivers (*more so than motor boaters) • Fix roads (Ex. Welch Cave Hole)/Access • More seasonal periods for boaters o Ex. Tuesday VS Saturday (no size limits) o EX. October/winter VS July/August with size limits NA-04 • The river is our way of life o Eminence Residence • More Protection (IE. More Rangers) of Resources • More Patrols (Road/Boat) to protect rivers (fewer rangers/people in bushes) • More control over canoe concessions (They don't follow the rules & put illegal unmarked boats on the river.) NA-05 • Motorboats (Jet) save lives, but smaller boats won't help o Smaller motors = bigger wakes=more tubers flipping over 2 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 • Describe operations difference between jet & Prop (ex. Steering, wake, control, etc.) • More citations are written to Tubers/Canoes than to motor boats. o Look up the stats! o Need more restrictions on tubes & canoeists. • More mowing/open field management o Less NPS mileage = more mowing NA-06 Leave caves alone: Let people go into them More rangers patrolling river for all protection of people & resources and for prevention or education of floaters/boaters. 3 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 EMINENCE 6/23/09 (No Action) Brett Painter, Rick Drummond, Greg Moss NA-101 I would like to leave motor boat areas the same, also like to canoe, leave roads open to access river at different places, for areas away from other people. Keep roads open to spread people to different locations, prevent congestion at any one spot. Keep horse access open, it is a traditional use – no changes to current management. Get volunteer help with problems – clean-up – work with other groups. NA-102 No changes to Current/Jacks Fork management plan – Don't want any roads or trails closed. There should not be any Horsepower limits on outboard motors – there weren't problems back when we could run bigger motors. Don't close any river crossings, roads or river accesses – for use, remove gravel from the river – rate the horsepower at jet unit. NA-103 Park Rangers more visible on river – would help, more rangers allow for enforcement of current laws like highway patrol on the highway. This should be a family place, more education for canoers on how boats run. Boaters should be able to have their family at the river without bad language and behavior – currently bad. NA-104 Tourists and home people need to better work together to make it a safe happy time for everyone. Please let us determine resolutions to any problems that occur or arise. We can find cooperative solutions if we are aware of the difficulties, environmental or otherwise. 4 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 Any problems with boats can be resolved through/by courteous action on the river. Education of/by/for those who use the river. NA-105 Fallen trees in river need to be cleaned out of rivers. Fix motor boat accesses – clean out gravel. Have the park reach out to boaters to get help cleaning trash out of the river. Park Rangers/rentals educate canoers on how to deal around Power boats – how to give boats room, get along. NA-106 More interpretation, education – No motorized boat from Round Spring up stream – that area mainly. Do not like the noise of jet outboards. Keep the rivers pristine and natural as possible – like it should be. No motorized vehicles near or around the river. NA-107 A lot of problems on the river are alcohol related – arrest people for being drunk on the river. Open up more campsites along the river around Roberts Field – volunteers would be willing to open them up – would like restrooms at Roberts Field. HP limit should be the same below Van Buren, 40 HP is big enough. NA-108 Outboard motor HP should be measured at the jet if they have a jet. Taking jet boats off river would take a source of aid, safety backup off the river – Boaters often assist canoers/tubers who are in distress. In favor of "No Action" alternative. NA-109 5 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 I support "No Action" because I am concerned about HP limits because in order to take my family (5 people) on the river, a smaller motor would not allow this. I believe the 60/40 hp jet should be not changed – the current zones are appropriate. NA-110 If there are any actions taken – it should be returned to the former landowners/their heirs. If there are further restrictions all user groups lose. Present HP limits are at minimum now. NA-111 Current conditions are acceptable because they do not adequately represent the Ozark Culture – 1) less populated river 2) more suited to family activities Restrict number of rented canoes on any given section of the river. Require people to abide by Park Regulations. Control ATV use/River access – Keep them out of the river. NA-112 No-change in HP regulations – Measure HP at the jet Open up old fields Doandardizing? How is there talk about measuring power at the head? How can the Park Service make a law for no hp on J-Fork without an open Forum? Main concern is that local residents have invested in boats & NPS is wanting to make a law to remove ALL motors in some Areas? A-8 If take the boats off the river = taking any safety for helping people who capsize and get into trouble. What is it the Park Service is managing? Can't have regular camping and yet 2 tents, 6 people, 2 vehicles, 6 people??? 11 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 Why when we mow and maintain outlying areas do we get limited as local people to 14 days? Leave the boaters alone. River level takes care of this. Gravel in the river is a problem. Take some out along with the dead trees. Use gravel from river on the roads. Don't buy Chat. A-10 Give it back to the people and have law enforcement manage things. The river needs more enforcement. Local people don't want to be punished because day floaters cause trouble. Floaters don't understand what a boat needs to operate & use the river. They don't have to float our part of the river. Need more facilities for floaters – Raw toilets. Publicity brings more folks in who don't respect the river. 1 day trip vs. living here. Concessionaires and NPS need to educate their people about boats, horse, and other people on the river. Support alt A to protect the natural resources. The canoe rental needs to be responsible for their people's impact on the river. A-12 Bland Cemetery needs to have access Remove major obstacles from the waterways. Put in concrete boat ramps @ Jerk Tail landing. Don't change anything from the way it is now. When it comes to taking care of rivers, I believe locals can take care of the river better than others from the outside (ie. St. Louis, Kansas City) Only thing I'd like is for you to leave it as it is. A-14 The river will eliminate higher HP motors later in the year. Information made available to all users on how jet boats operate, so they can understand why boaters have to operate. Clean up some of the areas that used to be open fields. I'd like to see several locations that gravel would be removed from. This would allow more riverway for everyone to use, but this will take a while to see any difference. A-16 I don't							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>want to see any HP restrictions on the river because in the long run this will cause more problems than we have now. People can only be pushed so far. I don't like the zone idea at all. If all the footprints are in one place, it isn't going to be good for that place. All of the alternatives are on one side of the coin. There should be an alternative that allows HP to go up. The no action plan should be middle ground. 12 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 A-18 I think these proposals are mostly affecting local people which most likely in the long run will affect local businesses who mainly survive off of tourists because as the local people suffer their way of payback will be taking it out on tourists which will soon drive them away. Also, local people are hurting because of local access being shut off which effects tourists too because they like to be able to go to their private access points. A-20 At Two Rivers, for instance, local families and tourists families have been camping there free for years. Want folks to still be able to camp for free. Folks who have enjoyed a Christian gathering fish fry, for example. We are told to disperse because too many given people at a given campsite. Some rules ruin traditional experiences. Need more LE rangers to enforce laws in place regarding ATVs. Strong support for Alternative A in regard to Jacks Fork and Upper Current from top to Round Spring Consider alternate days or seasons for use or one river for one use and the other use on the other river. A-22 Do not allow concessionaires for power equipment. 13 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 Ozark. Eminence 2009 (Cathy Runge, Elisa Kuntz) B1-1 I would like to see more of the fields cut. I cannot get through them when I hunt. Leave it just the way it is. Everyone should learn to live with one another. No change on the H.P. because the big motors know where to boat. The 40 HP are fine where they are. It would effect me if it changed by not being able to use our boat. Not one person I know could use their boat and everyone I know has a boat. B1-2 We've got to open up the river (J.F.) to mine gravel/river rock because the holes are filling up. No place to fish and swim. I could, as a child, now I cannot. The river is filling up. Harvest the timber. There are millions of dollars of timber that has gone to waste. Look at 17 bridge area where the wind went through. Don't let it rot. We want to have a meeting so we can talk about this. The holes in the river are filling up. If gov. does not want to remove – then private citizens should get to. B1-3 Motorized use should begin and end at or below R.S. because of the nature of the river. It is more curvy & narrow. It is a heavy canoe use area & there is a conflict between motorized boats and canoes. The gov. is limiting the access of the public to the park by alternatives A,B &C. There are not enough wash room along the river. There needs to be more policing of the river ways. Have been here 5 years & never met a ranger on the river or on foot patrol. B1-4 Any new restrictions would hurt the citizens by affecting economy and it would effect their recreational activities. Stay as is. The economy of Carter, Reynolds & Shannon Counties would be hurt. Leave as is. Staus quo. We love the freedom of the way it is. I have lived here/my family has for more than 100 years. Why does the park need to control it? Not a fit place to take a family on a weekend. At least in a boat we have the freedom to move if we don't need it. Locals help pick up the trash that the canoers dump. The locals help to manage the park, wildlife, etc. B1-5 14 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 Leave as is rather than changing it. The park service keeps edging out the locals a little at a time. I've been watching them for over 60 years. I know what I am talking about. If the restrictions cut down on the tourists and we have already lost the timber – then what would we live on? Have a seasonal HP limit to stop at Akers prevents people from going further up the river for fishing, etc. Would prefer to see seasonal HP limits to Cedargrove. I do not want to see any roads closed because they limit access. B1-6 There are areas that are not designated as access points that are busy & overcrowded – signage is needed at these points (trash, ATV's, Dune Buggies, etc.) and enforced. Traditional river crossings are abused. If you take away the access to the river, the access points you keep will be over crowded. Organize volunteer groups. Is. Volunteer backcountry horsemen. Then work with them. A volunteer canoe group and a volunteer motorized group would be well received to help the NPS keep our parks clean. Would do more good than restricting access. Thank you. B1-7 Leave HP as it is at the jet pump. I feel like the motorboat and fishermen are being discriminated against. In 1980, in a meeting in V.B. Mo, at the courthouse, congressman Dick Ichord made the statement "that he proposes/ introduces ONSR bill, it should be a national recreation area. The NPS is out to change it to a wilderness area. I feel the people should stand up for the original intent." (National Recreation Area) I feel like this is what the NPS is working toward today. The new alternatives will have a negative impact on the local areas due to boat & motor sales, supplies, gas, oil, food, etc. This will be reflected in loss of sales tax, personal property tax. (The new alternatives) B1-8 All three alternatives limit the freedom of te people on or near the river & woods. This area is unique due to the freedom we have here. Every time the government brings new restrictions; it punishes everyone for the bad actions of a few. I would rather see the existing law enforced rather than lose our freedom. Freedom is the ability to hike, use a motorized boat responsively if I choose. I would like to have the same freedom as Lewis & Clark. There should be more enforcing of trashing the river and conduct on the river. B1-9 15 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 No change on HP limits since 1968. It is a regulation, not a law & I would like to see it stay the same. To clear things up w/motorboats would like 40 horse at the pump. Gravel removal on the river-can be done in a safe manner where it will help marine life. No change on HP limits since 1968. It is a regulation, not a law & I would like to see it stay the same. B1-10 Not in favor of wilderness studies because it limits access. Would like to see Big Spring Wilderness opened up to special hunts for wildlife to control animal population. (Drawing for privilege.) Would like to keep accesses & Roads open to the river. Current roads maintain what is here. Leave it alone. B1-11 Boaters are needed to help keep floaters safe and from being lost. Boaters also pick up trash and bring it to land. (Example – flipped canoes, gravel bar campers, tubes.) We save lives. If boats are taken off the river and people lose their jobs, will the NPS hire them to feed their families? I would like the HP to be left alone. I don' see it as a problem. Isn't 40mph low enough? NPS should hire local people like they promised. Riveredge was like a park. Now it is like a wilderness, all grown up. B1-12 Open all the caves up like it was in the early 1960's and 1970's. The upper stretch of J. F. should be a primitive area. More scientific research about the effects of motorboats use on erosion on the river banks. More research on gravel movement on the river and the effects. In areas designated as primitive existing vault toilets should be maintained and kept. Without these facilities peoples option may cause worse pollution. B1-13 In the areas designated primitive (access points & campgrounds) I would like signage, trashcans to help with littering, trash etc. Keep things primitive as can be. Recycling should be required of any tax supported project whether it be national state or local. No motorboats, they have plenty of other places to go. We need to save for our children. 16 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 EMINENCE 06/23/09: Dena Matteson and Elisa Kunz B2-1 I would like to see them leave the wild horses</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>alone. I like to see them. I have had horses most of my life. NPS needs to establish an advisory board composed of community leaders in close proximity to the park and use the input of the advisory board to develop a complete new alternative to those put forth by NPS. B2-2 We need to re-establish food plots & farm lands and manage for wildlife. Need to establish rest areas along the river for floaters & boaters. I am concerned about changing the measurement of HP on motors from lower unit to head, when manufacturers are mandated by law to measure them at lower unit. These changes will affect me as a businessman selling boats. B2-3 This will affect owners of boats because they will have motors they can't use. Jet boats are necessary because they save people's lives. They are available to help people in trouble. Rangers need to be on the river to monitor behavior, alcohol use, and enforce current laws for families. This is a safety issue. B2-4 I am afraid if a lot of these changes to current management occur, there will be a lot of destruction in opposition. If they want to lower HP limits, then even NPS should lower limits on their boats. If lower HP, our family will not be able to travel up the river. If your family has several people or are larger in size, 25 HP won't handle it. 17 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 B2-5 25 HP will allow river to erode & fill-in faster than a 40 HP. 25 HP pulls a bigger wake. Everyone has to work together-NPS needs to work with locals, locals need to work with NPS. Need more maintenance workers around springs. Why is there no concern for accumulation of river gravel and erosion of river bottom soil along banks and river bottom fields? B2-6 I would like to see gravel removed and cutting vegetation that grows in gravel and turns the river toward the river bottom soil. Brush should be cleared along rivers so we can reach banks to fish. 20 yrs ago you could see the banks. I would like them to bring back the cultural demonstrations that used to be held all along the river – molasses, quilting, whiskey, etc. Jon boat making, blacksmithing, basket making. B2-7 I don't like any alternatives except No Action because we can all co-exist together. We don't need new rules and regulations, but just need to enforce current regulations. B2-8 Stricter enforcement of road rules. More patrols. More great rangers like Mark. Increase stream clean-up activities including with visitors. Signs-Take only pictures, leave only footprints. Keep all river accesses open to the public as they are now. Such as Brushy on the Upper Current and Mill Hollow. 18 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 B2-9 This would limit our ability to get to the places we want to go. Places like Blairs Creek, Ant Hole, Bee Bluff School. These used to have county roads but are not being maintained. Park Rangers need to be more visible on the river, not necessarily to write tickets but to deter people from doing things they shouldn't do. B2-10 We should keep our 40 HP rating at the jet so that our families can all go up river together. All of the recreational activities such as horseback riding, ATVs, 4-wheel drives, boats & motors, hunting/fishing should be allowed because our park system is supposed to be a recreational park for the people. B2-11 If NPS can't bring back the things we used to do, they can at least not take away the things we have (current activities). People feel we are losing our cultural & historic heritage piece-by-piece by losing old structures such as the old silo at Powder Mill or Two Rivers Lodge & housing. More emphasis should be placed on preserving these structures. B2-12 Bottom land fields have been allowed to grow up, and these fields could be managed for wildlife and people. Where I use my boat, a 25 HP will not push my boat and my boat won't be worth anything to me. I will lose a lot of money. Won't be able to sell it in this area. B2-13 I feel that visitors in canoes shouldn't try to come here and change our operation. I feel they need to understand more about how a jet boat operates and realize we aren't trying to impact them. (Bee Bluff) Jet boats are the only type of boat (not a propeller) that can be operated on the rivers because of how shallow the rivers are. In the past, removal of some gravel allowed the rivers to be deeper. 19 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 B2-14 Running boats on the river is a family tradition for local people and I would like that to continue for my kids and grand kids. Boats on the river have positive aspects, they can be used to help rescue capsized floaters, used to help transport victims in accidents such as bluff jumping, etc. Boats are used for recreation such as fishing or accessing points along the river that can't be accessed by roads. B2-15 Restricting HP limit will restrict number of family members you can transport and boat won't get up on top of water, which will cause damage to the boat and motor. Decreased HP will require doubling the number of boats you will need to transport the same family members. This will cause more boats and congestion. I would like to see HPabove Akers to 25HP year-round, locals have sense to stay out of those areas when lots of canoes are present. But we could trout fish in the mornings and evenings. Can't fish where they stock trout all summer long. B2-16 I would like to see NPS work with (MDC) & county to fix some of the old roads, then roads would hold up and there would be less erosion and less off-road use. When you remove common lower unit using a prop & install a jet pump on the same engine, you have a drastic HP loss, such as 60HP power head produces 40HP at jet. 40HP power head produces 28HP at jet. If the HP rating in regulations is taken at power head, actual HP to operate will be reduced drastically. B2-17 When you reduce HP, then boat rides lower and produces larger wake, and boat won't carry as much weight. Therefore, boat will drag on bottom of river. Boat won't carry as many people. Will increase number of boats and create congestion to carry same number of people. 20 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 This information was confirmed with the impact study done at Buffalo River. Also, boats help movement of water and keep channel free of gravel and thereby more passable. **Voices of Ozark has impact study. J.C. Kuessner has a copy of a study that shows the impacts of canoes, boats, etc. on fish beds in the river. Changes to HP limits will make my investment (\$15,000) in boat motor and trailer worthless. B2-18 Have the least human impact as possible. There are plenty of other places to use motor boats. I support non-motorized recreation on the Jacks Fork. For the safety of canoers, providing a place with no noise, and natural resource. Recommend a study of decibels of all motorized vehicles on wildlife and fish. Study hibernating, breeding, patterns. Impact on flora and fauna. 21 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 EMINENCE 06/23/09 ALT C Jim Price, Kim Houf, Mike Gossett C1-1 Alternatives A, B, & C seems to limit access by the public. Supports the 'No Action' (b/c) any new restrictions could hurt the county revenues. Exploits too much of the resources of 2 wonderful free-flowing rivers. By not restricting ATV travel, horse use, horses crossing the river, and too many development areas. C1-2 No change – economy vs. amount of money spent by boaters and tubers. The same people should be allowed to use rivers. Too much restriction now. Re-open the access points that have been closed, e.g. Williams Landing. Roads that NPS tried to close and county re-opened – leave them open. 40 HP creates a bigger wake than a larger motor. If NPS doing what's best for ecology, why require a motor that creates a bigger wake than the motors NPS outlawed? Smaller motors will erode the river more than bigger ones. C1-3 Maintain current open fields and would like to see previously relinquished fields opened up. Not in favor of any new restrictions by the NPS. Re-open campgrounds at Akers.</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Stricter penalties for polluters (i.e. make individuals do community service – river cleanup – in addition to a fine) Supports measuring HP at the jet. There is a federal law that dictates manufacturers measure the HP at the jet/lower unit. 22 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 C1-4 Wants to keep John Boats on the river, especially if emergency assistance is needed. Better monitoring/regulations regarding alcohol use/abuse on the river. More NPS staff on the river. Supports unlimited HP. If lower HP or restricted to seasonal use, he would no longer be able to take his family on camping trips, particularly from Round Springs to Two Rivers. If reduce 40hp to 25hp above Round Springs they would not be able to boat up to Carr's for ice, etc. C1-5 Hp restrictions could restrict boaters from being able to assist people up river if within a different hp zone. In favor of re-opening agricultural fields (don't let grow up). Would like to see open fields maintained in legumes and wild grasses. Keep hp as it currently is – No changes. The river accesses should remain open. C1-6 Keep the old 2-tract roads/trails open Keep the 40hp measured at the pump so I can get my family up and down the river safely. Your alternatives are: No Action = you can keep coming to our river C = 20% of you are getting kicked off B = 35% of you are getting kicked off. A = 50% of you are getting kicked off. 23 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 C1-7 We ran the Indians off their land long ago; now its our turn to be run off our land. The NPS is like a conquering army, they will make whatever rules they want and could care less about the local people, who have been conquered. C1-8 More management of NPS lands and less preservation (i.e. open fields, fields for wildlife, timber management.) Re-open all the closed roads and caves. More road access would allow people to get to the river easier for fishing. From Akers to Cedar Grove have it 25hp year round. Keep roads open b/c 1) Fire safety (easier to get in to access for fire fighting) 2) could help with emergency situations (i.e. stranded/hurt canoeist) C1-9 Likes the primitive camping and would like to see more of them because they are in the less traveled and less tourist occupied areas. Maintain the current hp as they are now. Not in favor of Seasonal Restrictions from Rymers to Bay Creek because it limits local use during the restricted time frame. From Eminence to Bay Creek allow 40hp. C2-1 Prefers no action alternative because the stretch of the Jacks Fork from Rymers to Bay Creek is not normally accessible with motorized watercraft during summer months. Leave HP limits same on whole C.R. Lift restrictions on camping areas and river ways (that would not endanger people) i.e. restricted access to river's edge and gravel bars. Clear areas along major spring branches to allow better viewing. Keep motorboat HP limits at current levels or increase them. 24 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 C2-2 Prefer no motorized boats from R.S. upstream – problem – noise from jet boats. Open all former accesses to river to all users. Leave HP limits alone except remove limit between Big Spring and V.B. Gap. People are in an upstir and not buying boats & motors because of rumors. Removal of boats & motors will affect all people in these areas - economically!!!!!! Want all farms to be cleared and managed as open fields for wildlife. C2-3 Want old back country roads to be left open – river access, to old abandoned farms. Leave HP limits as is. Reduce number of canoes on river to reduce conflict with boats. Lease old farms to public to be managed more like a farm. Manage old farms for ag-prod. by leasees for wildlife/for food prod. End harassment of motor boaters vs canoeists and tubers. Park treats motor boaters like 2nd class group. C2-4 Control public use of easement access roads that lead only to private property. Continual growth & development is not sustainable. Continued Park development will damage park's natural state in the long term. No ATV use in park Apply Alt A type management to Upper Jacks Fork, Alt B type management to Lower river sections and Alt C type management to Lowest river sections. Compare after a time to assess impact on environment. 25 Eminence Open House 6/23/09 26 C2-5 Alt C is better of 3 proposed alternatives except for 25 HP limit on J.F. from Alley to Eminence. Prefer no change in HP on this section. Locals within a reasonable amount should be less restricted to whatever rules are put in place. (because this is their home area) More education of children about natural ecosystems and how to preserve them.... EDITED for Length</p>						
4335	<p>Salem Open House Ozark National Scenic Riverways Public Comment on Preliminary Alternatives* June 24, 2009 Overview The public comments provided below were recorded on flip charts during the Salem Open House, held at the Ozark Natural and Cultural Center, on June 24, 2009. A total of 116 people attended (signed in). At this open house, the public was invited to provide their comments on the Preliminary Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. Here is some information to help you understand what is shown on the transcribed flip charts: • National Park Service employees have typed up this record from the original flipchart pages and every effort was made to type everything as originally written. We apologize in advance if any mistakes were made in transcribing these notes from the original. • At the meetings, most flip chart comments were recorded by National Park Service staff. The name or initials of the recorder(s) is usually noted at the top of the first page. • There were four open house stations, each one labeled for one of the alternatives'No Action Alternative; Alternative A; Alternative B; Alternative C. There were usually two flip charts at each station. (Different labeling and numbering approaches were used by the recorders to distinguish between the two sets of flipchart notes.) • Each flip chart page was numbered. Next to the number is a letter to identify at which station the comment was recorded (and sometimes which flipchart): o N, NA'No Action alternative station o A'alternative A station o B'alternative B station o C'alternative C station • The recorders sometimes abbreviated words. Some of the common abbreviations are: o HP'horsepower o NPS'National Park Service o BS'Big Spring o VB'Van Buren o LE'law enforcement o JF'Jacks Fork o TR'Two Rivers o RS' Round Spring *Note: Handwritten comments that were placed in the comment boxes at the open houses have been recorded into the comment database separately Salem Open House 6/24/09 OZARK - SALEM-JUNE 2009 Dale Counts NA-101 No changes (just like it is). Quit changing everything. Quit taking away "locals" rights and catering to the tourist. Keep Park Superintendent more than just a few years. (They come up with new rules and regulations then just leave). Leave Sinking Creek alone, not just for floaters. Keep it like it is, but make no HP limits. Keep HP below RS at 40 HP. Have seasonal HP from R.S. to AK be 40 HP. Leave it just like it is, but enforce laws. Establish yearly fee for ATVs in park. Keep it like it is, but maintain roads. Keep horse trails non-commercialized. NA-102 Bring back the road and trails to 1964 status. Keep things like they are, but add canoe access at Current River "Presley Center" location. Keep passion about the park with staff. Park needs to do a trails impact study as well as rive use study; "are we good or are we exceeding its capabilities". 2 Salem Open House 6/24/09 Do long term clean water planning not only in and around park, but how other areas/communities affected with watersheds. Abide by original legislation. Unrestricted recreation of current accepted activities (canoes, motorboats, hunting, fishing, gigging, horseback riding, ATVs). NA-103 ONSR</p>	6/24/2009	No			MO	65560

<p>established for recreation and should stay that way. More signs along river all across the park (Banks & Wide Fords, Lipps Hole, mileage markers). Signs (i.e. _____ miles to _____). More bathrooms (i.e., every 3 or 4 miles along rivers). More "Leave no trace" education programs. Base permit system on demand system (more on Sat/Sun when visitors are here and less through week when no one is around). Need more LE & Interp Staff year round vs. Seasonal or STF. Need more dumpsters year round. Need more trout and expand area to Pulltite (especially during winter). Private canoeist and park users should have a user fee. Restrooms need more handicap access. Money ear-marked for a project should stay with that project. 3 Salem Open House 6/24/09 Need more maintenance workers. NA-104 No Park Service – return land back to original owners (indigenous people). They love the land and was better custodians than the Park Service of other gov't agency (i.e., MDC, etc.) Wild and Free should be good on paper, but what it means is unmanaged and don't care – i.e., river bank erosion, gravel build up, build up of undesirable trees and plants (thorny locus, multi-flora rose, etc.). Remove gravel from river bank, gravel bars and river corridor, this will benefit fish and wildlife. Retain present trails which are old logging roads and those which go to old home places. Provide more resources for present numbers of recreationists – bathrooms, horse trails, boat access points, assistance and help by NPS staff along the rivers. NA-105 Have park rangers and staff be informative and helpful to recreationist – not harassment. Remove the river otter. Restock with natural fish. Provide more resources. Season long cultural demonstrations, i.e., blacksmithing, woodworking, sorghum molasses making, lye making, native food preparation. Nature is to be seen, touched, felt and experienced. People are a part of nature. Current numbers of recreationists don't damage flora & fauna. ONSR was founded to provide people the opportunity to experience nature personally. Locals see the ONSR as their background and take care of it well. 4 Salem Open House 6/24/09 Locals take trash out of ONSR and don't ask for publicity. They are about the environment as much or more than any other group of extra locals. NA-106 Do not limit horse power for johnboats. Provide more secure jobs for local people. Show what a working farm prior to 1964 was like. Do not limit current numbers of canoes. Do not limit current numbers of horseback riders. Study data about river pollution was biased and skewed. Do not limit where camping and picnicking can occur. Do not limit swimming and bluff jumping. By having NPS personnel visible on the rivers many of the problems that are said to happen would not occur because of the respect of people in uniform. Open all old roads along the river for access for all campers, hunters, ATVs, 4-wheel drives, horses for use during camping, etc. NA-107 NPS must have more enforcement officers on 135 mile of river. Enforce the laws you have. NA-01 Leave the Park the way it is; no changes. Smaller HP throws a bigger wake than larger HP. All horse trails from Akers Ferry North, to be retained at no cost. Horsemen will maintain them like they have for last 50 years. 5 Salem Open House 6/24/09 More pit toilets at Flying W, Walter Lipps, etc. (congregation). Leave it the way it is currently managed. Remove alcohol from river. NA-02 No wilderness areas. More Rangers in boats being seen. Enforce the laws you got – No more regulations! More wilderness areas. More walking trails. Leave the 40 HP alone! 6 Salem Open House 6/24/09 Ozark – June 2009 Alt A – Salem A-1 I would like to see ATV use but have it licensed and regulated. Why does the Park LE go to the extreme i.e. as in moving leaves to find worms. Horses cause more damage than ATVs Don't lower the horsepower to less than 40 hp below Round Spring. How will these plans affect Current River State Park or will they. A-3 Park upper management needs to be required to stay in their job long enough to see the results of what policy change does. I would like to see the park managed to be more family friendly on the river. I am against closing roads. Maintain the grounds in the developed areas so people can get to the rivers edge without going through tall grass or weeds & brush. Open more roads and a few more river crossings. A-2 What does the "Natiet kicked off. C-3 Can we still use the existing roads and river crossings? (Upper Current-Cedargrove to Akers). A lot of times it is the only access to certain areas with a boat to hunt, etc. One ranger may say the road is useable one day, then another may restrict use. I would like to see Akers Ferry campground reopened for camping and picnicking. Have a non-motorized section above R.S. on river. I love the idea of not having to compete with boaters. C-4 Continue to promote the family friendly use/environment on the river. The Ozarks are much more fun than the Meremac. Would like to see funding put for staff to regulate existing rules and regulations. 14 Salem Open House 6/24/09 The park needs an impact study done for people, horses, boaters, canoes, etc. Use of the river period. I would like to see a family friendly park. I like to spend time with my family in the park. I love to swim, float, fish, etc. C-5 I would like to see the drinking, partying regulations enforced more. There has been an improvement and we appreciate that. I would like the motorboat limits stay the same. Makes it easier to use boat. The boat w/large motor is safer to carry the grand kids in. Locals pick up trash on river. They help canoers, floaters. Pick up their trash and save their lives at times. Gasoline motors on boats should not be allowed except for emergency vehicles. C-6 The NPS needs to utilize social networking to target a more rounded audience, i.e., Facebook, Twitter, linked-in, etc. Possibly needs a media specialist to better understand and target unreached groups for public forum. It is frustrating to want to find out important information and cannot. Missing certain demographic groups. I do not own a TV or listen to radio so it is difficult to receive information. I listen to my iPod, listen to podcast and am on the internet. Community radio is big with my age group, etc. C-7 Make sure that whatever plan is decided upon can be funded in the coming years. UTVs should be allowed on all NPS roads so (65 & older) they have access to the park. There is too much motorized access to the river. A lot of people look for more primitive stretches of the river without motorized access. Don't use development to solve use problems. Does not always achieve what is set out to achieve. 15 Salem Open House 6/24/09 C-8 ATVs and UTVs should be allowed on gravel bars. We need more ATVs and UTV trails in park. C1-1 Leave HP as is – measure at pump. Quit asking anywhere else how to manage down here - need it left just like it is. Park Service does an OK job – but don't want it over regulated so can't do what we have been. Leave as is – go back to old HP regs (i.e., no limits) – common sense will take care of upper river sections. Need restrooms along the river where there is drive-in access – have signs upriver informing boaters that restroom ahead. C1-2 Restrooms needed at Jerktail and Williams. Alt C concerns me because it focuses on immediate desires. It doesn't take into account long-term use planning. The river isn't just for recreation. I'm worried about the ecology and environmental conditions of the river. I worry about the watershed pollution from overuse by recreation like horses or human miss-use. C1-3 Not as many people at 197's-80's. We had canoeing/camping then – change is 10% economy – most due to miss-handling by law enforcement – Leave 'em alone, let them enjoy themselves.</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Traditional use of camping at Sinking Cr. Ancestors camped there, constantly closing campgrounds. Open them back up. People want to be at river. Want to see HP stay the same all throughout park. 16 Salem Open House 6/24/09 Want to see it (river in particular) managed for family use – have ids & grandkids. Want drinking reduced/eliminated. Want less canoes – too crowded to run boat from Two Rivers to Round Spring. C1-4 Changed boating habits to avoid crowding by canoes on weekends in RS – 2 River Section. 4th generation enjoyment of Current River – teaching grand children to swim & learned in johnboat, from grandfather, without motor. See eagles, wild horses, keep these opportunities. 4-wheel drive pick-ups need to be more respectful to canoeists when crossing river. They speed up in the river hard splashing water on canoeists, like if you lift a jet motor. Bathrooms all over need to be more handicap-accessible. Should be able to drive up to them, e.g., like at Two Rivers. C1-5 More bathrooms needed on Upper Current between Baptist & Akers Ferry. The only one row is at Cedargrove & you have to walk up and out to get there. There are places you could put a vault toilet out of the flood plan. NPS plan should go back & review enabling legislation & accompanying Senate/Congressional committee report for guidance on managing this National Park as it was intended. Close all the Fords. Improve the campground – campsites are right on top of each other. The snoring in the next site keeps you awake. C1-6 Make accesses for fishing – provide a nice parking area, then no vehicles beyond this point. Vehicles don't need to be down on the river's edge. 17 Salem Open House 6/24/09 18 Designate horse trails, staging sites and then close all the others. Don't want horse use near campgrounds. No one wants to smell the manure. Separate these uses – horse & camping. Finish the Dee Murray camping area, by making parking, closing gravel bar to driving. Re-build the dam at Welch Spring – it was beautiful – restricted access to spring. All of the alternatives are too vague; if I'm gonna vote I want to know what I'm voting on. Need to be more spelled out. (e.g., what does "more development" mean – some? Everywhere? Need details). C1-7 More and more people are asking for hiking – make more hike up/canoe down loops. People enjoy the Pulltite & Devils Well trails. Add a trail to Schafer Spring. More interpretation in the Upper Current. We're more than just Round Spring Cave. Make campsite along Schafer branch, then trail past Susie Nichols to Schafer Lakes picnic area. Make a horse or hiking trail along old mail route that Susie Nichols rode.</p>					
4336	<p>1 Columbia Open House Ozark National Scenic Riverways Public Comment on Preliminary Alternatives* June 25, 2009 Overview The public comments provided below were recorded on flip charts during the Columbia Open House, held at the Courtyard by Marriott on June 25, 2009. A total of 127 people attended (signed in). At this open house, the public was invited to provide their comments on the Preliminary Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. Here is some information to help you understand what is shown on the transcribed flip charts: • National Park Service employees have typed up this record from the original flipchart pages and every effort was made to type everything as originally written. We apologize in advance if any mistakes were made in transcribing these notes from the original. • At the meetings, most flip chart comments were recorded by National Park Service staff. The name or initials of the recorder(s) is usually noted at the top of the first page. • There were four open house stations, each one labeled for one of the alternatives'No Action Alternative; Alternative A; Alternative B; Alternative C. There were usually two flip charts at each station. (Different labeling and numbering approaches were used by the recorders to distinguish between the two sets of flipchart notes.) • Each flip chart page was numbered. Next to the number is a letter to identify at which station the comment was recorded (and sometimes which flipchart): o N, NA'No Action alternative station o A'alternative A station o B'alternative B station o C'alternative C station • The recorders sometimes abbreviated words. Some of the common abbreviations are: o HP'horsepower o NPS'National Park Service o BS'Big Spring o VB'Van Buren o LE'law enforcement o JK'Jacks Fork o TR'Two Rivers o RS'Round Spring *Note: Handwritten comments that were placed in the comment boxes at the open houses have been recorded into the comment database separately Columbia Open House 6/25/09 2 G. Moss and Lindel Gregory NA-01 Support no action because would like to continue fishing the Two Rivers area – no change to horse power limits More visible patrols on river. Large fines for bad apples Maintain old farms Protect and serve not just enforcement Open old camping areas (Keatons) Open old roads for access to old farms Leave boat horsepower limit as is Make higher horsepower limit below Two Rivers NA-02 No boat horse power limit Enforce existing horsepower limits Limit on horse concessions Enforce protection of natural eco system Enforce easement strictly Endorse wilderness protection Limit river access points Close illegal roads and trails Enhance cultural and historic teaching Disagree with all above statements to blue line NA-03 More restrooms available for floaters Emergency phones for emergency contacts and law enforcement assistance Way too many horses in the water Support no change to Jacks Fork Stop excessive ATV's and horse use No limitations on horsepower! No zones at all! No zones No boat horsepower limits No change Show proof for changes in horsepower NA-04 Reason for zones! NO MORE REGULATIONS – let us stay on the land and play Too many horse restrictions on plans A, B, & C - In favor of no action Leave it alone, Mother Nature did a good job! As natural as possible No ATV's in the river or on gravel bars, restrict horses from the river, campgrounds are too large Columbia Open House 6/25/09 3 NA-04 Enforce rules on foul language and disorderly conduct, including loud music Ban alcohol on the rivers Increase trout stocking on upper Current River Eliminate trout stocking in rivers (this may be hurting our endangered Hellbenders) Confiscate ATV's if /when caught off road (or trucks) I'm for plan A – leave it as natural as possible (↑E-coli) No ↑ in HP allowed, please A-1 Recommend that the charts be clear on limits of ATV use. Like to see: (t see it) stay or go more primitive. *Embrace original mission to preserve and protect. *Equestrian access should be permitted as canoe numbers are permitted, but not unlimited numbers. A-2 1) Do not want unauthorized motorized vehicle access above Round Spring. 2) Round Spring to Two Rivers should be non-motorized in Alt. A. 3) Provide signage on the river to let visitors know when they enter or leave river areas managed by NPS. 4) Support Alt "A" would like to see non-motorized down to 2 rivers. 5) Would like to see the river going back to an earlier time. 6) The condition of the ONSR is less preserved than other river ways not managed by NPS ie..("Il point") 7) Like to see the river back to an earlier time – like more deep pools and not so full of gravel. A-3 1) A little more protect and serve and less enforcement and more visibility on the river – be willing to provide water. 2) No action – Alt "A" – Alt "B" – Alt "C" would be devastating to the recreation and economy o f the local counties. 3) Like to see an "open season" for any HP motors when floaters are not abundant. – (NO!) 4) Glad to see the park service doing this. 5) Ranger presence to emphasis rules and be available to assist the public. 6) Would like to have more access to the history sites and ONSR</p>	6/25/2009	No		MO	65201

	<p>sites. 7) (blank) A-4 1) Limit motorized access (especially ATV's) – check ATV website that promotes park as ATV friendly 2) Can we make areas of the ONSR more friendly to motorized recreation than others? 3) In favor of limited motors to the max extent totally if possible. Columbia Open House 6/25/09 4 4) Want to keep motorized (EQ) off the gravel bars. 5) In favor of Alt "A" 6) Would like to see no "2-cycle" motors in the water – oil in exhaust pollutes 7) Would like to see the zones remain as they are – much like a "no-action" alternative. 8) Support management decisions on water quality and biota based on scientific data. There is a vast amount of information and science to show impacts. A-5 1) It costs far more to remediate damage to resources than to prevent them. 2) How will "solitude" be achieved? Allow a certain number of put-ins (vessels/boats, not location), as at the Boundary Waters? 3) Get the trucks off the gravel bars. New roads in Shannon County lead right to the gravel bars. 4) No boats with motors above Two Rivers downstream. Number of horses in park is too many and river crossings too often. Restrict, limit ORV's around Jack and Current River. A-6 1) Other National and Scenic Riverways (St. Croix, MN/WI) enforce "No Drinking" on rivers. This has eliminated MANY problems. Maybe we should look into this in Missouri? Even with the river located next to a major metropolitan area, one can find a quiet and peaceful time! 2) I also do not think motor boats should be allowed above Two Rivers. (Pollution, stream bank erosion, safety). 3) Permits should be issued to limit # of canoers' and horses on rivers/trails at one time. 4) Please don't turn it into a water theme park. 5) Don't place concrete everywhere to make it a commercial enterprise. A-7 1) Would rather have a more natural state. 2) Some of the interpretive programs move away from a natural experience. 3) Don't understand why horses have to cross the river. 4) Limit the river crossings for horse use. 5) Preserve clean water for future generations. 6) Strong support for Alt. A & B regarding restoring wilderness and river corridor. 7) Boat restriction in Alt. A is what I like. Alt. "A" Columbia Rusy 6/25 A-1 1) Stop motorized boat above Two Rivers. More a canoe river above that. Jet boats stir up sediment and damage the aquatic organisms, cause bank erosion. Below Two Rivers it is wide and deep eno</p>						
4337	<p>St. Louis Open House Ozark National Scenic Riverways Public Comments on Preliminary Alternatives* June 26, 2009 Overview The public comments provided below were recorded on flip charts during the St. Louis Open House, held at the Crowne Plaza Hotel (Clayton) on June 26, 2009. A total of 186 people attended (signed in). At this open house, the public was invited to provide their comments on the Preliminary Alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan. Here is some information to help you understand what is shown on the transcribed flip charts: • National Park Service employees have typed up this record from the original flipchart pages and every effort was made to type everything as originally written. We apologize in advance if any mistakes were made in transcribing these notes from the original. • At the meetings, most flip chart comments were recorded by National Park Service staff. The name or initials of the recorder(s) is usually noted at the top of the first page. • There were four open house stations, each one labeled for one of the alternatives'No Action Alternative; Alternative A; Alternative B; Alternative C. There were usually two flip charts at each station. (Different labeling and numbering approaches were used by the recorders to distinguish between the two sets of flipchart notes.) • Each flip chart page was numbered. Next to the number is a letter to identify at which station the comment was recorded (and sometimes which flipchart): o N, NA'No Action alternative station o A'alternative A station o B'alternative B station o C'alternative C station • The recorders sometimes abbreviated words. Some of the common abbreviations are: o HP'horsepower o NPS'National Park Service o BS'Big Spring o VB'Van Buren o LE'law enforcement o JF'Jacks Fork o TR'Two Rivers o RS' Round Spring *Note: Handwritten comments that were placed in the comment boxes at the open houses have been recorded into the comment database separately St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 06/26/09 – St. Louis, MO Greg Moss & Jodi Towery N.A. – 1 Need more staff to enforce original intention for projection including: A. Closing roads and fining those trespassing. B. Ticketing drunk persons; four wheelers on illegal roads; ticketing littering. C. Limit commercial enterprises: # horses/day # canoes/½ day D. Reduce access points: Change current access landings to primitive instead of developed. E. More support for NPS staff on rivers. F. More education – Visitors Local Communities Statewide N.A. – 2 1. No Action Plan Does not single out restrictions on any one particular group. All visitors of ONSR should be able to enjoy the recreational activities available. Camping at Cardereva gravel bar should have picnic tables, trash cans, trash pick-up, plus toilet services, if required to pay for camping. Limit the horseback riders out of Eminence. Park should install and maintain restrooms or port potties on the rivers at specific area for visitors. Get rid of jet boats, none allowed on river, unless emergency vehicles. N.A. – 3 No horses allowed within the park. No action and no additional restrictions on river. 2 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 No restrictions to horseback riding. No restrictions to motor boat use. Mine the gravel out of the river. River ways was created for recreation and current numbers of visitors does not damage the resource, therefore, numbers of tourist and locals visiting the river should not be limited. The resource should be available for the public to use, to touch, to experience, not just to see a picture behind your desk in the office. The locals take care of these resources and have for 200 years, which explains in part why they desire to live and to recreate in this area – O.N.S.R. N.A. – 4 Minority rights have been protected in the past from other minority groups, and they should also be protected in South Central Missouri. The Native Americans had their land and their rights taken away from the, as the Europeans aided by the Government and this is the case with O.N.S.R. Economic rights of the locals should also be protected as they also desire for the resource to be intact for future generations. Should turn/protect Big Spring as wilderness area, and to include the adjacent U.S.F.S. lands around that tract. Do not like motorboats and ATVs. They should be banned from the entire park. Horses should be dealt with or maintained due to horse crap in the river. Should allow geocaching with reasonable restrictions in the park. N.A. – 5 Ban motorboats and ATVs from the park. Limit motorboats and ATVs and horses. No action = no such thing. This plan will include natural degradation to the resource, which is sometimes called "entropy". The park needs a continuous thoughtful design that promotes "appreciation", of the entire resource that is there. No action is the only alternative that should be considered for the reason that there is no data that supports any damage has been done by any recreational activity (so this is all uncalled for). The O.N.S.R. admits that 90% of all tickets are written to tubers and canoes for alcohol and drug citations. So why should boaters be punished by HP limits. N.A. – 6 3 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 Canoes and tubes should be limited to specific times to put in at access points. This may prevent river congestion. Boaters help and rescue floaters who are in trouble. Some have saved lives. No action alternative provides the maximum amount of opportunities for everyone to enjoy the O.N.S.R. There is no conclusive</p>	6/26/2009	No			MO	63105

<p>evidence that the present regs are allowing the natural ecosystems to be harmed. Improve educational opportunities for children. Likes the no action alternative – enforce the existing regs and laws. N.A. – 7 Remove the HP limits, the river will regulate itself. The NPS & MDC should partner up to create a small mouth management zone in the Two Rivers – down zone within the park. Survey the park so it can be posted. Restrict bicycles and pedestrians use to prevent damage. Ban ATVs from park. Leave the park as primitive as possible. Likes the No Action Plan because of the revenue the canoe/tubes/boats bring to the local area. N.A. – 8 Need more boat landings north of Van Buren near Waymeyer. No HP limits on boats. Put numbers on waterways to identify problem people/floaters (commercial boats have these numbers) or any emergency reason. Restrict number of floating groups to stop overcrowding of both gravel bars and narrow areas where conflicts occur with motorboats. N.A. – 9 Lower the HP on boats, in all areas. Create designated horse trails and keep them away from the water. At designated Fords, create bridges so the motor vehicles are not in the water. I have been riding boats on Current River since I was two weeks old. Leave the river like it is. Nathan Moss. No action is not an option. Impose speed limits for boats on the river. Fewer access points. Education is needed for all user groups so they understand the impact of uses. Preserve the river and its resources. 4 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 N.A – 10 Disagree with lowering HP on the river. It's not safe and it's discriminating. Lift all HP limits, so there is no HP limit. I suggest an elected advisory council consisting of four counties to help advise on new and old regulations pertaining to the O.N.S.R. Why are the motorboats users always the ones singled out for more and more regulations. Under the present economic conditions, it is a very poor time to arbitrarily cut the tax base for all the counties and state. Any more regs on boats and motors will have a definite negative monetary impact. How many times do the motor boaters save lives and aid canoeists, etc. 5 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 Ozark – June 2009 –pollution from power boats & ATV's & uncontrolled horseback riding prevent this enjoyment and contribute to the destruction of this rare & valuable resource for the present & future generations. 4. Don't mess with the horse power on the boats. 5. No new wilderness areas. 6. Would like to continue to allow folks to be able to float the river & experience a good time – responsibly. 7. There should be education before people go onto the river – safety & resource protection & environmentally aware. 10 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 B-1 1. We can't take trips to the rivers because they are too rowdy for the boys. Boy Scout Leader. 2. Don't fix it if it isn't broke. Keep horse riders on trails. Bottom line – who's problem, is it? NPS resources spread thin and NPS has bigger fish to fry. 3. River eco-system, why all the algae? Are trout responsible? Trout eat bottom feeders. 4. Ban ALL motorized from Montauk to Cedar Grove, in water and along river: boats & ATV's & SUV's. 5. I'd like to see limitations on things rather than out right banning things. If you make a rule – enforce it! 6. Plant mowed areas at Big Spring/Alley Spring with native plants. 7. I like to trout fish; I'd like to see more trout. Need for people to make connection to the resource or they won't come back. At same time the uses shouldn't impair the resources. 8. Ditto – the Boy Scout leaders comments - there are many rivers in MO where people can go if they want to be rowdy! B-2 1. No gigging or horses or powerboats or loud music at night, on the river. My main concern is to keep the river clean. No dumping in the river. 2. I'm for No Action. No action is best way for everyone to get the most out of it. Doesn't single out one group of users. No action. 3. Landowners who sold their property for the park were promised that the river & the land would be kept natural, undeveloped & pristine. 4. Horses and bikes should not be lumped together. Human powered (bikes, canoes, hikers) should be grouped together. 5. In favor of no action rule, but would like to see the old horsepower limit (prior to 1992) cheaper – old/smaller engines burn more gas to move a family on the river. B-3 1. Any new restrictions would deter tourists from using the river ways & would devastate the economies of Reynolds, Carter & Shannon counties, who depend on the sales tax. 2. It's all about future generations. We need to think of nature first, not economics. You can make a living marketing this as a natural ecosystem. Market it as a place that is left alone. People will come. There are other rivers where people can have the other experience. 11 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 1. No conclusive evidence that the regulation "as is" have done any harm to any natural ecosystem. "No Action" would be best course of action so that everyone has the opportunity to experience the ONSR. B-4 1. "No Action" is the only alternative, I feel, that is the one that needs to be implemented. I've been on the river all 44 years of my life. I have seen no change in the river, so there's no reason for any other alternatives. 2. No action – enforce the current laws. 3. Try a free market approach to canoe rentals, don't limit number of outfitters, "The Market" will create a natural limit to users on river. 4. No action – please keep gravel bar camping at Sinking Creek, even if you have to raise the price. 5. Figure out ways to impact the local economy minimally. Keep cultural heritage. B-5 1. I want to float, fish & camp on the river gravel bars. Natural processes help limit hp on the river. 2. Please not have forum in this hotel – Clayton – difficult for parking. Use community colleges. 3. The conflict isn't activities per se; the conflict is the time and location. When you pull everyone into one place at same time, that's when there's conflict. 4. They need to enforce laws they already have. They need more rangers. Limit the horses. 5. Let's get enough enforcement out there to enforce the laws on the books. 6. Hire extra law enforcement to work summers. Maybe hire teachers and train them to do law enforcement. No change in horsepower limit. Would have bought a different boat/motor otherwise. A taking. B-6 1. Current River trail is an important part of the future of the park. The zone from Round Spring down river to Brush Creek should accommodate a hiking trail under any alternative. 2. I first floated the Current in 1956 (age 16 – toted our own canoes-no outfitter then). Still do it every April. Hope you don't relax any restrictions at all – period. 12 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 1. "No action". Any other alternatives would be devastating to our community. I work at places that would be in terrible trouble w/o folks who go to the river. They should enforce the rules they have now. 2. Alt. B would do best job of balancing most peoples' wants, although I personally prefer A. I realize I'm a visitor down there and residents live there year round. "Art of the possible". B-7 1. The locals care about the resources evidenced by the fact that they reside in this area despite the economy & other factors. The locals have taken. B-8 1. I like Alt. A, only because in negotiations you ask for the most but settle for a little less. I'd like to see alcohol & drugs controlled. Bad to mix alcohol and guns. I feel vulnerable when I'm on the river. 2. No Change – horsepower limits as they are. 3. Rangers should be more visible, not hidden; more open will deter things from happening. 4. Must consider economic impact on area residents. Horsepower limits how many people (weight) you can carry in a boat. Could result in more boats on the rivers. 5. I think motorcycles and ATV should be allowed. Trails should be flat. More campsites, there shouldn't be a horsepower or a speed limit. B-9 1. I don't think there should be ANY horsepower limits on the river. Horsepower not limited on the</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>highway, but speed is. Discriminating against locals on Current River. No local will willingly agree to 25hp. For people who use it daily, not seasonally. Also think tubers & floaters need some identification on tubes in case of trouble, whether private or commercial. Control volume of tubers/floaters in one group, monitor/control. 2. I think tubers & floaters should get preference. There should be zoning to separate out from floaters and tubers. Should be some limits on HP. Facilitate multiple uses. 3. We need a HP limit because it's only practical way to limit speed. The throttle is the most practical way to regulate speed. 4. If horsepower ratings are changed, 60/40 motors could be Grandfathered in. 13 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 St. Louis – Ozark NSR – June 09' C-1 . All ecosystems have a carrying capacity. Resource use has to be limited, or it will be limited for you. . When using power tools around beautiful works of art – one must be very careful. . Fewer ATV's! . Fewer horse use! . "Horse Trail Riders" of 1,000 + horses & riders 3-4 times a year out of Eminence should be LIMITED! . Visitors of the Park need to be educated about all the recreational activities on the riverways (boats, etc). C-2 . Heavily in favor of no action at all. Further restrictions would be economically devastating to local communities, as would restrictions on recreation. Fear that more restrictions would result in fewer tourists & a loss in sales tax. . No change, but if there were a change, lift horse power limits. Less than 40 HP is inadequate for family boat use. . Partner with MDC for trophy small mouth bass fishing management. . No action, enforce current laws! C-3 . No action, with no action alternative, provides the most opportunity for people with dif. Interests to experience National Scenic Riverways. . There is no conclusive evidence to support claims that the present reg's are allowing the natural ecosystems to be harmed. . Keep gravel bar camping at Sinking Creek even if you raise the fee to \$10.00 per vehicle/nt. \$5.00 is ridiculously low when the Round Spring showers look like that. No action except to modify current mgt. plan to maintain & improve current facilities. . Use Lake of the Ozarks for motorized recreation, and use the riverways for natural recreation i.e. human powered! C-4 . Unrestricted recreational activities i.e. Hunting, fishing, gigging, canoeing, motor boating, hiking & horseback riding. . No limitations on Jon Boats Motor HP. Jon Boats are one of the most safe vessels. 14 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 . Some of the issues & problems people cite occur on the river, would not happen if the NPS would have uniformed employees along the river in canoes and motor boats, not to harass but to provide information and a presence which would deter rowdy behavior. C-5 . No action! . Enforce current laws that are in place. . Communities need the tourists and sales tax! . Extremely opposed to Alt. C., it will be hard to enforce, and expensive to tax payers. And it will cause the most damage to the natural resources. . Leave Big Spring to gooseneck unrestricted! . No action! C-6 . What would people do in cities if we took away their recreational activities? The local communities enjoy everything the river brings us. It is OUR recreation! i.e. Boats, fishing, gigging, & etc. . I'm for locals enjoying the river and its recreation but at the same time, take pride in it. Don't litter and don't abuse it. . It would be great to have alcohol and guns controlled with any river use. . Limit boat speeds to keep wakes down for canoeists. . Encourage campers to pack out solid/human waste. . Keep horses out of river floodplain to control waste contamination. C-7 . Concerned about the lack of game fish on the upper Current, from Welch to Round Spring; would like to see it as it was in the 1950's & 1960's. . Would like to see conditions stay the same on the Current River. . Opposed to all wilderness areas. Will take away hunting areas. Poaching will be a problem. . Horsepower should be raised from Round Spring down. Have to have 40 hp at the pump, 60 hp at power head. . Keep current conditions the same! . Don't want canoes stock piled along the Riverways! C-8 . NPS needs to do a better job of communicating & educating the public, with policies and potential changes that may occur. 15 St. Louis Open House 6/26/09 16 . NPS needs to work on building better relationships with the people who live in the area (local public relations)! . No horse power limit within the Ozark National Riverways. . Needs to be some type of way to be able to indentify anyone using the waterways. i.e. number on tubes, boats, canoes, and a way to link the users to the vessels. C-9 . NPS needs to regulate the numbers of floaters per group. . Needs to be more visible uniformed staff on the water. . Would like no wildness areas and would like to leave the horsepower restrictions alone! . The local economy will suffer If any changes are made; especially for the motor boats. . Need to be more, more visible law enforcement on the water. . The floaters need to be better educated about the boats on the river and what it takes to run safely! C-10 . All developed camp grounds need to be private property. All electric sites' needs to be solar! I.e. hot water, etc. . Reduce the # of access points.</p>						
4338	Response to question 1: No Action	6/23/2009	No			MO	65466
4339	response to question 1: No Action	9/16/2009	No			MO	63830
4340	Response to question 1: limiting tubes, rafts, boat/moter horsepoewr is not necessary, we would enjoy more access points. There is plenty of river for all. I believe we should all be responsible for our own safety, country, and most of all trash. Thhose that do not comply should be exposed to discipline by fine or community service such as river clean up.	6/30/2009	No			MO	63965
4341	response to question 1: None response to question 2: None response to question 3: none response to question 4: none response to question 5: 40 HP at the output shaft	8/4/2009	No			MO	65804
4342	response to question 1: No Action response to question 2: No Action response to question 3: ABC response to question 4: No Action response to question 5: 40 Horsepower at the output shaft	8/5/2009	No			MO	65560

4343	response to question 1: No Action response to question 2: None - No Action response to question 3: We should be able to use all the land and river as it is now. No limits on the pump on motors response to question 4: All of it is special - leave the way it is so everyone can enjoy all of the land and river. response to question 1: Park Rangers shoul dbe seen on hte river. Get tougher on people trashing the river.	7/31/2009	No			AL	36461
4344	response to question 1. No Action. I would keep it the same and put some trash cans along the river. response to question 3. A. I don't want to not be able to be on the river. response to question 4. Pultiet (?) Springs, Pet hole. teddy o. den hole, and walterlips hole.	9/11/2009	No			MO	65466