

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Public Involvement

Although the NEPA scoping process was officially initiated in December 1994, wilderness managers solicited information from agencies, the public, and other user groups concerning the FC–RONRW from 1991 until 1994. The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on December 7, 1994. The NOI asked for public comment on the proposal through December 30, 1994. Six public meetings were held in Idaho and Montana in December 1994. In addition, a mailing was sent to people on the *Frankly Speaking* newsletter mailing list. In April 1995, a second round of six public meetings was held, as well as additional mailings (DEIS, pg 5-1 to 5-12).

On January 15, 1998, the Notice of Availability for the DEIS was published in the Federal Register. A special issue of *Frankly Speaking* newsletter containing a copy of the Executive Summary of the DEIS and the Draft Programmatic and Operational Management Plan was mailed to the *Frankly Speaking* mailing list of more than 3,700 people who had expressed interest in the planning process. There were also numerous open house meetings held during the formal comment period and written and oral comments were recorded. Forest Service representatives also attended several interest group meetings to present the alternatives discussed in the DEIS (SDEIS, pg 3-1).

Due to an overwhelming number of requests to extend the comment period, the Forest Service extended the comment period to December 1, 1998. The comment period was again extended until February 1, 1999 at the request of several more interest groups. At the end of the comment period, there were 1,623 letters/or transcripts of oral comments received (SDEIS, pg 3-1). The Supplemental DEIS was signed and issued to approximately 1200 persons on September 7, 1999. Comments were requested from the public with a deadline of February 1, 2000. There were 1,410 comments received on the SDEIS.

From February through April of 2002 a series of communication, document reviews, and a meeting were conducted with the Nez Perce Tribe regarding the FEIS. During development of the Cultural Resources Programmatic Agreement, which is referenced in this FEIS, the Nez Perce and Shoshone Bannock tribes reviewed and commented on the Programmatic Agreement (PA). Federal, State and local governmental officials were briefed by the Responsible Officials prior to, or shortly after the release of the DEIS and SDEIS.

Agencies, Organizations and Individuals

The following agencies, organizations and individuals received the DEIS, SDEIS, or a summary of those documents during this planning process.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Agencies & Organizations Receiving the DEIS or SDEIS

2L Llama Co	Assn of Experiential Educ	Boise Valley Fly Fishermen Inc
4th District IAA	Associated Press	Bonneville Power Admin
5 Valley Audubon	ASUI Outdoor Program	Boulder-White Clouds Council
A Carhart Natl Wilderness Trng Ctr	Audubon Society	Boundary Cr Prod Ltd
A/C Sales & Brokerage	AVJet Aviation	Boy Scouts
AAA Egg Farms	B & A Engineers Inc	Bridger-Teton Natl Forest
ABN-AMRO Inc	B A Mullen Group	Browns Industries Inc
Acquisitions & Serials Branch	Backcounty Horsemen	Brunini Grantham Grower & Hewes
Action White Water Adv	Badley Ranch Landowners	BSA Snake Rvr Area Council
Ada County Commrs	Baker House	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ada County Fish & Game League	Ball Enterprizes Inc	Bureau of Land Mgmt
Adventure Medical Kits	Bank of Mississippi	Bureau of Reclamation
Advisory Consultants for Historic	Bannock County Commrs	Burke Albright Hartr & Rzepka LLP
Advo Inc	Barker-Ewing Rvr Trips	Butte Library
AFSEEE	Beaverhead-Deerlodge Natl Forest	BVTV
Aircraft Owners & Pilots Assn	Bevis Cameron & Johnson PA	Cains Doyle Lans & Nicholas
Aldo Leopold Wilderness Institute	Big Creek Lodge & Outfitters	California State University
Allen & Leuthold Inc	Bighorn Outfitters	Cameron & Barkley Co
Alliance for the Wild Rockies	Bitterroot Chamber of Comm	Campbells Ferry Landowners
Allison Photography	Bitterroot Conservation Dist	Canoe & Kayak Magazine
Allison Ranch Landowners	Bitterroot Natl Forest	Carpenter Const
Alpha Tau Omega	Bitterroot Ranch	Carson Ranger District
Aluma-Glass Industries	Bitterroot RC & D	Cascade Chamber of Comm
Alumi Assoc Inc	Bitterroot Ridge Runners	Cascade Public Library
AMAX	Bitterroot Valley TV	Cascade Ranger District
American Adrenaline Co	BLM –Winnemucca Distict	Casilla De Correo 1433
American Canoe Assn	Blue Mtn Audubon/Walla Walla	Center for Biological Diversity
American Fisheries Society	Blue Ribbon Coalition	Central Equipment
American Outdoors	Bobs Aircraft	Central Idaho Rod & Gun Club
American River Touring Assn	Bogus Basin	Chairman Cultural Committee
American Rivers	Bohart Ranch	Challis Area C of C
American Ski Federation	Boise Adjudication Team	Challis City Council
American Whitewater Affiliation	Boise Cascade Corp	Challis Messenger
American Whitewater Assn	Boise Chamber of Comm	Challis Public Library
American Wildlands	Boise City Hall	Chamberlain Basin Outfitters
Animal Clinic at the Festival	Boise County	Chandler DeBrun Fink & Hayes
ARA Consulting Group	Boise County Commrs	Chattahoochee-Oconee Natl Forest
Arapaho Roosevelt Natl Forest	Boise Field Station	Checker Cab Alley
Arco Adventors	Boise Natl Forest	Chesapeake Bagel Bakery
Artic Creek Lodge	Boise Payette Backctry Coalition	China Bar Landowners
ASARCO Incorp	Boise Public Library	Chou Chemical Co
Asset Remarketing Corp	Boise Schools	Circle KBL Outfitters
Assn Logging Contractor	Boise State University	City of Boise Public Work
	Boise Towne Square #2153	City of Stanley

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Clearwater Flying Service	Dept of Lands	Foundation for N Amercia Wild Sheep
Clearwater Natl Forest	Dept of Water Resource	Friends of Clearwater
Clearwater Ranger District	Diamond D Ranch	Friends of Line Creek
Clearwater-Potlatch Corp	Discovery	Friends of the Bitterroot
Cogan-Owens-Cogan	Div of Eco & Community	Friends of the Clearwater
Cold Mtn Cold Rivers	Div of Enviro Quality	Friends of the Lemhi River
Colorado State University	Dixie Outfitters Inc	FS Info-Intermountain
Colorado Whitewater Assn	Don Hatch Rvr Expeditions INC	FSEEE
Columbia Rvr Inter-Tribal Fish	Dowglanco	Futra Corp/Mackay Bar Div
Columbia Seaplane Pilots Assn	Drake Mechanical	Gallatin Natl Forest
Columbus Hospital	E G C Enterprises	Garden Valley Outfitters
Community Library	E Montana College	Gem State Hunters
Concerned Citizens Coalition	E Montana College Library	Genesis Capital Mgmt LP
Congressman Mike Crapo	Eagle Rock Backctry Horsemen	Gerlach Holding Corp
Continental Divide Trail Soc	Eakin Ridge Outfitters	Gibbs Farm Ltd
Co-op Wilderness Handicap Gro	Earnst A Dernburg MedicalL Corp	Gibbs Products Inc
Copenhaver Home Owners Assn	Earth River Expeditions	Gila Natl Forest
Couer d'Alene Wildlife Federation	East River Travellers	Gillihan Guide Service
Cox & Johnson Ins Agency Inc	Eclipse Expedition	Girl Scouts
Croman Corporation	Ecocentric Wildlaqnds Mgmt Institute	Godfreys Foothill Retreat
Crooked Creek Ranch	Elk City Ranger District	Gold Beach Ranger District
Currey Expeditions	Ellsworth Engineering Inc	Graham & Company Inc
Custer County Commrs	Elm Ford-Mercury Inc	Grand Targhee
Custer County Extension	Engineering Incorp	Grangeville Chamber of Comm
Custer County Farm Bureau	Enviro Coordinaator Chief 1950	Grangeville City Hall
Custom River Tours	Enviro Protection Agency EIS	Grangeville Public Library
Cuyahoga Valley Joint Vocational SC	EPA-Mgmt Info Unit off. of Fed Activity	Grassroots for Multiple Use
CWHOG	Ex-Officio Auditor & Recorder	Green River Drifters
Cyprus Thompson Cr Mine	Exxon Company USA	Greyhound Mining & Milling
Daly-Jensen	F Randall Kline Chartered	Grimes Logistics Services
Dames & Moore	Fargo & Benson	Grizzly Bear Task Force
Danvile Orthopedic Clinic Inc	FC-RONR Wilderness Id Team	Gros Ventre River Ranch
Darby Public Library	Fed Hwy Admin	Grove Prk PL
Dave Helfrich Rvr Outfitter Inc	Fiels Golan & Swiger	Groveland Ranger Dist
Davis & Davis Ins & Real Estate Inc	First Security Bank	Hailey Public Library
Dean Helfrich Guide Service	Fivemile Bar Landowners	Hamilton City Council
Deerlodge Natl Forest	Flathead Cultural Comm	Hamilton Hikers Club
Dees Jackson Watson & Assn	Flathead Natl Forest	Hankins Hicks & Madden
Defenders of Wildlife	Flecher Farms	Hansen Mining & The Rock Works
DeFoor Realty	Flying B Resort Ranch	Hanson Paint & Body Works
Delman Logging	FNAWS Natl Office	Happy Hollow Vacations
Denali Natl Park	Forest Guardians	Happy Saddle Tramps
Dept of Commerce	Forest Magazine	Hatch River Expeditions
Dept of Enviro Quality	Fort Lewis College Library	Havlah Resources
	Fortine Ranger District	Healthy Harvest

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Hearst Free Library	ID County Free Press	ID State Univ. Eli M. Oboler Library
Heartland Backcountry Horsemen	ID County Sheriff	ID State University
Heating Supply Co	ID County Weed Control	ID Statesman
HELCA Mining Co -Grouse Cr Unit	ID Dept of Aeronautics	ID Trail Machine Assn
Hello Inc	ID Dept of Agriculture	ID Whitewater Assn
Hells Canyon Council	ID Dept of Commerce	ID Wildlife Federation
Hells Canyon Natl Rec Area	ID Dept of Education	ID Wool Growers Assn
Hells Canyon Preservation Council	ID Dept of Enviro Quality	Idaho Assication of Counties
Helmsing Sims & Leach	ID Dept of Fish & Game	Idahonian
Herndon Assn	ID Dept of Health & Welfare	Independent Miners Assn
High County News	ID Dept of Lands	Indian Creek Guest Ranch
Hillside Farm	ID Dept of Parks & Rec	Inland Empire Public Lands Comr
Hobnailers Hiking Club	ID Dept of Transportation	Intermountain Orthopaedics
Hodson-Schindler Elevator Co	ID Dept of Water Resources	Intermtn Research Station
Hoffman Law Offices	ID Div of Econ & Commun	Internat'l Llama Assn
Hogan Hartson	ID Div of Enviro Quality	Inter-State Aviation Inc
Holland, Ray, Upchurch & Hillen	ID Education Assn	Inyo Natl Forest
Hometown Sports	ID Enviro Council	ISSU
Honorable Bernie Swift,	ID Falls Chamber of Comm	J A Heath Consulting
Honorable Conrad Burns	ID Falls Gem & Menerals	J Eberle Wines
Honorable Dirk Kempthorne	ID Falls Post Register	James Henry River Journeys
Honorable Elmer Severson	ID Falls Public Library	James Ranch Landowners
Honorable Larry Craig	ID Farm Bureau Federation	Jan's River Service
Honorable Michael D Crapo	ID Forest Industries	Jarbridge Ranger Dist
Honorable Mike Simpson	ID Gem & Minerals Society	Jay Pk Kenney PC
Hoot Owl Farm	ID Horse Council Backctry Horsemen	JC Pitts Aviation
Horace Mann Co	ID House of Reps, Wendy Jaquet	Jonathan H Marvel Arcgitect
House Resources Committee	ID Machinery & Supply Inc	Jones & StokesAssoc
Hovis Homes Inc	ID Mining Assn	Jules Stein Eye Inst
Howe Chamber Member	ID Mtn Express	K/KYLT/Z-100 Radio
HRP Staff	ID Mule Assn	KDXT 93-KGRZ Radio
Hungry Horse Ranger District	ID Natl Audubon Society	KECH Radio
Hwy Mile Marker Guide	ID NW Wildlife Council	KECI TV
Hyde Wetherell Bray & Haff	ID Outfitters & Guides Assn	Kelly Home Builders
Hyperspod Sports	ID Outfitters & Guides Lic Bd	Kenton Ranger Dist
ID Air Quality Bureau	ID Power Company	Ketchum City Hall
ID Air Taxi Assn	ID Rivers United	Ketchum Community Library Assn
ID Alpine Club	ID Rural Council	Ketchum Ranger District
ID Assn of Chambers of Comm	ID SEEE	Kettle Range Conserv Group
ID Assn of Counties	ID Soil & Water Conservation	KGVO
ID Attorney General	ID Sporting Congress	Kingfisher Expedition
ID Aviation Assn	ID State Dept of Lands	Kings River Ranger District
ID Cattle Assn	ID State Historical Society	KLEW-TV
ID Conservation League	ID State Journal	Klutho Cody & Kilo PC
ID County Commrs	ID State Snowmobile Assn	KLYQ Radio

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

KMCL RADIO	McCall City Council	Montana Trail Bike Riders Assn
KPAX TV	McCall Mtn/Canyon Flying Sem	Montana Wilderness Assn
Krassel Ranger District	McCall Public Library	Montana Wildlife Federation
KSKI Radio	McCall Ranger District	Montana Women in Timber
KSRA Radio	McCullough Grotting Rousso & Assoc	Monumental Ranch
KUFM	McCoys Tackle Shop	Moody Jones & Monte Fusco PA
KXLY-TV	Megis Machine & Welding	Moon & Assoc Mining
KYLT Radio	Mercy Doctors Tower	Moore & McFadden
Kyss Radio	Meridian Ear Nose & Throat Clinic PA	Morgan Ranch
La Rue Des Boulees	Merrill Lynch	Morgan Stanley Dean Witter
Lake Powell Resorts & Marina	Middle Fork Aviation	Moscow Chamber of Comm
Land Use Chronicle	Middle Fork Land Inc	Moscow City Hall
Lantz Bar Hosts	Middle Fork Lodge Inc	Mountain King
Lassen Natl Forest	Middle Fork Ranch Inc	Mountain Medical Ctr
Law Office of Roger E Crist	Middle Fork Ranger District	Mountain Pilot
Leading Edge Planes & Props	Middle Fork Rapid Transit	Mountain Travel Sobeck
Legacy Trust Co	Middle Fork River Tours Inc	Mountain Visions
Lehman Brothers Inc	Middle Fork Rvr Expeditions	Mt Borah Ranch
Leland Consulting Group	Middle Fork Wilderness Outfitters	Mtn Air Floats
Lemhi County Comr	Middlebury College	Mtn Air Mackay Bar
Lemhi County Land Use Committee	Mile Hi Outfitters	Mtn Home Ranger District
Lemhil County Weed Supt	Miller Consulting	Mtn Village Resort
Lewis & Clark Natl Forest	Mission Aviation Fellowship	Mtn West Outdoor Club
Lewis & Clark Trail Adv	Missoula Ranger District	MWC Box 1787
Lewiston Chamber of Comm.	Missoula Snowgrowers	Mystic Saddle Ranch
Lewiston City Library	Missoulain	Nakker Inc
Little Falcon Farm	MML Investors Service Inc	Napa High School
Lodgepole Inn	Monograph ACQ SVC	Natl Assn of RV Parks & CGs
Lolo Natl Forest	Montana 4X4 Assn	Natl Audubon Society
Longbranch Committee	Montana Audubon Council	Natl Forest Products Assn
Loon Cr & Cougar Cr Ranches	Montana Dept of Agri	Natl Forest Recreation Assn
Lowman Ranger District	Montana Dept of Comm	Natl Forests In FL
Mackay Bar Corp	Montana Dept of Enviro Quality	Natl Marine Fisheries Service
Mackay Bar Homeowners Assn	Montana Dept of Fish & Wildlife	Natl Marine Service Boise Field Off.
Mackay Bar Ranch	Montana Dept of Health & Enviro	Natl Org for River Sports
Mackay Bar Wilderness Trips	Montana Dept of State Lands	Natl Org for Rvr Sports
Mackay City Council	Montana Logging Assn	Natl Outdoor Leadship School
Mackay Wilderness Rvr Trips Inc	Montana Mining Assn	Natl Park Service
Maken Irrigation Inc	Montana Oil Journal	Natl Wilderness Trng Ctr
Manytracks Publishing	Montana Outfitters & Guides Assn	Natl Wildlife Federation
Marion County Water Watch	Montana Power Co	NatlL Audubon Society
Marshall Welding & Fabrication	Montana Standard	New England Capital Mgmt
McCall & Wilderness Air Inc	Montana State Historical Society	Nez Perce Natl Forest
McCall Air Taxi	Montana State Library	Nez Perce Ranger District
McCall Chamber of Comm	Montana Tech	Nez Perce Tribe

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Nine Mile Ranger District	Phenix Group LLC	Retina Consultants
NOAA - NMFS	Philipsberg Ranger Dist	Ridgerunner Outfitters
Nobility Homes Inc	Philipsburg Library	Riggins Chamber of Comm
Norman H Guth Co	Phillips Petroleum	Riley Construction Co
Normood Clinic	Piedmont Physicians	River Access for Tomorrow
North Fork Guides	PIN/NIP Inc	River Access for Tomorrow (Raft)
North Fork Ranger District	Pistol Creek Financial Co	River Adventures Ltd
North Fork Store	Pistol Creek Properties	RMEF Natl Wildlife Conserv
North Idaho College	Pocatello Chamber of Comm	Robinson Bar Ranch
North States Power Co	Pocatello City	Rocking H Packers
Northern Region	Polly Bemis Ranch -Members-Owners	Rocky Mountain Lab
Northern Rockies Sierra Club	Ponderosa Aero Club	Rocky Mountain River Tours
Northgate Vet Hospital	Porterbilt Post & Pole Co	Rocky Mtn Elk Foundation
Northwest Mining Assn	Portneuf Valley Assn Society	Rocky Mtn Eye & Ear Center PC
Northwest Rafters Assn	Post Register	Rocky Mtn Oil & Gas Assn
Northwest River Runners	Potlatch Corporation	RONR Intrprtve Assn
Northwest Whitewater Assn	Prescott Natl Forest	Royal Robbins Rugged Outdoor Clothing
Northwest Youth Corps	Preston Gates & Ellis LLP	Rudd Elder Care Consulting
Northwoods Wilderness Recovery	Primecap Mgmt Co	Saddle Sprgs Trophy Outfitters
Nova Metal Finishing Inc	Primitive Wilderness User	Safari Club Intl
NPS Denver Service Ctr	Professional Arts Bldg #504	SAIC
NRCS	Prop Investments Advisors Inc	Salisbury State University
NRS	Properties West Inc	Salmon Air Taxi
NW Power Plng Council	PTMA	Salmon City Hall
NY State Dept of Env. Cons.	Public Land Law Revision Comm	Salmon Intermtn Inc
NY State Dept of Enviro Conserv	R & R Outdoors Inc	Salmon Public Library
Oars Inc	R Bruce Bass MD FAC	Salmon River Backcounty Horsemen
Office of Honorable Larry Craig	Rail Tex	Salmon River Challenges
Office of ID Attorney General	Rams Head Lodge	Salmon River Lodge Inc
Oliver Russell & Assoc Inc	Randall Blake & Cox PA	Salmon River Ranger Dist/Slate Cr
Olympia Natl Forest	Ravalli County Commr	Salmon River Resort Club
Orion Expeditions	Ravalli County Elec Co-op	Salmon River Wood Prod
Outdoor Adventures	Ravalli County Fish & Wildlife Assn	Salmon Rvr Chamber of Comm
Outdoor Wilderness Leadership School	Ravalli County Planning	Salmon Valley Chamber of Comm
Pacific Const & Interiors Inc	Ravalli Republic	Salmon-Challis Natl Forest
Pacific Rivers Council	Rec Htg & Wilderness	Salmon-Cobalt Ranger District
Pacific Const & Interiors Inc	Recorder-Herald	Salomon Smith Barney
Pack & Paddle	Red River	Sanders County
Paddler Magazine	Red River Corrals	Sandy Livestock Co
Pail Stewart MD Inc	Red River Ranger District	Sawtooth Guide Service Inc
Passport Air Cargo	Redfish Lake Lodge	Sawtooth Flying Service Inc
Payette Forest Watch	Redmond IHC	Sawtooth Hotshots
Payette Natl Forest	Redside Guide Service	Sawtooth Natl Forest
Perkins Coie llp	Rendezvous Sports	Sawtooth NRA Stanley RS
Pet Animal Hospital	Resource Rec & Tourism	Sawtooth Valley Work Ctr

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Sawtooth Wildlife Council	State of Montana	Treasure Valley Trail Machine
Schaeffers Guide Service	State of New Hampshire	Tri C Ranch Whitewater Flt
School of Forestry	Steve & Mary Richards Flying Farmers	Troop 323
School of Mechanical Engineering	Stevensville Library	Twin Falls Orthopedic Assoc PA
SD Outfitters	Stevensville Star	U I Wilderness Research Ctr
Sea Kayak Adventures	Stockton Sales Inc	U OF MN B50 Nat Resource Bldg
Seafoam Mine	Stoltze-Conner Lumber Co	UCRB - EIST
Shep Ranch Landowners	Strategic Geo Info Systems	University of Idaho
Shepp Ranch ID Western Resort	Stream Net Library	University of Michigan
Shepp Ranch Landowners	Stub Creek Inc	University of Montana
Shoshone & Bannock Tribes	Student Conservationist Assoc	University of New Hampshire
Shoshone Natl Forest	Sudbury Dental Ctr	University of Oregon
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Council	Sulfur Cr Ranches Inc	University of Wisconsin
Sierra Club	Sun Gard Data Systems Inc	US Army Corps of Eng
Sierra Club NW Office	Sun Valley Geo Tech	US Corp of Army Engineers
Sierra Natl Forest	Sun Valley Rivers	US Dept of Commerce
Silver Clud Expeditions	SY-Enterprises	US Dept of Defense DAF Enviro Fit
Simplot Ranch	T J International	US Dept of Interior #6221
Siroth & Permutt	Targhee Natl Forest	US Dept of Labor
Slate Creek Ranger District	Tec Dev Digital Imaging Texas Instruments	US Dept of Transportation
Sleeping Child Planning Group	Texaco Corp	US District Court
Sleeping Deer Ranch	The 100 Club	US Enviro Protection Agency
Smith Beeks & Hodges	The Capital Group Co Inc	US Fish & Game Service
Smith Sport Optics Inc	The Dickinson Co	US Geological Survey Wrld
Snake Rvr Area Council BSA	The Ecology Center Inc	US House of Representatives
Snake Rvr Basin Office -USF&WL	The Flying -W-	US Senate
Soil Conservation Service	The Good Shepherd Wool Works	US Senator Kemthorne
Solitude River Trips Inc	The Horsley Co	USA Today Life Section
South Idaho Press	The Myers Associates PC	USDA-Enviro Policy Office
SP Aircraft Mtn Air	The Outpost	USDA-FS Misty FJords NM
Spokane Canoe & Kayak Club	The Shoshane-Bannock Tribes	USDA-FS Northern Region
Spokane Falls Community College	The Star News	USDA-FS Region 4
Spokane Valley Fire Dept	The Valley Voice	USDA-FS Region 6
Spokesmen Review	The Wilderness Society	USDA-FS Washington Office
Sportsman Naturalist Farmer	Thibodaux Womens Ctr	USDA-FS, Chiefs Office
Spotted Bear Ranger Dist	Thunder Mtn Outfitters	USDA-Natl Resource Consv Service
Stage House Vision Ctr	Tierra Linder Ranch	USDA-Soil Conservation Service
Stancils Toyota Inc	Tilton & Rosenbaum PLLP	USDI-Fish & Wildlife Service
Stanley Air Taxi	Timberlake Realty	USDI-Fish & Wildlife-Snake Rvr Basin
Stanley Community Library	Times-News	USDI-Office of Enviro Affairs
Stanley Potts Outfitters	Tour West Inc	USDI-Office of Enviro Policy/Comp
Stanley-Sawtooth C of C	Trails Clubs of Oregon	USDI-Office of the Secretary
Star News	Trails Council	USFS - MTDC
State Historic Preserv Office	Transiera Technology	UT Power & Light Co
State of Idaho	Transportation Systems	Utah Environmental Congress

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Valley County Commrs
Varnum Riddering Schmidt & Howlett
Verde Valley Whitewater Club
Verdee Valley Whitewater Club
Vermillion Community College
Village of Northbrook
Wags Wool Farm/Hrafn Wiiks
Wallowa-Whitman Natl Forest
Wally York & Son Inc
Walnut Hill Obstetrics & Gynecology Assoc
Wapiti Meadow Ranch
Wapiti Ranger District
Wardens Brundiges Benedicts
Warren Rvr Expeditions Inc
Wasatch-Cache Natl Forest
Washington Kayak Club
Washington Pilots Assoc
Washington State University
Ways West
West Fork Ranger District
West Valley Medical Ctr
Western Aircraft Main Inc
Western Forest Ind Assn
Western ID Llama Assn
Westpark Hotels
Whispering Media
White Cloud Outfitters
Whitewater Ranch Landowners
Wicks Furniture
Wightmans Farms Inc
Wilcox & Fetzer Ltd
Wild Allan Moutain
Wilderness Adventures
Wilderness Aviation
Wilderness Consultant
Wilderness Doc ID Wildlife
Wilderness First Aid Custom Tng Service
Wilderness Land Trust
Wilderness Outfitters
Wilderness Public Rights Fund
Wilderness Resource Ctr
Wilderness Studies
Wilderness Watch
Wilderness Watch Georgia
Wildlife & Lands Inst
Wildlife Damage Review
Wildlife Mgmt Inst
Williams Lake Lodge
Windward Eye Clinic
Wolf Recovery Fund
Womans Clinic
World Wide River Expeditions
Writing Editing Photography
WS Ranch
Yakima Oral Surgery Assn
Yankee Fork Ranger Dist
Yellow Pine Bar
Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuse
Z Air Inc

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Individuals Receiving the Deis or the SDEIS

Abastillas, Dave	Allen, Mr & Mrs Michael	Andrus, Lesley A
Abbott, Ted M & Mereta	Allis, Amy	Angel, B
Abell, Robin A	Allison, Keely	Angel, Bev
Abramson, C E	Allred, Kari & Darl	Angel, Tom
Abtomowitz, Jennifer	Alters, Steve	Angiocchi, Peter
Accoler, William	Aluequist, Jon	Angove, Sam W
Acee, Jim	Alward, Dave	Aniello, Pete
Achley, Ron & Madeline	Ambrose, Holly	Ankner-Mylon, Jennifer
Ackerman, Wayne C	Amidon, Karen	Anstine, Susan
Ackley, Gary D	Amon, Robert	Anthony, Linda
Ackley, Kathleen	Ancho, Mike	Antonio, Mike D
Adair, Jim	Andelin, Gorden	Appleford, Dale R
Adams, Bob & Vicki	Anderson, Allen T	Arensmeyer, Mike
Adams, Dean	Anderson, Carolyn B	Arenz Jr, Robert F
Adams, Doug	Anderson, Chuck & Lynn	Armacost, Bret
Adams, Joel Thomas-	Anderson, Darin	Armbruster, Mary Ann
Adams, Mike	Anderson, Don	Armstrong, Richard
Adams, Rollie	Anderson, Donna S	Arnebold, Henry
Adams, Todd	Anderson, E C	Arnold, Raleigh N
Adkins, Howard	Anderson, Hale	Arnold, Ray
Adkins, Ron	Anderson, J E	Armstrong, Marvin
Adkison, Carroll & Virginia	Anderson, James	Aronson, Ed
Adza, John	Anderson, Jerry	Arrington, Audrey
Aharj, Art	Anderson, John	Arsen, Dawn
Ahearn, Mike	Anderson, John E	Arseth, Colleen
Ahrens, William N	Anderson, Karen	Ash, Dave
Ainsworth, Al	Anderson, Lynn	Ash, Gordon
Aitken, Gary	Anderson, Marshall C	Ashley, Toby
Akerman, Philip C	Anderson, Michael	Ashmore, J L & Brends
Albers, Richsrd	Anderson, Monte	Ashton, Walt & Judy
Albright, Jerry	Anderson, Rick	Asmussen, Rodney
Alex,	Anderson, Steve	Atherton, Robert C
Alexander, Don	Anderson, Steven A	Atkin & Family, Thomas
Alexander, John	Anderson, Sue	Attemann, Rein & Paul
Alexander, Tim	Anderson, Tom	Audiss, Larry
Alexine, Mary	Anderson, Tom	Augustinos ESQ, Demetrie L
Alford, Jane	Anderson, Tom	Aulette, Dawn M
Alford, Larry	Anderson Sr, Edward C	Auriemma, Mary
Ali, Lynn N	Andolina, Tina	Austin, Briggs M & Alice H
Allan, D	Andrea, Jan	Austin, Gail B
Allen, Donald	Andreatta, David Lee	Avant, Bill
Allen, Ed	Andrews, Elton & Pat	Avery, G P
Allen, Liz	Andrews, J	Avolio, Dave
Allen, Michael R	Andrews, Jerry	Awes, Robert
	Andromidas, Jorge L	Awtrey, Daid C

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Axline, Keith	Banks, Katie Manns & George	Baxter, Patti
Babb, Jim	Banow, George & Rory	Beale, Milton
Babbitt, Freda	Barany, Bruce R	Beale, Rick
Babcock, Bill	Barash, Ace	Beauchaine, Steve
Babcock, John	Barber, Bill	Beboer, Judd
Babcock, Julie	Barbhart, George	Bechdel, Sally & Mike
Bachelor, Thomas W	Barbouletos, Tom	Bechdel, Wayne R
Bachman, Kirk	Barbresa, J	Beck, Aaron R & Gary R
Bachman, Lynne	Barden, Willis H	Becker, Andrew J
Backus, Sharon & Lynn	Barder, Ron & Linda	Becker, David G & Shelley
Bady, Amanda	Bare, Matt	Becker, Doug & Gloria
Baer, Cathy	Barfield, John B	Becker, Kurt G
Baer, Ron	Barger, Cliff	Becker, William R
Bagshaw, Bradley	Barker, John	Beckwith, Terry
Bahan, James	Barlett, Steve	Beebe, Bruce & Peg
Bahls, Peter	Barline, Sally	Beensing, Bryan
Baier, Ray	Barmore, Bev & Fred	Beitelspahr, Ron
Bailer, Travis	Barnett, Bryce	Beldon, Lisa
Bailey, Brain	Barnett, Jean	Bell, Bryan C
Bailey, Derek	Baroni, Kenneth	Bell, Fred
Bailey, Dr Lawrence	Barrets, E	Bell, Harvey
Bailey, Steve	Barrow, Nicole	Bell, Larry
Bailezurs, J Suazane	Barry, Steve D	Bell, Patti
Bair, Steve	Bartels, Ed	Bellamy, John
Baird, Dan W	Bartelt, James	Belles, Mark
Baird, Donald Lee	Bartholomew, David W	Bellman, Mickey
Baird, Jerry	Bartholomew, R C	Belnap, Rick
Baird, Reed	Bartholomew, Tim	Belo, Brad
Baker, Carl	Bartman, Larry & Sue	Beltz, Lisa C
Baker, Dick & Betty	Bartos, James T	Bencke, Errol D
Baker, Eddie	Bartos, Jim	Bender, Ann & Bob
Baker, J R	Basabe, Randy	Bender, Ted
Baker, Jim	Bascom, Jon	Benedict, Robert & Jean
Baker, Mike	Basham, Connie	Benejam, Gary
Baker, Robert	Bashista, Carol	Bennett, David
Baker, Robert S	Bateman, Gerard	Bennett, Dean
Baker MD, Martin K	Bates, Gil	Bennett, Glenn
Balderston, Ronald G	Bates, Spike & Ruth	Bennett, Paul V & Cindy E
Bales, John	Baucus, Honorable Max	Bennett, Tracy
Balkins, J	Baucus, Honorable Max	Bennett, Trevor N
Ballard, Elizabeth	Baugartner, Harvey	Bennett, Valeria
Ballard, Troy M	Baxter, Dave	Bennetts ESQ, James R
Balridge, Charles	Baxter, Garth	Benoit, Greg
Bammann, Walt	Baxter, Glenn	Benson, DR Richard & Debbie
Banister, John	Baxter, Jerry	Benson, R J

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Benson, Susan M	Birch, Kim	Boehmier, Carla
Bent, Julia	Birch, Mary	Boehmler, Dick
Benton, Bonnie L	Birch Pt,	Bogdan, Conter
Benton, Clayton J	Bird, Doyle	Boggess, Bill
Bentz, Brian	Birl, Al & Sean	Bohm, David R
Bentz, Rusty	Bishop, Bill	Boice, Peter
Berg, Douglas R	Bisom, Casey	Boine, Earl
Berger, Joan & Ken	Bissell, Angelo & Joyce	Boles, Jan & Anne Marie
Bergeron, Carolyn	Bissett, Bob	Bond, Andrew
Berglund, Peter	Bissett, Tom	Bond, Karen Smith & R Watts
Bergset, Ole	Bitton, Deb	Bonilla, Natiala
Berhardt, Marci	Bitton, Kathy	Bonino, Lee
Berigan, William J	Bjornson, Dr Donald & Carolyn	Bonn, Chris
Berkholder, Keeley & Joel	Black, John	Bonner, Bill
Berkland, Jeff	Blackadar, Bob	Bookbinder, David
Berkowitz, Henry & Linda	Blackburn, Dell	Booker, Bruce A
Bernardo, Jennifer R	Blackwood, Beth	Bookhart, Jim
Berneck, Dey	Blair, Charles L	Boone, TnyaA
Berry, James C	Blair, Theresa E	Boorman, Benjamin G
Berry, Rex	Blair DMD, Lon	Booth, Howard G
Berryman, C R	Blake, Clifton G	Booth, Stina
Bertelsen, C David	Blake, John	Boots, Jerry
Bertijcci, Cliff & Kimbra	Blakeley, Jed & Bitsy	Borgeson, Don R
Bertinet, William	Blakely, Blake	Borner, G & M
Bertram, Nick & Helen	Blanc, Dan	Borsberry, James & Joanne
Betschart, Randy L	Blauer, Wayne	Bose, Greg
Betz, Cindy	Blayden, John M	Bosley, Elizabeth C
Beuneel, Steve & Cheryl	Blechinger, Eric & Connie	Bosman, Corrie
Bevan-Gardiner, Lorie L	Blevin, William	Boston, Jackie
Bianulli, Barry	Blickenstaff, Dale	Bostrom, Doug
Bichford, Donald	Bliss, Edna G	Boswell, Joann
Bickel, Bettina	Bliss, R H K & M	Bosworth, Dr Ken W
Bielenberg,	Block, Eugene G	Botello, Anthony
Bier, Chellney H	Blodgett, Chris	Botello, Nina
Bier, Irvin J	Bloomfield, Greg	Bothwell, Charles
Biermann, Aaron	Bloomfield, Peter S	Bottoms, Mike
Bigelow, Gary	Blout, Robert	Botts, Donald E
Bigelow, Perry	Bloxham, Ron	Bottum, Ed
Biggs, Jo	Bloxham, Roy	Bourbon, Greg
Biggustaff, Shirleu G	Boag, Guy	Boure, Craig & Deb
Binford, Chris	Bobbitt, R F	Boussard, Liz
Bingaman, Dave	Bochonok, John	Bove, Cliff & Jean
Binzel, Chuck	Bockenstette, James & Kristin	Bower, Jim
Birbee, Marvin	Bodahl, Deb	Bowhay, Jerry L
Birch, James C	Bodner, Dave	Bowler, Bruce

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Bowlus, Robert & Carolyn	Britschgi, Dennis	Bruneel, Robert
Bowman, Bette	Brobeck, Dwain & Jean	Bryan, Patty & Mike
Bowman, Bud & Lynda	Brock, Dr Wesley & Barbara	Bryant, Bill & Kelly
Boyce, Steve	Brock, James T	Bryant, Bill & Miriam
Boyd, Chuck	Brock, Jim	Bryant, John J
Braay, Mike	Brock, L Jim	Bryant, Marvin
Brabner, Edith R	Brock, Tom	Bryant, T O
Bradberry, Bruce	Brockenbough, J Scott	Bryant, Tamera S
Bradbury, Clarence	Brodock, Richard	Bryer, Elizabeth
Bradley, Drs Brian & Rsalie	Brookman, Gerald	Bubala, Lou
Bradley, Jock	Brooks, Eric	Bubert, Mary Beth
Bradley, Linda	Brossman, Nancy	Buchanan, Buck
Bradshaw, Buce	Brower, Kirk & Marilyn	Buchanan, John I
Bradshaw PhD, Michael	Brower, Scott & Della	Buckheit, Bob
Bradt, Peter & Cheryl	Brown, Ann	Buckingham, Richard
Brady, Jim	Brown, Bill	Buckley, Gerald F
Brady, Joseph & Elizabeth	Brown, Carol	Budolfson, Jim
Brady, Rob	Brown, Catherine M	Buehring, Jessica
Branch, Tom	Brown, Deirdre M	Buetliner, Ed
Brand, Dr Stanton F & Jane	Brown, Ed	Buettgenbach, Howard H
Brandstrader, Harry R	Brown, Elizabeth	Bug, Sheila
Bransetter, K	Brown, Garrett	Buhl, Bob
Branvein, Allan	Brown, George	Buker, Neil
Brate, Jean	Brown, Leslie D	Bullock, Travis
Braun, Robert R	Brown, Lynn A	Bulshis, Bill
Brauner, Kalman	Brown, MaryAnn	Bunce, Mike F
Brausen, Tami	Brown, Mike	Bunch, Van
Bray, Bob	Brown, Mr & Mrs C	Bunge, Robert
Breech, Andrew L	Brown, Ralph	Bunker, Michael K
Breidinger, Brenda	Brown, Roger	Burak, Steve
Breiling, Mike	Brown, Sarah & Kathryn	Burchard, Robert P
Brennan, Joe	Brown, Web	Burgel, Bill
Brenneman, Fleet	Browning, Kent	Burger, Frank M
Breski, Brandt & Heidi	Browning Familt, The	Burghard, Paul
Bretes, Jim	Brownmiller, Richard & Patricia	Burica,
Brewer, Andrew	Brubaker, Dela	Burk, John & Sue
Brewer, Buck	Bruce, Gene	Burke, Dale
Brewer, Wayne	Bruce, James	Burkhart, David
Brewster, Millinton	Bruchak, Bill	Burnette, Deborah M
Bridgeford, Bruce	Brucher, Tom	Burnim, Joshua W
Briggs, Larry	Bruck, Tom	Burns, B
Briggs, Tom	Bruesch, Jane	Burns, Bob
Briggs & Family, Mr & Mrs Peter	Bruke, Richard J	Burns, Candace
Brindle, Jayne	Brumbaugh, Steve	Burns, David, Kay, Jean & Dan
Brinkman, Rita	Brundige, Lou & Laura	Burns, John

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Burns, Jon L	Callaway, Miller	Carty, Dennis
Burns, Larry	Callihan, Bob	Carvalho, Joe
Burns, Michael R	Cameron, John	Carver, Dan
Burns, Roy B	Camiller, Scott	Carver, Ruth
Burns, Stephen A	Campbell, Cate	Case, Rocky
Burns, Terry R	Campbell, Charles	Caseri, Gary
Burns, Troutner Cockey	Campbell, Jim	Casey, Bart
Burns, Truman L	Campbell, Judy J	Casey, Claire
Burns, Victor W	Campbell, Larry	Casey Jr, William V
Burnt, Bill	Campbell, Nancy Harris	Cass, M N
Burrup, Dean	Campbell, Tod & Angela	Cassell, Paul & Trish
Burt, Van C	Campbell & Family, Doug	Castle, Barbara & Allen
Burton, John	Campbell Family, The	Castle, Dick
Bush, Steve	Canfield, Kerry S	Caston, Homer
Bushong, Shirley	Canning, Stephen	Caswell, Joan
Buss, Jason A	Cannon, Bob	Caswell, Quentin & Maxine
Busse, Lou	Canoe, Al	Caterson, Denee S
Buster, Katey	Caples, James W	Caton, Sabe D
Butler, Donald	Capra, Stephen & Kellie	Caudill, Rodney V
Butler, Steve	Carden, Patricia L	Caughlin, Drew
Butler, Tom	Careny, Cal	Cawley, Becky
Butterfield, John F	Carl, Mike	Cecil, Kenneth S
Butz, Eric	Carlin, Steve A	Cecil, Pete
Buychefeil, Gene	Carling, Scooter	Cerilo, Cirila
Byington, Danny E	Carlson, Bernard	Cernac, Joe
Byker PhD, Harlan J	Carlson, Jack	Chace, Joel T
Bynum, David Z	Carlson, Paul	Chamberlain, Phil
Byrne, Michael N	Carlson MD, David J	Chambers, Pamela J
Byrne, William M	Carlton, Scott	Chambley, Jackie S
Caberson, Fred	Carmichael, Leland & Mary Margaret	Chamerda, Robert S
Cabre, Elise	Carolus, Kenneth H	Chapman, Anita E
Cady, James W	Carpenter, Kurt	Chapman, Don W
Cafaro, Philip	Carr, Donald B	Chapman, Tony
Caffrey, Michael E	Carr, Tina	Charles DMD, Brian W
Cahill, Richard S	Carren, Claire	Charnes, Ellen
Cahills,	Carrico, Ted	Charpenter, Paul
Caine, Matt	Carroll, Joann	Chase, Mah & Barb
Calbreath, John F	Carruthers, Chuck	Chase, Marjorie Stephen Eli
Caldwell, Bert	Carson, Melvin	Chasson, Will
Caldwell, Mitchelle	Carter, Craig	Cheney, Ernie
Caldwell, Will	Carter, Debbie A	Cheney, Shayne
Calentine, Bobbi	Carter, Noah	Cherry, Donna R
Calkins, Randy	Carter, Tim	Cherstain, Becky
Call, Dave S	Carter, Tom	Chesney, Charles
Callan, Art	Carthers, Don	Chesnik, Camie

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Chesnover, Bob & Bobbie	Cliffe, Bob	Collord, James
Chesnut, Wilson L & Judy K	Clifford, Tom	Collord, Jim & Leta
Chessin PhD, M	Clohesay, Thomas	Colsaratlo, Jerry
Chew, Eddie	Cloninger, Harold	Colson, Chris E
Childers, Dorothy & Bob	Close, Norm & Joyce	Colson, Dennis
Childers, Stephen	Clower, Don	Colton, Sterling D
Childs, Robert	Cludin, Cliff	Colwell, Geo
Childs, Scott	Clymer, Brian	Comard, Sharlene
Chinn, Mary	Cniemeie,	Comer, Dennis
Chorba, Dennis M	Coates, Edwin	Comerford, John
Chrisison, Jack & Sherry	Coates, Robert C	Conaly, Ken
Christensen, David	Cobbley, S R & Andrea	Conant, Kathy
Christensen, David E	Coble, Daphine	Conant, Nick
Christensen, Garn	Coby, James W	Cone, Dan
Christensen, Neil & Terri	Cocanougher, Bill	Cone, Frances M
Christensen, Rand	Cochran, W Scott	Congdon, Wally
Christofer,	Cockey, Israel	Conklin, Chester
Christophersen, Allen	Coddington, Lane	Conley, David & Jan
Christophersen, Jack	Coe, Clarence S	Conley, John
Chuljian DDS, David T	Coe, Ronald	Conley, Patrick J
Church, Bethine	Coffelt, Norman L	Conn, Jay & Joy
Churchwell, Stew & Mary Jo	Coffin, Aaron	Connell, Christine
Churchwell, Stew & Mary Jo	Coffman, Thomas J	Conniff, Richard
Cirifelt,	Cogan, Lindy	Conrad, Dee
Clancy, Pat	Cohen, Donald	Conrad, Jessica
Clark, Anne	Cohen, Jay	Conrad, Joe
Clark, Bill	Colavito, Dave	Conrad, Thomas R
Clark, Bob	Colbert, Dan	Conver, James A
Clark, Bob	Colbert, David	Conway, Dave
Clark, Colin	Colburn, Alan	Cook, Christine L
Clark, David	Colburn, Everett	Cook, David B
Clark, Ken	Cole, Andrew M	Cook, Gary
Clark, Ken	Cole, Carole	Cook, Kim, Jack & Norma
Clark, Malcom	Cole, Chip	Cook, Kirby
Clark, Perry L	Cole, Heidi Bigler	Cooke, Pete
Clark, Peter A	Cole, Patrice	Cooke, Ronald R
Clark, Richard	Cole, Pete	Cooley, Jack
Clark, Rick	Cole, Richard P	Coome, Weny
Clark Family, The	Cole, Robert	Cooper, Dale
Clarke, Doug	Cole, Steve & Kathy	Cooper, John H & Joan B
Clear, Steve	Collins, Bill	Cooper, Michael B
Clements, Matt	Collins, Ed	Cooper, Mike
Clementson, Willard	Collins, Jim	Cooper, Robert P
Clemmons, Joey	Collins, Paige R	Cooper, Thomas L
Cleverger, Garrett	Collins, Shan	Cooper, Troy

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Cope, Steve	Creason, Charlie	Daly, Jorgena
Corbin, Lowell D	Creek, Dennis	Damas, Paul & Justin
Cordova, Caroline	Creek, Michel	Dame, Ryan
Coren MD, Seth D	Cremin, Janet	Danals, S W E & M
Corgatelli, Randt	Criss, E M	Dancer, Jerry
Corkery, Janice	Crocker, Gene E	Daniels, Lee L
Corlett, G Joseph	Croft, Mike	Daniels, Tom & Julene
Corn, George	Croisant, John K	Danielson, Dean
Cornet, Douglas R	Cromwell, Robert	Danies, Judy
Cornitius, Bill & Elly	Cronin, James	Danner, Buddy
Cornwall, James	Crookham, George L	D'Antonia, Dave
Corr, Nancy	Crosby, Donald F	Daucher, David & Suzanne
Corrigan, Eddie	Crosby, Michael	Dave,
Corrigan, Kami	Cross, William	David, Laurie
Cory, Al	Crossett, Deborah R	David, Reddick
Cote, George J	Crowell, Karen L	Davidson, James L
Cotitta, Robert	Crownover, Gerald & Gail	Davidson, Jim
Couch, Dave	Crownover, Wayne	Davidson, Sam
Couper, Richard	Crumley, Steve	Davies, Dave
Cousins, Vera	Crump, Bob	Davies, Spence
Cowan, Sarah	Crump, Robert S	Davis, Bonnie B
Cox, Charles & Becky	Csedrick, Lewis	Davis, Bradley
Cox, Edwin	Cudmore, Berklee B	Davis, Brik
Cox, Gene L & Florence	Cullinane, Ray	Davis, Chad
Cox, John & Pamela	Culnane, Rich	Davis, Debby
Cox, Lafe & Emma	Cummings, Cliff	Davis, James R & Elaine T
Cox, Mary C	Cummings Jr, Clifford	Davis, Jan
Cox, Paul	Cunat, John C	Davis, Leslie
Cox, Rodney	Cunningham, Jerry & Diane	Davis, Lonnie
Cox, Sandra	Cunningham, John Julian	Davis, Lora & Larry
Cox, Susan	Currie, Cathleen	Davis, Marsha
Cox, Suzanne	Curry, Brent	Davis, Nancy & Dr John
Coyne, Ellen	Curt, Mack	Davis, Nigel L & Diana
Craig, Gail L	Curtis, Don	Davis, Rick
Craig, Keli	Curtis, James F	Davis, Russ
Craig, William C	Curtis, Mort	Davis, Shirley S
Cramer, David W	Curtis, Robert R	Davis, Stanley B
Cramer, John & Caudia	Curtis, Warren E	Davis, Stanley B
Crampton, Ed	Curtis, William J	Davlantes, Nancy A
Crane & Family, William J	Cushman, Bob	Dawdy, Ken V
Crapo, Honorable Michael	Cushman, Robert A & Susan H	Dawler, Paul
Crawford, Steve	Dailey, Dennis	Day, Ted
Crawlley, Linda	Dake, Chuck	Day ESQ, Laura A Rose
Creager, Louise	Dagleish, Duane	Day MD, K L
Creasman, Don	Dalton, Eric	Dayley, Pam

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Dayton, Peter	Diehl, Gary	Dubail, Gene
Dean, Bill, Teresa & Kayla	Diehl, Rebecca A	Dubiel, Rich
Debban, Craig	Dien, Lou Ann	Dubiel PhD, Richard
DeBlasio, David	DiGrazia, Dr Robert & Romary Kay	Dudley, Lisa
DeBord, Eric	Dillard, John & Connie	Dugan, James M
Decker, Dr Eric & Patrica	Dilley, Matthew	Dumas, Jeannette
Decker, Warren	Dimario, John	Dunbar, Dr H
Deckler, Jeffrey H	Dinwodie, Dick	Duncan, E M
DeCora, Shirley A	Dipama, Vince	Duncan, Phyllis
Dedie, Don & Sue	DiStefano, Diana L	Duncanson, Steve
Dee, William	Dixon, Sam P	Duneham, Michael
Deem, Jim	Dixon, Thomas F & Linda F	Dunham, Barb
Defenban, JAMES	Djerke, Dave	Dunham, Roger
DeFrance, William D	Dodd, Douglas W	Dunham, W C & M K
Degiulio, Rodney & Jan	Dodds, Earl F	Dunn, Bill
Deitch, Donald G	Dodson, Lynn	Dunn, Michael E
Delacy, Mike	Doherty, Dan & Sheila	Dunn, Robert & Stephani
Delana, Summer & Joyce	Dolan, James M	Durant, Betty
Delaney, Bob	Dolan, Terry	Durham, Donna
DeLaney, David	Domit, Jack & Peggy	Dustin, Anne
DeLazzer, David	Domko, Mel	Dwyer, Bob
DeLeeuw, Jennifer L	Donahue, Kieran	Dyer, Andy
DeMarco, Maria	Donart, Charles	Dyke, Charles M
Demerse, Mike & Lyn A	Donnelley, Stephen M	Eade, Gilbert G
Demirelli, Doug	Doolittle, James	Earll, George
DeMond, B C B & C	Dorman, David	Easom, Sparky & Maryellen
Denison, Mr & Mrs James L	Dorris, Pat	Easterday, Dave
Denman, Amy	Dorrton, Chip	Eastman, Aubrey L
Dent, David & Marilyn	Dorward, D M	Easton, Paul
DePeyster, F V	Doug,	Ebertz, Kirk
Depperschmidt, Jack	Douglas, Brent	Ebeson, Robert
DeReimer, Mary Hayes	Douglas, George	Economou, Constantina
Derhake, Sarah B	Dow, Barry W	Eddy, Carolyn
Deroche, Steve	Dowdle, Reid	Edgerton, George
DeRoot, R J	Dower, Tad	Edlund, Lizabeth
Dertling, Tony	Drabec, T	Edlund, Lizabeth
Derwood, Doreen	Drain, Vance	Edson, Marshall
Desserault, Scott	Drake, Bob	Edson, Scott A
Detwiler, David	Drake, Randy	Edwards, Daye
Deuter, Dayna	Dratwa, William	Edwards, Mike
Deveny, Bryan G	Drennon, Paul E	Edwards, Paul F
Devin, Eddy	Dreyer, Bertha	Egan, Kelly
Deyerberg, Robert P	Drinkwater, Matthew	Eheson, Robert
Dickey, Knowles	Druker, Phil	Eikren, Pamela J
Didier, Steve J	Drury, Omer	Einert, Martin

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Eisenberger, Maragaret	Erwin, Alan & Myra	Fehrs, Greg
Eisenhauer, Phil	Erwin, Tom	Felbreck, Kristina A
Ekblad, Sather	Escher, Thomas B	Felder, Richard E
Ekker, Gary	Espadas, Carlos A	Feldman, Harvey
Ekman, Jeff	Essley, Janet	Feldman, Murray
Elder, Frank S	Etten, Ashley	Felix ESQ, AlanR
Elder, Scott	Evans, Dale R	Feller, Bill
Eldridge, Gordon	Evans, Doug	Fellows, Carol
Eldridge, Jim	Evans, Jim	Fellows, Jeff
Elkins, R N	Evans, Jim & Linda	Fender, Fred
Elleman, Dustin	Evans, Keri	Fereday, Jeff
Ellen, Tom	Evans, Larry	Fereday, Rick
Eller, Gerald A	Evans, Larry L	Ferguson, Doug
Ellingwood, Brook	Evans, Robert G	Ferguson, James M
Elliott, Deborah A	Evans, Ron	Ferguson, Jan L
Elliott, Kathleen	Evans, Shirlee	Ferguson, Warren
Ellis, Jennifer N	Evans, Stephen	Feyk, John A
Ellison, Phillip G	Everett, Stewart	Fiedler, Margie
Ellsworth, Theadore	Everly, Juanita	Fiegel, Nancy
Elmquist, Augustus L	Evers, Gary	Fields, Ann
Elmquist, Bruce	Ewards, Mardell	Fieleke, Michael S
Elsassen, Cher Sanmire & Corkey	Ewing, Jack W	Finch, C Dean
Elsay, Alan-David	Eye, Kelly	Findley, George
Elton, Wallace M	Fabry, Michael	Finnieston, Karen L
Emch, David S	Fagan, Alex	Fischer, Dennis & Elva
Emery, John & Valeria	Fagan, Susan	Fischer, Virlis L
Engel, A E & Celeste G	Fagin, Kristin	Fishbein, William
English, Gregg H	Fahler, Mary	Fisher, Don
Engstli, Gayle	Fairaday, Rick	Fisher, Harold
Engstrom, Michael	Falk, Brian M	Fisher, Mike
Ennols,	Fall, Robert A	Fisher, Robert A
Enstad, Lisa	Fallon, Bob	Fitch, Ken
Entler, Dave	Farmer, Pauline L	Fitzgerald, Debi
Epanchin, Peter	Farnsworth, R	Fitzgerald, Gretchen
Ephram, Dave	Farrington, Carl	Fitzgerald, Pat
Epley, Ted	Farris, Alyssa	Fitzgibbon, Joe C
Eppelheimer, Mr & Mrs	Farris, Mike	Fitzgibbon, Mike
Epstein, Ruth S	Farris, Red W	Fitzharris, Kerry
Erb, Jay	Faste, Andrea	Fitzpatrick, Mel
Erickson, Kenneth J	Faulk, Joe	Fitzsimmons, Mike & Kathy
Erickson, Lillian	Faust, Tom	Fitzsimmons, Robert
Erickson, T	Fay, Mel	Flannery, Stacy N
Erickson, Todd	Feathers, Jesse	Fleagle, Bill
Erlandson, Steve	Fee, Max, Mary & Dustin	Fleagle, Scott
Ervin, Rex	Fehlhaber, Glen	Fleenor, Elen

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Flemmingell, VickieJ	Fredericks, Sally	Gagw, Leslie L
Fletcher, Kent & Kim	Fredrickson, Dennis	Gaillard, Elaine
Fletter, Matthew L	Freed, Jane	Gaines, Craig
Flinn, Brian L	Freedman, Joel E	Galbraith, Marlin
Flores, Lupito	Freeland, Christopher L	Gale, Steven
Florie Jr, Christopher P	Freeland, Cygina	Galiley, C Jerome
Floyd Mayor, Hilda	Freeman, Dan	Gallafent, Steve
Flynn, Loren	Fregien, Keith B	Gallardo, Kristina
Fodness, Karla	Frehm, Ron	Gallian PhD, John J
Fodrea, Don	Frei, Brad	Galloway, Jim
Foege, Jeff J	Frei, Chad	Gamble, Carol
Foeman, William W	Frei, Michael J	Gamblin, James E
Fogt, Natasha D	Freidenberg, George	Gandy JR, Charles L
Foley, Mike	Freidman, David	Gangemi, John
Foley, Rachel E	Freilich MD, Steven H	Gangemi, John T
Foley III, Frank D	Freitag, Kenneth	Gangler, George
Folsom, Michael	French, Kathi	Ganley, Tom
Fontenot, Christine	French, M W	Gantz, Glen
Fontenot, Donald W	Frendt, Marty	Garber, Andrew
Foote, Mercer	Fridley, Jeanne	Garbriel,
Ford, James	Fries, Christopher D	Gard, Brian R
Ford, Pat	Frisbie, Robert	Gardner, Adam White & Tom
Ford, Tyler	Frisch, Kerry	Gardner, Dale R
Ford-Scholz, Kitti	Frish, Kristen	Gardner, Shelley L
Forrest, Karyn	Fritz, Frank	Garechana, Ben
Forrester, Bret	Fritz, Paul	Garediner III, Woodwar C
Fortun, Anne	Frost, Catherine G	Garman, Stephen & Barbara
Foryrig, Louie	Frost, Lew	Garn, Steve
Foss, Ed	Fry, Dan	Garn, Val
Foster, Carol	Fry, Lindsey	Garner, Jack
Foster, Michael J	Frye, James	Garnett, Jack
Foster, Thomas N	Frye, Ron & Jill	Garrette, Ronald W & Julia A
Fourney, Conrad	Fuellenbach, Marge	Garris, Bill
Fournier ESQ, Paul	Fuhrman, Roger J	Gartland, Chris J
Fowle, Mike	Fujinoto, Kathy	Garza, Ray
Fowler, Beverly A	Fuller, Margaret	Gasnier, Mark
Foy, John	Fuller, Rich & D	Gasparotti, Roy
Frangis, Thomas	Fundenburg, Jim	Gass, Toby
Frank, Steve & Lori	Funke, Jerry	Gates, Robert
Franklin, Glenn	Furey, Kevin T	Gauzzi, George
Franks, Gregg	Furlong, Roger	Gazere, Alan
Frantz, Jeff	Fusaro, John	Gazzaniga, Rebecca
Franz, Robert G.	Fyffe, Bill	Gebhards, John
Frauenholz, Lowell	Gadler, Timothy Lee	Geerlings, John D
Frazee, Chris	Gadwa, Gary	Geertson, Ronald

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Gehrman, Mike	Gill, Kent	Graham, Derrel
Geibel, Ralph	Gillen, Paul E	Graham, Dr & Mrs John L
Geis, Dean W	Gillettee, Amy	Graham, Elaina
Geis, Harvey	Gilliam, Tony	Graham, John & Shauna
Gellert, Jeff	Gillick, Thomas L	Grant, Gordon
Gelles, Ronald	Giltz, Alaina J	Grant, Larry
George, Daniel	Gingrich, Ron	Grant, Pamela
George, Judy & Theron	Gitmann, Frank T	Grant, Sandy & Larry
George, Larry A & D Fay	Glaccum, Ellen & Tom	Gratton, Dennis
George, Mary	Gladwin, Tim	Gratton, S
George, Mike & Gail	Glass, Lloyd & Linda	Gray, John
Gerback, Marion Shirley	Glatte, Hayden	Gray, Mike & Sharon
Gerber, Guy E	Glayne, Gary	Gray, Monte
Gerber, Lee	Gleason, Melinda	Gray, Reza
Gerber, Richard	Glende, Nancy H	Gray, Robert & Cheryl
Gerencer, Christy	Glittenberg, Donald	Green, Bob
Gerl, Andrew J	Glodowski, Mike & Margaret	Green, Dan & Melissa
Gerlach, Diane	Glos, M	Green, Joel A
Gerlach, Steve	Gnojewski, Joe	Green, Michael
Gerrard, Doyle	Godkind, R A	Green, Steve
Gerry, Steve	Goeser, Christine	Green, Win
Gestrin, Terry	Goetz, Patrick J	Greenberg, Julie R
Getty, Carol & Allen	Goetz III, John	Greenberg, Susan B
Ghielmetti, Jim	Golden, Kathy	Greene, Doug
Giampaoli, BRAD	Goldenberg MD, Arthur F	Greenway, Allen
Giampaoli, ROLAND	Goldman, Elise R	Greer, Michael
Gibbons, Helen & Aidun	Goldring, Judith	Gregerson, Susan
Gibbs, Brad	Gollberg, Greg	Gregg, Robert
Gibler, Ned	Golsby, Jeff & Larry	Gregory, Alan C
Giblin, Billy	Gonzalez, Lisa M	Grench, Herb
Gibson, Dirk & Joann	Goodman, Gary	Grene, Dave
Gibson, Jackie & Mike	Goodnight, Ed & Jr	Gribble, Rich
Gicela, Raymond E	Goodnight, Ernie	Grice, Eleanor E
Giese, Mark M	Goodwin Jr, Reginal S	Griebenow, Merle
Giffith, C Doug	Gootkind, Steve	Gries, Susan
Giffith, Carol	Gordon, Rebecca	Griffin, Dr C B
Giffith, John & Jini	Goslin, Ben	Griffin, Bob
Giffith, Jolene D	Goslin, Bill	Griggs, K G
Gifford, Jerry L	Goth, Larry	Grim, Bob
Gigliotti, James B	Goth, Larry	Grimes, Nicholas
Gilbert, Tracy T	Goudreh, G	Groen, Cal
Giles, David	Gower, William H	Groff, Darin
Giles, Frank	Grace, Raymond M	Groff, David & Fay
Giles, Lamar	Graefe, Kent	Groll, Clint
Giles Jr, James B	Gragg, Richard & Mary	Groll, Michael

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Grooms, Jenny	Hadley, Doug	Hanowell, Steve
Gross, Gary	Haga, Lindsay	Hanselman, Galen
Gross, Pete	Hagel, Bob	Hansen, Beverly A
Grosscru,	Hagen, Jerry G	Hansen, Bill
Grove, John & Darlene	Hager, Bill	Hansen, Carol A
Groves, Orville	Hagle, Ted	Hansen, Gaardon
Grubbs, Sharon	Hahr, Meg	Hansen, Lynn R
Gruber, Dn	Haigh, Newt	Hansen, Mark
Gruber, J Brent	Hainline, Anne	Hansen, Roger
Grukaher, Lela I	Hairston, Andy	Hansen, Ron
Gudas, Meg A	Haitum, Jeff	Hansen, Sterling
Gudmendsen, Bob	Halbasch, Joann	Hansen, Terry R
Gudmundson, Lindad	Hale, Bruce E	Hanson, Derek
Guenther, Nancy	Haley, Bill	Hanson, Megan
Guillot, Doug	Haley, Lonnie & Sonya	Hanson, Sandra
Guisto, Missy	Hall, Adrienne	Hanson, Sibyl
Guitteau, Owen & Laurie	Hall, John C	Hanson, Thomas J
Gunckel, Marcy Wood & Kristin	Hall, Kevin	Hanson, Will
Gunderson, Mary J	Hall, Laurel	Harbin, Chris
Gunstone, Leroy	Hall, Martha	Harbine, Patrick
Gurney, Scott	Hall, Mildred L	Hardie, Daniel B & Mary Agnes
Gustafson, Bill	Hall, Robert	Harding, Brent G
Gustafson, Don	Hall, William B	Harding, George S
Gustafson, Don	Halligan, Otis	Hardison, Casey William
Gutch, Dwain	Halstead, Ottilie	Hardman, Allen & Jeanne
Guth, Marty	Halverson, Ron	Hardwick, David & Lynda
Gutkind, Richard D	Halvorsen, Robert	Hardy, Garney
Gutmann, Frank T	Ham, Anna S	Hardy, Rick
Gutteridge, R W	Ham, Catherine B	Hargett, Overton
Guy, P	Hamill, Lou	Harless, Sheila Wagner
Guyaz, William F	Hamilton, Alan R	Harman, Douglas E
Guys MD, Daniel K	Hamilton, Andy J	Harman, W Max
Guyton, Ed	Hamilton, Anne M	Harmon, Robert
Gwasy, Luverne	Hamilton, Brad	Harmon, Ron
Haagensen, Lynne	Hamilton, Geoff	Harndan, Garry
Haak, Amy	Hamilton, Gordon	Harnden, Thomas N
Haarvet, Jennifer	Hamilton, Michaela "Sugar"	Harper, Butch
Haas, Don & Mary	Hamilton, Scott	Harper, Harold
Haase, Warren G	Hamilton, Tad	Harper, Henry
Habec, Dr James	Hammond, Dan	Harrington, John
Habeck, Linda	Hammond, Judy	Harris, Carl
Habel, Don	Hammers, Rocky	Harris, Dr John
Habgood, Christopher M	Hancock, Rulen B	Harris, Edward
Habo, Don	Handler, Eric A	Harris, Holly & Shane
Hade, Kathleen	Haney, Robert	Harris, John W

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Harris, Michael B
Harris, Randy
Harris, Steve
Harris, Steve
Harrison, David F
Harrison, Howard E
Harrison, Joanne Z
Harsharger, Brent
Harshman, Jeff
Hart, Cheryl
Hart, Emily
Hart, Mary
Hart, Milea
Hartman, Bill
Hartman, Candice J
Hartman, Michelle & Chewy
Harty, Jack
Hartz, Bernice
Harvey, Margeret Jean
Harwell, Ben & Julia
Hash, Robert & Gerline
Hatcher, Jrrfrey A
Hatham,
Hatlestad, Robert L
Hatley, George
Hattan, John & Debbie
Hatz, Ken
Hauff, Dick & Pat
Hauserman, Hilary
Hausrath, Alan
Havemann, Grant
Havens, Eileen
Havis, Steve & Terrie
Hawkins, James N
Hawkinson, Colby
Hawley, Clyde
Hawley, Daniel
Hawley, Denny
Hawn, Pat
Haydon, Steve & Merry
Haye, Stan
Hayes, Dan
Hayes, Mike
Hayes, William & Majorie
Haynes, Tom & Karen

Haynie, Michael G
Hays, Robert & Rebecca
Hays, Suzanne
Haysmith, Leslie
Hazelbaker, Nick
Head, David
Headlee, Paul
Heady, William
Healy, Brian & Joy
Healy, Thomas F
Hearst, Priscilla
Heart, William W
Hebert, Jennifer
Hed, Scott J
Hedditch, David R
Hedman, Wayne A
Heffington, Lloyd
Heidt, Barry
Heikkila, Del
Heikkola, Gene
Heimer, John
Heinitz, Neil
Heiss, Bill
Helfrich, Aaron
Heller, Elinor
Heller, Theo M
Helleskov, Dave
Hellhake, Joe
Helmbecker, Ray
Helmbrecht, Mark
Helmer, Bob
Hembree, Ryan J
Henderson, Alan
Henderson, Bud
Henderson, Steve A
Hendricks, Bruce
Hendricks, Deloy
Hendricks, Mamella
Henkel, Dick
Hennich, Alvin
Hennig, Jeff S
Henry, Bob
Henry, Cassis L
Henry Jr, Orville J
Hensley, Brian

Heohn, D
Hepebes, Julie
Herbert, Jack
Herbold, Creed
Herbst, George W
Hering, Gene
Hermann MD, Randall
Herold, Robin & Dan
Herrin, Mike
Herring, Joseph
Hersel, Angie
Herskovitz, Stephen
Herzog, Ed M
Herzog, Michael S
Herzog, Steve
Hess, Randy
Hess, Robert E
Hesselbarth, Forrest
Hesselbarth, Woody
Hester, J Ross
Hett, Carie
Heverly, Jonathan
Hewitt, Al
Hiatt, Mark
Hibbard, Delbert
Hibbs, Ken
Hickey, Chad
Hicklin MD, Greg A
Hicks, John & Marjoria
Higgins, Joseph F
Higgins, Lorie
Higgins,
Hihnala, Larry
Hill, Carol J
Hill, David L
Hill, Frank
Hill, Kathy
Hill, Otto
Hill, Robert A
Hill, Rod
Hilliard, Wade
Hillman, John W
Hills, Tracy
Hime, Vernon & Roxie
Himes, Greg & Denise

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Hine, John	Holubetz, Terry	Hubner, Ann
Hines, James	Homan, Paul B	Hudelson, Eric Lee
Hinman, Bob	Hommond, Frank R	Huebner, Pete
Hinson, Joe	Honsinger, Bob	Hueftle, Keene
Hise, Ron	Honstead, Kirk & Loren	Huffard, Denny
Hixon, Amy	Hood, James	Huffard, Rick
Hllberg, Fritz	Hood MD, Roger W	Huffman MD, P J
Hobday,	Hook, Tony & Cindy	Hughes, Gary
Hock, June	Hooper, Donald H	Hughes, Noah
Hodel, Larry	Hooper, Ken	Hughes, Stuart
Hodges, Sheila	Hoops, Joshua Staci	Huijser, Marcel
Hoff, Ron & Karen	Hoover, Amy	Hull, C
Hoffman, Chris	Hoover, Jonathan & Susan	Huls, Dave
Hoffman, Jeff	Hope, Carol	Hult, Audrey
Hoffman, Todd	Hope, R Kiffin	Humberger, Jerry
Hoffmann, Richard	Hopkins, Thayer & Geer	Humphrus, John & Nicki
Hogaboam, Merril & Velda	Horejsi, Bryan	Humphry, Chad M
Hogan, Mary	Hornbeck, Twila	Huneke, Richard & Kathleen D
Hogan, Ted	Hornstein PhD, Jacqueline	Hunnan, Bary
Hogel, Jakob	Horowitz ESQ, Tina A	Hunt, Hal
Hoglund, John	Horrax, David	Hunt, S D
Hokins, Michael	Horton, Michael & Teresa	Hunter, Alan
Holbrook ESQ, Douglas R	Hoshley, Cindy & Jody	Hunter, Jeanne
Holcomb, Jeff	Hoskins, Barry L	Hunter, L C
Holcomb, Mark	Houghton, David C	Hunter, Ray
Holladay, Dee	Hourihan, Cornelius	Hunter, Ray D
Holland, Don	House, Samuel R	Hunter, Ray S
Holland, Karyn Helfrich	Hovde, Mark	Hunter, Roy
Holliday, Jeff	Howard, Brian M	Hunter, Ryan
Hollifield, Joe	Howard, Lynna	Huntington, Charles W
Hollingsworth, Nate	Howard, Pat & Sam	Hurless, Dana
Hollingsworth, Wiley	Howard, Ron	Hurst, Pete
Hollor, Donna	Howard MD, Thomas K	Huston, Guy
Holloway, Dustin	Howe, Joshua J	Hutchenson, Margaret
Holloway, Graham	Howe, Kevin	Hutchins, John & Taryn
Holloway MD FACS, James B	Howe, Steve	Hutchinson, George & Molly
Holman, George H	Howell, Bob	Hutson, Lonnie
Holmes, Donna	Hower, Jonne	Hutton, Terry
Holmes, Jim & Betty	Howerton, Jim	Hyde MD, Thomas P
Holmes, Lester	Hoychkiss, Michael M	Hyde SR, Wayne E
Holmquist, Jeff	Hoyt, Melanie	Hylkema, Steve
Holsinger, David	Hsu, Fiammetta	Iacono, Bob
Holt, John R	Hubb, Dave	Ingram, Gary
Holtan, P & W R	Huber, Patrick	Ingram, Janice L
Holton, Wedell	Hubler, Terry M	Inskeep, Oliver

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Inskeep, Roy Y	Jeffries, Steve	Johnson, Orla
Irion, Ray	Jening-Mills, Katleen A	Johnson, Robert B
Irish, Laura B	Jenkins, Eric V	Johnson, Ron & Christy
Irlbreck, Thomas H	Jenkins, Michael	Johnson, Samuel B
Isaacs, Christine	Jenkins, Susan	Johnson, Sandra
Isakson, Vick	Jennings, Gerry & Chuck	Johnson, Vinson
Isbister, Daniel B	Jennings, Linda A	Johnson, Virgil
Isern, Douglas J	Jennings, Richard	Johnson, Wayne & Dolly
Isham, Larry	Jennings,	Johnston, Fred
Ivanoff, Vince	Jensen, Gene S	Johnston, Stephanie
Iverson, Hubert & Estella	Jensen, Jim	Johnston, Stevie
Ives, Dallas & Karen	Jensen, Keith R	Johnston, Vicki
Jaber, David	Jensen, Lyle	Johnstone, Bruce
Jacklin, Don	Jenson, Gale	Joiner, Howard
Jackson, Allison	Jenson, Sandra	Joly, Kyle
Jackson, Don	Jeppsen, Brian K	Jonas, Erik
Jackson, E, M, & L	Jessen, Gene Nora	Jondahl, Terry
Jackson, H Reid	Jessup DO, Sarah A	Jones, Arthur C
Jackson, Kein J	Jevorns, Larry	Jones, Bill
Jackson, Ken & Anne	Jewesson, Kenneth & Frances	Jones, Bill
Jackson, Laura	Jipp, D L	Jones, Cedron
Jacobs, Dennis L	Joaw, Haley K	Jones, Chris
Jacobs, Lane	Jochem, Dan & Nancy	Jones, Chuck D
Jacobs, Mike	Jochum, Reed & Linda	Jones, David
Jacobsen, Brook	Jocums, George	Jones, Greg
Jacobsen, Julie	Joet,	Jones, Hobart B
Jacobsen, Neal	Johanel, David	Jones, Jenn
Jacobsen, Norman	Johnson, Chuck & Sally	Jones, Larry M
Jacobsen, Robert	Johnson, Curt	Jones, Luther
Jakusz, Kent	Johnson, Dale R	Jones, Mike & Pat
James, Richard	Johnson, Dick	Jones, Nancy
Jameson, Howard	Johnson, Floyd W	Jones, Paul D
Janes, Michael S	Johnson, Greg M	Jones, R Douglas
Janoush, Brad	Johnson, J	Jones, Randy
Jansak, Eugene	Johnson, Jim	Jones, Reg
Jarecki, Charles M	Johnson, Jim	Jones, Steve H
Jarsky, Seth	Johnson, Jo	Jones, Tad
Jarvis, Michael	Johnson, Lainie	Jones, Todd
Jaskowski, Duane B	Johnson, Larry	Jones, Tom
Jayne, Jerry	Johnson, Leon	Jones, William E
Jayo, Douglas	Johnson, Lisa	Jordan, Cheryl Leman
Jefferies, Aileen	Johnson, Mark	Jordan, Joe & Cindy
Jeffery, Don	Johnson, Melford H	Jorgensen, Lon
Jeffries, Bert	Johnson, Myai J	Jorgensen, Wade
Jeffries, David & Kimm	Johnson, Norm	Joslin, Ann

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Joslin, Bob	Kelley, Tammy L	Kinnear, G M
Joslin, Casey H	Kelley, Tonya	Kinney, Don
Joslyn, Chris	Kelley, Vince	Kinney, Don L
Jost, Bob	Kelly, Jean L	Kinzfogel, Brian & Kathy Park-
Jost, John	Kelner, John	Kipfer, Dr Robert & Barbara
Joste, Tom	Kelsey, Kim	Kirby, Cock
Judge, George	Kelso, Minor	Kirker, Donald J
Juel, Grant	Kemble, Wayne & Lynn	Kirklands, Cecelia
Julian, Brian	Kemmerer, Kurt C	Kitson, Paige L
Junga, Frank A	Kennedy, Adam	Kitzman, Allan A
Justice, Gary & Marilyn	Kennedy, Kathleen	Kiver, Eugene P
Kaae, Keb	Kennedy MD, T Eugene	Klein, Patrick
Kahn, Reisa	Kennell, Kristen	Klein, Randal B
Kaid, Vicky Osborn	Kent, Jon S	Kleinkopf, Karl
Kain, Richard	Kerl ESQ, Ron	Klima, Don L
Kaiser, Kevin	Kern, Jeff	Kline, April
Kaley, Readt	Kerr, Jim	Kline, Elissa
Kaminsky, Lori	Kerr, Ron	Klingbeil, Carol J
Kamm, Jennifer	Keys, John	Klinger, Lisa
Kangas, John A	Kibler MD, Robert F	Klinger, Wayne
Kappas, Jack	Kido, Clarice	Klippert, Vern E
Karban, Rick	Kiebert, K A & B W	Kloepfer, John
Karsten, Nancy	Kiebert, Mason R V	Kloss,
Kauange, David	Kieckbusch, Mark E	Kluss, Pete
Kauffman, Charles	Kiely, Ann Mayo	knddog,
Kauffman, Chris	Kiely, Mike	Knight, Warren
Kauffman,	Kieran, Karen	Knittle, Keith A
Kaul, Doug	Kieser, Jerry A	Knoch, Carl R
Kavanaugh MD, James P	Kilborn, Fred	Knoshaug, Eric
Kawakam, Kent & Arlee	Kilker, John S	Knudisen, Stephen B
Kaye, Roger	Killen, Bill	Knudson, Ruthann
Kearsley, Karen	Kilmer, Tom R	Koch, Leslie G
Keating, Earl & Sue	Kimball, Earl C	Koebge, Norman
Keehn, Dell E	Kimbirck,	Koehler, J
Keene, John	Kime, Teri	Koehler, Matthew
Keesling, Cliff	Kincaid, Jim	Koepke, John H
Keifer, J C	Kindel, Karen	Koepnick, Bill & Judy
Keim, Christina	King, Al & Linda	Koeppen, Michael Lynn & Owen
Keim, Susan A	King, Dieter D	Koester, Ardis & Jerrold
Keiser, Jud	King, Doug	Koester, Don
Keith, Scott	King, Gregory D	Kofoed, Alan
Keithleys,	King, John J	Kohrman, Elaine
Kellam, Janet	King, Neil	Koler, Monica I
Keller, Amy	King II, Wayne	Kolwaite, Ana C
Keller, Matthew P	Kingsmore, Grant & Michelle	Kopcho, Richard & Darcy

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Kopper, Mike	Lague, Rich	Lawrenz, Donald R & Susan R
Kopschke, Keith	Laiplay, Audrey	Lawson, Vickie J
Korte, Chris	Laird, Andrew	Layser, Earle F
Kosola, Bernie & Ruby L	Lakes, Greg	Lazar, Lyn E
Kossler, Mike	Lakey, Jacob	Lazimy, Udi
Kother, Charles	Lamarque, Dave	Le, Richard
Koury, Al	Lamke, Richard W	Leaterman, Phil
Kraft, Sy	Lampard, Gordon	Leavell, Bill
Krall, David J	Lampard, Hilary	Leclair, Niki
Kramer, Ronald	Landis, Rob	LeClair, Niki
Kramer, Scott A	Landon, Mike	Ledlow, Andrew
Krase, Robert	Lane, Linda	Lee, Allan
Kreck, Dr Loren L	Lane, Rick	Lee, Brady
Kresan, Tom	Lange, Burgess	Lee, Brent
Kress, Charlotte Easter	Lange, Burgess & Maxine	Lee, Gerry Lynn
Kress, Victor	Lange, Detlev & Ann	Lee, Jeff & Doreen
Kroft, Joan	Lange, Don & Kierstin	Lefler, Susan K
Kroiss, Hennessey &	Lange, Nancy	Lefleur, Bob
Kronberger, Lance	Langford, Trey	LeFrancois, Gerry
Kropf, Jess	Lani, Andrea E	Legel, Pat
Krransu, Dale	Lanza, Mike	Legg, Ann
Krueger, Carol & Dave	Lanzon, Mr & Mrs Robert	Lehan, Caleb
Krueger, Janice	Larcom Jr, Gordon D	Lehrman, John
Kruse, Natalie	Large, Pat	Lehto, Wayne
Kubits, Elliott	Larkins,	Leid, Greg
Kucera, Frank & Jackie	Lamer, Joel	Leifer, Tim
Kuczek, Thomas	Larocco, Larry	Leinberger, Monty J
Kuehn, Rich	Larsen, Arlo	Leirhan, Dena
Kuhlman, Roger A	Larsen, Nils E	Leith, Michael
Kujawa, Nick	Larson, Dave	Leman, Cal
Kulesza, Mike	Larson, Kurt	Lemke, Brea R
Kulik, Paul	Lashlee, Carolyn	Lemmelin, Leo
Kunesh, Lynne	Lauber, Alexander R	Lemmon, Ron
Kunkel, Mike	Lauck, Paul	Lempke, Chis Dean
Kutner, Jeff	Laverty, Lyle	Lengerich, Madonna
La Brie, Rex N	Lavin, Jack	Lent, John
La Ferriere, Ruth	Lavine, Bob	Lentz, David C
La Gra, Tom	Law, George T	Leo, Greg
La Mont, Susan	Law, Richard R	Leonard, Austin & Sam
La Rue, Lawrence	Law, Verl	Leonard, Mike
Lacey, Carey, Celestine & Duncan	Lawrence, Allison & Michael	Leonard, Patrick
Lafferty, Jim	Lawrence, Dan	Leonard, Sam
Lafferty, Jim	Lawrence, M O	Leonard, Steve
Lagergren, Eric	Lawrence, Marc	Leonhard, Galen
Lagergren, Ken & Ginna	Lawrence, Rhett	Leppo, Jeffrey E

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

LeQuire-Schott, Toni
Leslie, Rod
Leslie, Tom & Sue
Levaux, Monti
Leveille, Dr Jacque & Nicole T
Levine, Ed
Levine, Roger
Levy, Scott
Lewinski, John & Lynn
Lewis, Laurie
Lewis, Rich
Lewis PhD, Mary S
Liberty, Janet L
Liebowitz, Peter B
Lien, David A
Lien, Michael
Light, Buster & Margie
Lihou, Leslie
Lile, Dennis
Lillback, Kenneth C
Lillis, Arthur J
Lincoln, Bruce & Sue
Lincoln, Carl
Lind, Kent
Lind, Scott
Lindsey Jr, James M
Line, Leo
Link, Map
Linke, David
Linsay, Allan & Barbara
Lipe, Bill
Lipman, Bernard M
Litflower,
Little, Jed
Little, Jim
Little, Luther
Littman, Peter
Litton, Donald C
Livingston, Shawn
Lloyd, Brent
Lloyd, L W & John
Locatelli, Mario & Doris
Loebing, Mark & Holly
Loftus, Bill
Logue, David E
Loing, Helen K
Long, John R
Long, Mark D
Longinitti, Cheryl
Loomis, Gary & Rea Ann
Looze, John
Lord, Bradford
Loro, Anthony
Loshbaugh, Bob
Loucks, Bob
Loucks, Leslie
Loupy, Cathy
Lovejoy, Nancy S
Lowder, Virgil F
Lowe, David
Lowery, D E
Lowery, Ding
Lowry, Josh
Lowry, Kathy
Lucas, Lawrence T
Lucchetti, Pete
Luedecke, Alison J
Lufkin, Elise
Lugert, Mike
Luke, Bill
Luker, Jason
Luna, Basil
Lundberg, Dean
Lunde, Eric
Lunn, Judd K
Lunte, James W
Lupher, Jody & Mark
Lutz, Matthew
Luzarraga, Javier
Lwmbert, Randle
Lyden, Scott A
Lyman, Joe
Lyman,
Lynch, Rick
Lynes, Barbara
Lyon MA MFCT, Marilyn
Lyons, Larry
Lyons, Leo
Lyons, Michael
Lyons, Michelle
Lytle, Rex
Lytle, Stacy
Mabbutt, Joseph
Macartney, Bill N
MacButch, Lynda & Scott
MacDonald, Terry
Mace, J A
Machen, Gary W
Machin, James L
Mack, Curt
Maclaggan, Andrew L
MacLean, Colin D
Maclean, Priscilla & Don
MacLean, Scott D
Macleod, Barbara
Macmenamin, Dennis
Macomber, Grant
Maddock, Laura
Mader, Cindi
Madsen, Rebecca
Madson, Gary
Maehr, Carol B
Magee, Jack
Magnuson, Dwight R
Magnuson, W G
Mahan, Brent L
Mahan, David
Maher, Barbara
Maichle, Robert W
Maier Jr, Albert F
Main, Leonard
Majerowicz, Dr Eugene I
Major, Lisa S
Majors, Dave
Malagisi, Ken
Malides, Paul
Malkerson, Joel W
Malley, Christopher V
Malloney, Judy
Mallus, Bob
Malmberg, Craig
Maloney, John
Maloney, Ken
Mandanas, Jeannette
Mandel, Mary E

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Mangan, Barbara J	Masak, Regina & Dwight	Mc Cannon, Tricia
Mangiamele, Matthew	Mashburn, Larry	Mc Carthy, Kevin
Mangini, Tony	Maslen, Holbrook	Mc Cartney, Ward B
Mann, Bryce E	Masoner, Elwood	Mc Carty, Todd
Mann, John	Masoner, Ken & Sue	Mc Claaran, Don
Mannchen, Brandt	Massengale, Glen & Donna	Mc Clelland, Harriet N
Manning, Christina	Massong, Tamara	Mc Clinstock, Dave
Manning, Dennis	Masters, Bob & Mary Ann	Mc Cloud, Barbara
Manning, Henry W	Matarazzo, Sharon A	Mc Clure, Mick
Mansell, Dennis & Cathy	Mathers, Bob	Mc Connell, Steven
Manser, Tim	Mathews, Mary C	Mc Cormick, Robert K
Maquire, David	Mathews, Terri	Mc Cornell, Gary
Marangelo, Glenn	Mathieu, Julie & Joseph	Mc Coy, Johnny R
Marek, Pat & Shari	Mathis, Jim & Jackie	Mc Coy, Ron
Marek, Todd	Matson, Gary	Mc Cube, Chad
Margolis, Gary E	Matthews, Dr Jonathan	Mc Cue, Jay
Markewych, B	Matthews, K R	Mc Cullah, Dennis
Markmann, Laura Suraye	Matthews, Richard J	Mc Curdy, Jerry & Robin
Markoe, Thurbie	Matthews, Robert	Mc Dade MD, William C
Marks, Harvey	Mauk, Bill	Mc Daniel, Keith A
Marks, Kathryn J	Maul, Susan & Richard	Mc Daniel, Richard
Marks MD, Richard L	Maxwell, Gertrude	Mc Devitt, Jim
Marlatt, Boyd VI & Kellie	Maxwell, Keely	Mc Donald, Fred
Maroney, Barbara A	Maxwell, Marvin L	Mc Donald, John B
Marple, Ho	May, Ed	Mc Donald, Kera
Marquardt, Candace	May, Michele	Mc Donald, Mike
Marrow, Donald F	Mayeda, Nanette	Mc Donnell, Jay
Marrow, Joanne	Mayeda, Nanette H	Mc Donough,
Mars, Doug & Nellie	Mayer, Frank	Mc Dorman, Wes
Marsden, Ken	Mayer, Oliver	Mc Dougal, Issac
Marsh, Allan F	Mayes, Eileen	Mc Dougal, Suzanne
Marshall, Crystil S	Mayfield, Scott A	Mc Dowell, Michael
Martens, Ashley	Mayfield & Family, Scottie & Lisa	Mc Elwain, Frank
Martens, Dean	Mays, Bob	Mc Ewan, Jenelle
Martin, Don	Mays, Dave	Mc Ewen II, William E
Martin, Jenny	Mazik, Kim	Mc Fredrick, Jim
Martin, Kyle	Mc Allister, Gary	Mc Garth, Michael P
Martin, Steven R	Mc Allister, Sean T	Mc Garvin, James R
Martin, Vernon L	Mc Arthur, Jean A	Mc Gee, Rick
Martinez, Chris	Mc Bee, Melissa	Mc Glashen, Tom
Marty, Tom	Mc Cain, Douglas E	Mc Glothin, L
Martz, Bill & Betty	Mc Call, Donald	Mc Govern-Rowen, Matthew
Martz, Dori E	Mc Call, Jeff	Mc Gowan, Larry
Marxgod, Stan	Mc Cambridge, Nancy	Mc Gowan, Tom M
Marzolf, Kirk	Mc Cann, Gregory M	Mc Gowan,

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Mc Gown, Mary G	Meissner, Julie	Miles, Jim
Mc Gregor S J, Mark	Mekemson, Richard L	Millemann, Steve
Mc Intyre, Ken	Melina,	Miller, Bruce & Becky
Mc Iver, Jim	Melnick, Heather L	Miller, Carol & Miler
Mc Kaig, Robert H & Coleen	Melquist, Wayne	Miller, Charles
Mc Kay, John	Melton, Jeannie & Mel	Miller, David
Mc Kay, Michael J	Melton, Jimmy A	Miller, David F & Ellen
Mc Kean, Hugh	Melvin, Ursula	Miller, Don E
Mc Kee, Bonnie	Menanno, Susan	Miller, Donald E
Mc Kelvey, Mr & Mrs Robert	Menery, Lisa M	Miller, Dr M Stephen
Mc Kenna, David	Menke, Ray	Miller, Dusty L
Mc Kenzie, Timothy C	Menne, Don	Miller, Eric
Mc Kimstry, Ben	Mennul, George	Miller, George
Mc Kinley, Russ & Anne	Mensik, Joel J	Miller, J K
Mc Kinney, Richardson	Menz, Richard H	Miller, Jeremy
Mc Koan, Tom	Menzies, Michael & Lurline	Miller, John & Delores
Mc Lain, Michael D	Meracha, Martel	Miller, John C
Mc Lane, Thomas L	Meral PhD, Gerald H	Miller, John P
Mc Lean, Jeremy	Mercak, Lee	Miller, M Sullivan & Cindy
Mc Lean, Leslie	Mercer, Carol	Miller, Michael A
Mc Lean-Ownby, Scott & Woo	Meredith, Sharon	Miller, Michael S
Mc Lomore III, B Regan	Merend, Veronica	Miller, Mr & Mrs David R
Mc Mannon, Mike	Merkt, Don	Miller, Paul
Mc Masters, Douglas R & Tracy	Merrick, Harry R	Miller, Phil
Mc Millan, Hal & Eva	Mertz, Robert A	Miller, Ralph
Mc Murtney, Patrick	Mesley, Neil D	Miller, Rob D
Mc Nair, Hugh	Mesluck, Dave	Miller, Robert
Mc Nally, Megan	Messinger, Dave	Miller, Ron
Mc Nutt, Glenn	Metzgar, Lee H	Miller, Thomas
Mc Pherson, Christy A	Meuleman, Guy	Miller, Tom
Mc Rae, Donna R	Meyer, Herb	Miller, Tom & Kim
Mc Reynolds, Tom	Meyer, Mary E	Miller, Wallace D
Meachan, Matha	Meyer, Shannon	Miller, William C
Mealey, Stephen P	Meyers, Kevin R	Miller MD, Michael E
Means, Anna	Meyr, Herb	Millhorn, Herb
Means MD, Roseanna	Mezo, Peter	Mills, Brent
Mecham, Amy	Michaels, Jim	Mills, Edward L
Mecham, Scott	Michaud, James	Mills, Kevin
Medberry, Mike	Mickelson, Chuck	Mills, Mike
Medel, Tim & Elaine	Mickelson, Joyce	Millsaps, Don P
Meden, Terry A	Micsan, Bill	Milton, Hal
Meehan, Keith E	Mieners, M	Milton, Ralph & Torchy
Meeker, Dan	Mier, Anne	Mimbs, J Brandon
Meier, Jon	Miesler, Hans U	Minch, Bob
Meis, Rick	Milan, Sheila & Bill	Mingus, Scott

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Minkus, Hannah R	Morache, Marty	Mullen, Jens
Minnis, Sarah E	Morano, Louis	Mullenix, Chuck
Minton, Al & Ruth	Morea, Michael N	Mulligan, Ed
Minturn, Mark	Morgan, Andrea	Munjar-Pearcure,
Mish, William	Morgan, Cal	Munson, Gerald
Mishell, Alan D	Morgan, Charles E	Munter, Andy
Mislinski, Kathryn R	Morgan, Chuck	Murchison, Hardy
Mitchell, Bill	Morgan, David	Murdock, Gary
Mitchell, Christine M	Morgan, Errol & Connie	Murdock, Lavar
Mitchell, Clifford	Morgan, Frank & Lora	Murphy, Elayne
Mitchell, Eric	Morgan, James	Murphy, Katherine B
Mitchell, Matt	Morgan, P	Murphy, Kathy
Mitchell, Robert	Morgan, Wendy	Murphy, Kent
Mizia, Ronald E	Morris, Floyd	Murphy, Sheila
Mladenka, Greg	Morris, Heather	Murray, Barry
Mladenka, Greg & Tina	Morris, James E	Murray, John
Moadeeb, Jon	Morrison, Bill	Murray, Michael
Moates, Tom	Mort, Angel	Murray Jr, Richard J
Mobilio, Richard	Morton, Charles R	Murray MD, Gwinn
Moe, Chuck	Morton, Christine	Murray-Fildman,
Mohr Family, Robert	Morton, Dr & Mrs John H	Murry,
Moiseyev, Maya R	Morton Esq, Allan S	Mustard, George
Moldenhauer, Mickey	Mortons,	Muszynski, Sarah E
Moncreif, Les	Moser, Gary	Mutchler, Russ
Monroe, Eugene	Moser, Gary & Paula	Myers, Jerry & Terry
Monroe, Pat	Moser, Laurie S	Myers, Nicholas E
Monroe, Steve	Moses, M	Myers, Stephanie
Monte,	Moss, Paul	Myhrum, Ron
Monteith, Amy	Mossman, Ralph	Myren, Ben
Moon,	Mossman, Robert	Nackerud, Jon F.
Moore, Barry	Moulton, R E	Naiden, Noella
Moore, Bill	Mourtsen, Pete	Nailen, Dan
Moore, Carol	Mowisa, Peter	Narde, Tom
Moore, Don	Moye, Falma	Nash, Roderick
Moore, Greg	Moyer, Paul	Nast, G A
Moore, Greg	Moyer, William L	Neace, Tom
Moore, Joseph B	Moyle, Jay & Dean E	Nebeker, Joe
Moore, Kevin	Mrr Jr, Albert A	Neef, Melvin E & Randi C
Moore, Kevin M	Mueller, Mark	Neher, Chris
Moore, Leon & Emagene	Mueller, Robert	Neils, John
Moore, Major Virgil C	Mueller, William P	Neilsen, Rod
Moore, Mardell O	Muir, Jack H	Nelson, Dr Greg
Moore, Martin	Mulick, Jim	Nelson, Dr Scott
Moore, Vincent C & Jeanine Beck	Mulkey, Gray M	Nelson, Ethan
Moore, Virgil	Mullaney, Daniel T	Nelson, Frederick V

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Nelson, Gary L	Norris, Dan	Oberlink, Doug
Nelson, Herbert J & Mildred A	Norris, Marcie	Obst, Robert A
Nelson, Mike	Norris, Robert J	Ochi, Jon
Nelson, Robert, Susan, Austin, & Trent	Norris, Scott	Odlum, Daniel C
Nelson, Sarah	Norslien, Harold	Odon Jr, Edward
Nelson, Will	North Jr, John F	Oja, Mike & Lisa
Nelson, Willow	Northrup, V	Olavarria, Andy
Nennum, Walt	Norton, Richard	Olde, Karen
Neser, Rick	Nortyn, John F	Oldham, Bill
Nesta-Berry, Jean	Nossaman, Sarah	Olds, Natalie M
Nett, Eugene A	Noyes MD, Peter	Oliver, Patrick
Neu, Rodney	Nuttal, Scott	Olmsted, Bill
Neumann, Lori	Nuxoll, Don & Carolyn	Olson, Charlie
Newby, Sam	Nye, Cy	Olson, Dana
Newcomer, Joseph	Nye, Randy & Sandy	Olson, Dixie
Newman, Rick	Nyker,	Olson, Lance
Newson, Suzanne	Nystrom, Jim	Olson, Linda
Nicely, Clyde	O'Brien, Kathy	Olson, Marc
Nicholas, Susan	O'Brien, Kevin	Olson, Marilyn
Nicholls, Jerry	O'Brien, Michael P	Oltersdorf, Jim & Joalena
Nichols, Brent	O'Conner, C F	Oman, Don
Nichols, Fred & Alice	O'Conner, Richard T	Onthank, Jim W
Nichols, Julia	O'Conner, Tim	Opachko, Bob
Nichols, Mike	O'Crowley, Janet	Opple, Andrew
Nichols, Yonnie M	O'Donnell, Jeanne	Orcholski, Gerald
Nicholson, Judith S	O'Donnell, Linda	O'Reilly, Tracy R
Nickels, Oliver	O'Donnell, Mike & Leslie	Origley, L
Nigrelli, Jeff	O'Keefe, Thomas	Orr, Donald E
Niklason, Mike	O'Malley, Michael	Ortman, Tom
Nilson, Douglas	O'Malley, Ted & Sue	Ortner, Peg
Niquette, Beverly	O'Meare, Tiffany L	Osborn, Bert
Nisbet, Phillip C	O'Neal, Denny	Osborn MD, John
Nissen, Joanne	O'Neal, Kelly	Ositersky, Jim
Niswander, Ruth	O'Neal, Kimberly	Osterheld, Keith
Nixon, Colleen	O'Neill, Kathlyn	Osterhout, Ruth
Noble, Gene	O'Neil, Jeane E	Ostrow, Marlee
Noble, Shawwna	O'Neil, John	Otter, John
Nobles, Terry	O'Neil, Katie	Oudley, Pat
Nokes MD, Herald S	O'Neill, Kelly	Overcash, Joshua B
Nolan, Joe	O'Set, Bob	Owens, Leonard
Nolan, Tom	O'Sullivan, David	Oye, Gary
Nolte, Christopher	O'Tool, Jim	Ozminkowski, Bill
Nolthenius, Juergen	O'Toole, Jim	Pace, Charles
Norden, C	Oakes, Paul A	Pace, Jim
Norricks, Mel	Oakley, Glenn	Paderett, Allen

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Padgett, Joel
Page, Brad & Pam
Page, Tom
Page, V Spencer
Pagenkopf, Kris
Paige, Bernice E
Paige, Kevin A
Painter, Ross
Palma, V D
Palmer, Dennis
Palmer, Don
Palmer, M
Palmer, Noel
Palmer, Peter L
Palmer, Todd
Palmer Jr, James B
Palmersten, Louis M
Pals, Gary
Pameroen, Bill
Pankey, Eric L
Papale, Mary
Pape, Michael
Paradis, Howard
Paradise, Parkie
Paris, George E
Paris, Rich
Parish, Tommy
Parker, Andrew J
Parker, Bruce
Parker, Bryan J
Parker, Jerry
Parker, John
Parker, Kathryn B
Parker, Marvin C
Parker, Steve
Parkhouse, Laura
Parks, Bill
Parks, Rod
Parmenter, David
Parnell, Kevin
Parnell, Sean R
Parrott, Gregory A
Parsons, Ralph & Donna
Pascoe, Kira
Pask, Arlene
Pasker, AL
Patel, Nick M
Patenaude, David
Patrvick, John
Pattillo, Carol
Patton, John
Paul, Circe M
Paul, Eric
Paul, Jim & D
Paul, Taul
Paule, David W
Paulsen, Duaine
Paulson, Dan
Paulson, Steve
Paulson Jr, Robert C
Pavey, Laurie
Payne, Marina K
Pearce, Paul G
Peavy, John R
Pecha, Bill
Peck, Brian
Peck, Neil
Peckman, Kristen B
Peets, Tom
Peirce, Randolph
Peitz, Randy
Pejsa, Mark
Pelkey, Jo
Pellento, Mary Jo
Pellettiere, Marc P
Penhaligen, Charles F
Penney, Sheila A
Pennington, Anita
Pennington, Larry
Pennington, Penny
Pentila, Kevin
Pentzer, Ed
Pepin, Suzanne
Percy, Jim
Perenich, Theresa A
Pergande, Doyle E
Perkins, Don
Perkins, Janna
Perkins, Jim W
Perkins, Linda Sue
Perrin, Michael
Perrine, Bob & Denna
Perry, Dr & Mrs Charles J
Perry, Earl
Perry, John
Perry, Madilane
Perry, Mark
Perry, Seth W
Perryman, Toddy
Persha, Eugene
Person, Ron
Peterman, Rebecca
Peters, Barnaby
Peters, Greg
Peters, Richard
Peterson, Bruce
Peterson, Curt
Peterson, Danny
Peterson, Dave
Peterson, Jan
Peterson, Jon
Peterson, Paul
Peterson, Raymond H
Peterson, Ronald J
Peterson, Sean
Peterson, Sue
Peterson, Tim C
Petrofsku, Mary
Petterson, Sam
Pettigrew, David
Pettit, Kelly
Pettit, Mikey
Petty, Richard A
Petty Jr, William J
Phelps, Jerry
Phelps, John M & Melisa
Phillips, Charles
Phillips, Claude & Gerry
Phillips, Roger
Phillips, Scotty
Pickens, Lynne
Picotte, Marv & Les
Piekarski, John
Pilewski, Laura A & Rob
Pilholski, Frank

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Piper, Tricia & K	Poxiutner, Harold C	Rainbolt, Katherine N
Pipes MD, Clinton A	Pratt, Wes & Marion	Rainbolt, W M
Pitgora, Robby	Prefontaine, Joan W	Rainet, Robert
Pitkin, Paul A	Pressley, Peter	Ralston, Gene & Sandy
Pitorais, Steve	Pressman, Kent & Karen	Rambo, Steve C
Pitstick, Randy	Prestwich, Bob	Ramirez, Eflen & Jenia
Pittenger, Greg	Priaulx, Chris	Ranch, Tracey
Piva, Linda	Price, Chad & Harry M	Ranganathan, Jai
Plant, Michael & Donna	Price, Sharon & R R	Rankin, Janna
Platt, Tom	Price, Wendy & R S	Ransom, Nancy Buck
Ploss, Robert	Pride, Gene & Matt	Ransom, S D
Plummer, M J	Priebe, Steve	Ransom Jr, Delos
Poe, Greg	Primrose, Lisa	Rasband, Randy
Pohner, Russ	Pritchett, Steve	Rasch, Donald
Poinsetta, Derek	Proctor, Laird	Rasmor, Ron
Poler, Henry	Proctor,	Rast Jr, Otto
Poliziani Jr, Leonard	Proescholdt, Kevin	Rathmann, Kurt D
Poll, Elizabeth	Profant, Peggy	Rathmann, Patricia A
Polney, Cassidy	Propp, Chris & Lois	Ravenscraft, John
Polstein, Linda	Provenza, Robert & Paulette	Ravenscroft, Vernon
Pomerening, Don	Prudek, Jack	Ray, David
Pomeroy, Betsy & Nelson	Puckett MD, P Andrew	Ray, Jason
Pomeroy, Tom	Puder, Susan	Raycraft, Joe
Pond, Ralph C	Purcell, Myron & Pam	Raymond, A A
Ponozzo, Ron	Purdy, Robin R	Reavis, Ralph G
Poorbaugh, John M	Pushard Sr, Michael H	Recht, Bradley P
Popa, Mitch	Pyle, Barb	Rector, Thomas
Pope, Don	Pyle, Joseph L	Reddick, David
Pope, Jim	Queen, William R	Redick, Leigh
Poplawsky, Alan R	Querner, David M	Redmond, Todd
Porter, David W	Quick, Ben	Reed, Bobby
Porter, James D.	Quimby, Allen	Reed, James
Porter, Leroy L	Quinn, Chris	Reed, Kent & Nelda
Post, Paul	Quinn, Erin	Reed, Lloyd
Potter, Don	Quirk, Jerry	Reeder, John
Potter, Rachael	Radcliff, B Greer	Reeder, Randy
Potts, Gail D	Radovich, Nicholas D	Reese, Gordon
Powell, Bob	Radzieta, Ron	Reese, Judy
Powell, Bob	Raeber, Hildegard	Reeve, Larry
Powell, Ralph	Raesly, Elaine J	Reeves, Carole
Powell, Ralph & Amy	Ragotzkie, Kim E	Reeves-Rutledge, Cheri
Powell Jr, Lee	Ragsdale, Cliff	Regan, Frank J
Power, Gary	Rahr, William	Regela, David
Powers, Bob	Railey, Chuck	Reich, Andrew L
Powers, Harry & Lynn	Rain, Jeffrey	Reich, Danny S

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Reich, Todd S	Richter, Scott	Rogers, Kevin
Reichardt, Kathy	Ricks, Bill	Rogers DVM, William P
Reid, Phil	Riddle, Edie & Norm	Roland, Megan
Reid Egbert, Bill	Ridle, Heather	Role, Abraham
Reiners, Al Jolene	Ridle, Scott	Roller, Howard
Reingold, Mel	Riebersal, Craig	Rolls, Bob
Reis, David	Rieffenberger, Betsy & John	Rolston II, Holmes
Reis, Sylvia	Riegers, Tom	Romig, Candace L
Reiswig, Barry	Riggs, Brian K	Ransom Sr, Delos
Reiter, John	Rigotti, Clark	Roos, Steve
Remaklus, Larry	Rinering, Gary	Roseberry, Lee
Remein, Kim & Dave	Ringo, Robert G	Rosekrans, Adolph
Rempelski, Ron	Rinolfson, Dennis	Rosenbaum, Waner
Remwyck, Marlene & Julian	Risien, Adam	Rosenberg, Kenneth I
Renfro, Clark	Rising, D I	Rosentreter, Roge
Renfro, Lois	Ritter, Charles E	Roskelly, Mickey
Renfrow, Susie	Ritzman, Daniel	Ross, Eric C
Rennell, Dennis	Rivas, Bob & Joan	Ross, Jerry C
Repa, Joseph	Rivas, Jeff	Ross, John & Harriet
Ressnick, Paul	Rivers, Bill	Rossman, M E
Reynold, Marilyn	Rixon, Carl	Rosten, Jeremy
Reynolds, Alan	Robbins, Jack	Rostykus, Paul
Reynolds, Brian & Katie	Roberts, Bruce	Rote, Alex
Reynolds, Carrie	Roberts, Jo	Rothman, John
Reynolds, Fred	Roberts, Kathleen C	Rothwell, Lynn
Reynolds, Jack	Roberts, Larry	Rotter, John F
Reynolds, Jim	Roberts, Roberta	Roupe, Richard A
Reynolds Jr, Phil	Robertson, Jason D	Roush, Thomas W
Rhoades, Phillip M	Robertson, Mark	Rowe, Helen Ivy
Rhodes, Will F	Robey, Waddell F	Rowe, Jim
Rice, Dick & Kathie	Robichard, Pete	Roy, Rich
Rice Jr, John B	Robins, Jennifer	Royster, Terry
Riceci, Brannon	Robinson, Bob	Rozema, Mel
Richards, Belle C	Robinson, Jerry	Rubin, Gary R
Richards, Paul	Robinson, Laurie & David	Ruby, Joie
Richardsen, Nina & Jerry	Robinson, Ron	Rud MD, John M
Richardson, Albert E	Robinson, Steve	Rudner, Adam
Richardson, George	Robinson, Todd	Ruether, Robin
Richardson, Tim	Rockwell, William(Rocky)	Ruff, Marvin
Richardson, Tom	Roden, John & Norb	Ruffatto, George
Riches, Jean U	Rodg, P	Ruffatto, Tom
Richman, Bob	Rodgers, Larry	Ruhnke, Phil
Richmond, David & Kathy	Roe, Jane	Rule, Juliann
Richner, Don	Roederer, Tom & Jeannie	Rumbaugh, Bruce
Richter, David	Rogers, Ken	Rumsey, Denton

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Rupert, Greg	Savage, Mary F	Schuster, John R
Rupp, Gretchen	Sawson, Chryl & Dick	Schultz, Bob
Rusco, Dean	Scales, Courtney	Schwartz, Angela
Rush, Jim	Scanlan, Jim	Schwartz, Joseph H
Rushforth, Sam	Scarborough, Bill & Kary	Schweitzer, Matt W
Rusnak Jr, Richard A	Scearcy, Betty & Everette	Schwyn, Craig & Penny
Russ, Donald L	Schaertl, John	Scifres, Dennis
Russell, Clayton T	Schaffer, Ed & Joyce	Scofield, Bruce
Russell, Diane	Schaffer, Scott	Scolar,
Russell, John	Schaffer, William P	Scoles, Daniel R
Russell, Luke	Schaive, Kimberly A	Scott, Catherine B
Russell, Tony	Schantz, Heidi	Scott, Dick
Russell PhD, Keith C	Schaper, Michael W	Scott, James R
Ryan, Dave	Scharf MD, Carl J	Scott, Richard
Ryder, Eileen	Schatz, Jim	Scott, Wally
Ryman, Karen	Scheffel, Steven J	Scott, Williamson
Sackett, John I	Scheler, Tom	Scouton, Forrest
Saffel, Patrick D	Scherman, George	Scroggins Jr, Johnny Angel
Saikevych MD, Irene A	Schild, Les	Sears, David G & Jesse
Saiter MD, Eugene T	Schill, Dan	Sebin, Lynn J
Salo, David	Schiltz, Al	Sebree, Steven
Salsbury, Susanna	Schipper, Gerrit J	Secord, Reed
Sam Jr MD, Ferrol A	Schlacks, Henry	Seeman, Richard & Carolyn
Sams, Dana D	Schley, Mike	Seibert, Paul W
Sanchotena, Mitch	Schlicht, Jan & Larry	Seibold, John & Lyn
Sandborgh, Gayle & Mat	Schmall, Megan	Seiler, Kerry
Sanders, Pete	Schmidt, Andy & Jamie	Self, Paul
Sandersfield, Dave	Schmidt, Lee M	Selleck, Matt
Sanderson, Craton R	Schmidt, Oswald H	Sellers, Candee
Sanger, Harold J	Schneider, Charles P & Molly L	Sellers, Charles
Sant'Angelo, Linda K	Schneider, Ed	Sellers, Joan
Sarbeck, Dave	Schneider, Wolfe	Sellers, Mike
Sargent, John E	Schochet, Joy	Sellick, David
Sartorius, Joann & Fen	Schock, Melba & Tony	Sells, Roger
Sas, Dave	Schoenecker, Gary	Semler, Dan
Sasinouski, Mike	Schofield, James	Senft, David C
Sauer, Greg	Schomaker, John	Sersland, Harold
Sauerbreit, Nolan & Ruth	Schonefeld, Bonnie J	Service, James E
Saulino, Biefke Vos	Schott, Joseph C	Sesseims, J W
Saulino, Vincent T	Schott, Keith	Severson, Marc
Saulsberry, Daryle	Schuffer, Esta Jo	Sewell, Tom
Saunders, Robert E	Schuir, Cary	Shackleford, Colleen
Saunders,	Schullo, Mike	Shaffer, Janette
Sautner, Don	Schultis, Samuel	Shaffer, Tami
Savage, Dennis	Schulz MD, John M	Shambo, James A

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Shamis, Jeff	Sibley, Robert D	Smith, Earl & Tatiana
Shamiyeh, S G	Siddoway, Leland	Smith, Ernestine I
Shannon, Terry & Beth	Sidell, Richard T	Smith, Frank
Shapiro, Naatalie	Siebel, Gonnie	Smith, Gary
Sharp, Dan	Siegler, Ted	Smith, Glenn
Sharp, Kerry L	Siersma, Bill	Smith, Howard T
Sharp, Marty	Siess, Kris	Smith, Jack E
Sharples, Laura	Sievert, Ken A	Smith, James
Shaver, Clyde	Siewest, Stan	Smith, Jane D
Shaw, Dr Robert	Sigrist, Mark	Smith, Jhn H
Shaw, Eugene	Sihler, Paul	Smith, Karl
Shaw, Harry F	Sikes, Lewis S	Smith, Kathryn
Shaw, Janice J	Siller, Gary & Corale	Smith, Leone Cook
Shaw, Jim & Tricia	Silva,	Smith, Lonnie & Nancy
Shaw, Joel	Silver, Perry	Smith, Mark
Shaw, Kelly	Silverman, Mike	Smith, Mr & Mrs M H
Shay, Bob	Simerly, Bill	Smith, Redge
Shearer, W Kirk	Simi, Warrren	Smith, Robert & Celia
Sheehan, Matt	Simonds, Jim	Smith, Royce
Sheldon, G Michael	Simonelli MD, Jon M	Smith, Sandra
Sheldon, Jennie W & James	Simonson, Darren	Smith, Sarah E
Sheldon, Sarah	Simpson, Gary	Smith, Scott
Shepherb, Austin	Sinnett, D William	Smith, Seth
Sheppard, Bill	Sisson, Dick	Smith, Sharon J
Sheppard, Bill	Siuce, Jauneco	Smith, T C
Sherman, Brett	Skaggs, Mark S	Smith,
Sherman, Roger	Skalka, Stuart	Smith DDS, Richard R
Sherrard, Kathryn	Skibsted, Kyle	Smock MD, Michael G
Sherwin, Dick	Slagle, Jeff	Smooke, Judith Lynne
Sherwood, Mike	Slansky, Dr Cyril M	Smucker, Dr Karen S
Sherwood, Rick Adam	Slattery, Wayne	Snell, Dean
Shinn, M	Slavin, Milton A & Roberta	Snell, Ed
Shirley, Mike	Slavin, Taryn	Snider, Bob
Sholes, Karen & Doug	Slickers, Christine	Snodgrass, Brent
Shonkwilers, Charles M	Sloane CPA, Timothy	Snow, Janet
Shopshire, Beverly	Slyster, Cort	Snyder, Gerry
Shore, Anita & James W	Smallwood, David	Snyder, R W
Shotwell, Joe	Smiley, Les	Snyder, Rich Jo & Weston
Shotwell, Richard M	Smith, Barbara & Norman K	Sobralске, Mary
Showalter, Gary	Smith, Bob & Jill	Solecki, Jim
Shrolike, Randy	Smith, Clyde C	Solomon, Laurie
Shuken, Howard L	Smith, David	Solomon, Mark
Shuman, D Ellen	Smith, Delmar L	Sommers, Katy
Shumard, Craig & Joyce	Smith, Dr & Mrs Arlan	Sondall, Michael D
Shurts, James A	Smith, Duane B	Sonderon, Mark A

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Sonntag, Alberta	Stebbins, Christy O	Storlie, Erik
Sonntag, John	Steck, Kevin	Story, Donald D
Sorensen, Pete	Steele, Ralph	Stotland,
Sorensen, Roger L	Steele, Wah Leeta	Stouder, Matt & Terry
Sorensen, Sunny	Steelhammer, George	Stouder, Scott
Soucy, Jakimo (John)	Steen, Alison	Stout, Dr Ben
Souers, Amy	Steen, Tyrone L	Stowe, David
Soulliere, Dacia	Stefanoff, Jim	Stowers, Ray
Sourbrine, Dick	Steffensen Jr, Alana M & Jens V	Strand, Cindy
Southwick, Robert	Steffs, Wallace	Strand, Robert
Southworth, Craig	Steger, Sheila J	Strand, Spencer D
Spafford, James S	Steinberg, Marc L	Stratton, Laurence J
Spalding, Curtis	Steinbrenner, Barbara	Strawder, Jill
Spalette, Howard	Stekette, Stephen C	Strebel,
Spangler, Todd	Stelmart, Ann	Street, Paul S
Speck, Wendy L	Stember, Ed	Streng, Robert E
Spence, Robert	Steninger, Al	Stretz, Sharon L
Spencer, Bob	Stephani, Barbara J	Stribil, Bob
Spencer, Dave	Stephens, Elmer W	Strickfaden, Jack M
Spencer, Robert & Sue	Stephens, Roxie L & Ronald H	Strickland, Mike
Spencer, Thruston	Stephenson, Ann	Strickland, R
Sperling, Ruth S	Sterling, John	Strong, Richard A
Spickelmire, Brandi	Sterling, R H	Stuart, Tom
Spielman, Karl	Steven, Dennis	Stubblefield, Jim
Spilotros, Mike	Stevens, Gaye	Stubblefield, Ted
Spinozzi, Joseph	Stevens, Keith	Stucker, Virgil
Spinsled, Dan	Stevens, Mary J	Studebaker, William
Spotts, Richard A	Stevens, Mckenzie	Stutzmay, S
Sprague, Bryan	Stevens, Robert G	Suk, Thomas
Squires, Ralph D	Stevensen, Wayne	Sullivan, Greg
Staab, George	Stevenson, Mike & Jan	Sullivan, Patricia A
Stackoeski, Kathleen	Stewart, Benjamin M	Sullivan, Sharon A
Stafford, Howard A	Stewart, James W	Sullivan, Timothy
Stalcup, Phil	Stewart, Johnny G	Summers, Dave
Stamets, Christine M	Stillman, Randy & Sue	Sumption, Patrica
Stanfield, Mark	Stilwell, Nikki	Sundblad, Paul D
Stanszak, Ski	Stimpson, Dorothy	Sundstedt, David
Stanton, Amy	Stimpson, Richard L	Surgeon, Robert E
Stanton, Debbie	Stingaciu, Adrian	Sutcliffe, Kay
Stapp, Catherine T	Stivers, Brian	Sutherland, Barbaara
Star, Ali	Stockton, Robert	Sutherland, R
Stare, R C	Stokes, Suzanne	Sutherland, Ron W
Stark, Marie	Stoltz, Jim & Leslie	Sutton, Lewis
Stark, Ray	Stone, Tim	Sutton, Tom & Becky
Stauts, Frank	Storer, Charles & Patsy	Swain, Gary L

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Swanson, John R
Swayne, Bruce
Sweatt, Mike
Sweet, Rick C
Swensen, Les & Eleanor
Swetland, Bob
Swift MD, Cheryl A
Swigart, Anne H
Swimsaway PhD, Crow
Swindell, Dennis
Swindell, Rich
Swindell, Susan
Swisher, Larry
Switzler, Barbara A
Swoboda, Mike
Sword, Marylin
Sykes, Kristen
Symons, Neill
Systaces, D A
Szambelan, J P
Szczepanowski, Whale
Taff, Michael
Talbot, Ed & Terry
Talbot, Mike & Kaylyn
Taliaferro, Diane
Tangeman, S K
Tanner, Linda
Tansler, Jeff
Tansley, J
Taplin, Richard
Tassoni, Peter Francis
Taylor, B
Taylor, Chuck
Taylor, Katie & Wally
Taylor, Laura A
Taylor, Marcus
Taylor, Robert & Mary
Taylor, Tommy
Taylor, Walt & Amy
Taylor,
Taylor DDS, Michael E
Teasdale, Aaron
Teaton, James
Teller, Ron
Templeton, Fred
Temus, Charles
Teneyck, Dirk & Lisa
Teply, Michael G
Tepper, Linda & Carol
Teralids, Tatjana
Terlinsner, Jerry
Terzakis, Nicholus
Teddall, Kathleen
Testa, Roy
Thatcher, Scott C
Theiler, Matthew
Therp, Todd J
Therrell, Lisa
Thiede, Martin
Thomas, Byron & Jim
Thomas, Craig E
Thomas, Fred
Thomas, J F
Thomas, James A
Thomas, Jim & Heidi
Thomas, Rick & Joan
Thomas, Rob
Thomas, Scott
Thomas Jr, H Grant
Thomas Ph D, John R
Thompson, Charlie
Thompson, Darrel & Judith K
Thompson, J
Thompson, J Nevin
Thompson, John D
Thompson, Kirk
Thompson, Kurt
Thompson, Margaret
Thompson, Mary Alice
Thompson, Ray
Thompson, Vern
Thompson, Vince
Thompson MD, Paul
Thorsland, Jeannie
Thorton,
Thoumi, Gabreil Andres
Thrash, Holly
Thurow, Russ
Tice, Kevin
Tichenor, Steve
Tiernan, Peter
Tierney, Robert
Tilly, S Lock & Kathryn
Tilton, Buck G
Timmer, Carol & Denise
Tipswood, Wayne E
Toan, Katherine L
Tobias, Nellie
Tobias, Samuel
Tobin, Marc
Tobler, Matt
Tobler, Paul
Todd, Michael E
Tolfree, Robert L
Tom,
Toma, Ray
Tone, Jerry
Toney, Dr Michael F
Toney, Jim
Tonnie, Linda M
Tonsmeire, Amy
Tonsmeire, Dan
Toof, John
Topper, Thomas
Tornley, N K
Torre, Richard
Torre, Rick
Totty, Mike & Susan
Tourangeau, Patricia
Towner, David
Townley, Jim
Townsend, Ernest
Tracy, Barbara
Tracy, Donald E
Tracy, Jerry
Train, Jack D
Trappett, Bill
Traynor, Eric
Tremain, Thomas S
Treue, Heide
Trevvett, Thomas P
Trickel,
Tripp, Warren D
Trixel, Robert
Trott, Sally

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Trout, Gordan	Van Bargaen, Darrell	Walker, Gary L
Troutman, Bob	Van Der Grift, Edgar	Walker, Jack
Troutner, Kathy	Van Every, Marsha W	Walker, John
Trowbridge, Roy	Van Hees, Marc & Colleen	Walker, Peter
Troyer, Jack G	Van Male, Janice	Walker, R J
Truax, Wayne B	Van Middlewoth, Jukie M	Walker, Sarah & Dick
Trusnovec, Rick	Van Schoick, Elmer	Walker, Terry & TerrillL
Ttomblison, Rick	Vance, Lowell	Wallace, C
Tubbs, Ron	Vance, Ron	Wallace, Joe
Tucker, Michelle	Vanderbeek, Roger & L Joyce	Wallace, Leonard M
Tucker, Thomas A	Vandercoveering, Josh	Wallace, Lynn
Tucker, Tom	Vanderleelie, Roy	Wallace, Mike
Tucker, Wilson	Vankoman, Heather	Wallace, Ray
Tuma, Ted	Varner, Morgan	Walter, Al & Connie
Turner, Janelle	Vaughn, Darren K	Walters, Jim
Turner, Kathleen Kaeding	Vaughn, Harry W	Walters, Richard M
Turner, P J	Vaughn, Larry	Walters, Sandra F
Turner, Paul	Vaughn, Rich	Walther, Dr Alan & Meredith
Turner, Scott	Vaughn, Stephen H	Walton, Thomas
Turner, Win Betty	Velasquez, Larry	Wandrus, Steve D
Turnipseed, Donna	Veley, Chris	Ward, Chuck
Turnley, Steve	Vermeer, Klaas	Ward, Claire
Tutt, Slavin	Verner, David	Ward, Craig
Tuttle, Gary	Vernot, Laurens	Ward, Dave & Val
Tuttle, Tim	Vial, Peter M	Ward, John & Debra
Twitchell, Roger & Kara	Vidmar, Jeff	Ward, John & Eleanor
Twitto, Don	Vignere, Joel G	Ward, Stacey
Tyler, Betty C	Vinegard, Bill	Warden, Lois & Harry
Uberuaca, David	Vican, Jeremy	Ware, Marcus J
Uihlein, Pam	Vogt, George & Josephine	Warnell, Terry
Uldrich, Evert D	Vogt Jr, James R	Warner, David & June
Umbach, Cutler	Volden, Ronald A & Helen	Warner, Marcella
Umthum, David B	Volk, Jeffrey	Warner, Natasha N
Ungerer, Richard A	Volpert, Bob	Warren, Jeffrey S
Unruh, Jerry D	Von Fremd, Sarah	Warren, L L
Uranga, Jean	Waddell, Brian	Warren, Sam E & Wendy
Urban, Dan	Wagner, Ronald	Warren, Todd
Urquhart, Andrew & Carolyn	Wagner, Roy J	Warren, Wyatt
Urreski, John	Wahl, William D	Wartchow, Lance J
Urrizaga, Don & Leslie	Waite, Dick	Wassmuth, Jim & Jan
Utecht, Todd	Waite, Jeff	Wassmuth, Michael E
Vaden, Bill	Waite, Sheldon Burns	Wassmuth, Steve
Vagabond, B L S	Waite, Sheldon Burns	Wasson, Gordon
Valcarce, Jay	Walker, Boyd W	Wasson,
Vallone, Cheryl L	Walker, Candess	Waterhouse, D L

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Waters, Beth	Welch, Monica	White, Jim
Waterston, C G	Welch III, Richard E	White, Kimberly A
Wathen, Shawn	Weller, Lorna K	White, Lornie
Wathim, Gerald R	Wells, Sally	White, Melissa D
Watkins, Donna L	Welman, Karen	White, Pete
Watson, Caroline S	Weinmann, Ovla	White, Randall
Watson, Chris	Welsch PhD, Clifford W	White, Randell F
Watson, Clay & Jenifer	Welsh, Bart & Olivia	White, Rebecca S
Watson, Deanne & Chris	Wendling, Kathy A	White, Rhonda
Watson, Louise & Stan	Wentling, Trisha	White, Robert
Watson, Stuart K	Wentzel, Richard R	White, Shawn
Watt, Gail	Wenzel, Zip	White CPA PC, Susan
Watts, Otis	Werdinger, Leon	Whitehead,
Wayburn, Cynthia	Werley, Brent	Whitehill, Barry
Waymire, Gary	Wermus, Susan	Whitherspoon, HenryY
Weaver, Charles & Sue	Werner, Paul	Whitman, Aimee D
Weaver, Jim	Wertz, Michael & Victoria	Whitman, Ben
Webb, Douglas H	West, Allan J	Whitman, Eli
Webb, Michael	West, Mike	Whitman, Roy
Webber, Dr Caroline M	West, Richard	Whittig, Holly
Webster, Charlie	West, Sarah	Whittig, Keith
Webster, Jack A	West, Wayne	Wick, Chris
Webster, John	West, Zeke & Erlene	Wick, I
Wedel, Elizabeth G	Westerfelt, Patrick	Wickline, Paige M
Weedop, Brent	Westervelt, Susan	Wilber, Jessie
Weedop, Jade	Westhusin, Tim	Wilbur, Patrick
Weedop, Marc & Karen	Westphal, Brian	Wilcox, Don L
Weeks, Cynthia	Wetmore, Frank	Wilde, Ed
Weeks, Robin	Wetzel, Chris	Wilde, Garth
Weeks, Tacy	Whaley, Bob	Wiles, Jeffrey L
Wegman, Jerry	Whaley, Mark	Wiles, Wilbur
Weichman, Joe A	Wheat, Alan	Wiley, Kevin
Weidenbach, Grant	Wheat, Mr & Mrs Francis M	Wilhelm, Jenelle
Weidenka, Greg	Wheaton, Scott	Wilhelm, Ray
Weidman, John C	Wheel, Julian Novotny	Wilke, John A
Weidner, Merrily	Wheeler MD, James N	Wilkerson, Don
Weil,Carolynn	Wheruaga, Joanne V	Wilkes,
Weinberger, Joe & Lynne	Whilden, Kevin	Wilkins, Debbie
Weingardt, Bernie	Whisnant, Lisa	Wilkins, J & T
Weisberg, Steve	Whitaker, Howard J	Wilkins, Kaiser & Olson
Weise, Dale & Charlotte	White, Chris	Wilkins, Tim
Weiss, Devrin D	White, Eric	Wilkinson, Bruce
Weiss, Michael S	White, Greg	Wilkinson, W D & Teresa A
Weiss, Miranda	White, Janice	Will, Dave B
Weissman, D	White, Jessica	Willard, R

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Willey, Barton & Laverna	Winge, Heather A	Wray, Bruce A
Willey III, Wally	Winnie, Jerry	Wright, Allan
Williams, Bill & Martha	Winters, Norman D	Wright, Chuck
Williams, D Curtis	Wirt, Laurie	Wright, Denise E
Williams, Dave	Wise, Caitlin	Wright, Fred & Kim
Williams, Ed	Wise, Ron & Mimsi	Wright, Ron
Williams, Gilbert L	Wislock, Stash	Wright, Tony L
Williams, Honorable Pat	Wisner, Eleanor	Wright, Wayne G
Williams, James F	Wisner, Jody M	Wright,
Williams, Jennifer J	Wofford, Dave	Wroblewski, Dave
Williams, Jessica & Mark S	Wojtowicz, Richard	Wuerthner, George
Williams, Ken	Wolff, David M	Wulff-Tilford, Greg & Mary
Williams, Larry	Wolff, Zane	Wurst, Geo
Williams, Lonnie	Wollen, Dennis F	Wurster, Jane
Williams, Mark & Ginger	Wolper, Steve L	Wyeth, George B
Williams, Marlene	Wolter, Scott	Wyeth, Nathan
Williams, Rick	Wolter, Scott	Wyeth, Theodore G
Williams, Roger	Womersley, Mick	Wynkoop, Dave
Williams, Roger & Margaret	Won, Yhoumey	Wynn, Ross
Williams, Shannan K	Wonacott, Greg	Yacalis, Yea L
Williams, Timothy D	Wood, Adams	Yacomella, Bill & Tammie
Williams, Wallace C	Wood, Bill	Yacomella, C
Williams Jr, Wallace C	Wood, Cartee	Yacomella, Tony
Willis, Jennifer P	Wood, E M	Yahola, Jessica M
Willis, L A	Wood, Larry	Yancey, Charles A
Willmus, Joseph A	Wood, Mike Deb & Camas	Yanke, Dan
Willows CLA, Sharlon L	Wood, Robert E	Yates, Clint
Wilmerding, Susan P	Wood, Ruth	Yavitz & Family, Amy H
Wilmonen, Ken	Wood, William G	Yeaman, Dee
Wilson, Albert E	Wood Jr, Clifton W	Yenter, Bryan
Wilson, Ann	Woodard, Mary H	Yeo, Jeff
Wilson, Betty & Frank	Woodbury, Scott	Yocam, Beth J
Wilson, Bob	Woodgerd, Wesley & Jo Ann	Yoneda, Rocky
Wilson, Delores	Woodman, Jean L	York, Gladys
Wilson, Dennis J	Woods, Bill	York, Travis
Wilson, Herb	Woods, Willy	Yost, Clair
Wilson, Howard	Woodward,	Yost, Matt
Wilson, Matthew O	Woodworth, Woody	Yost, Matthew Joseph
Wilson, Mike	Woolley, Brett	Young, Bing
Wilson, Richard C	Worf, Gayle L & Mary A	Young, Brian
Wilson MD, J Gwynne	Worf, Leslie	Young, Charles
Windycove,	Workman, Kenneth	Young, Clay
Winfrey, Harley	Worthing, Chic	Young, Don
Wing, Jason	Wotipka, Scott W	Young, James & Carla
Wing, Kira	Wouters, Danny	Young, Lawrence J

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Young, Mark
Young, Mike
Young, Olivia Herzig
Young, Richard M
Young & Family, Bert & Jennifer
Youngson, Patrica
Yuhas, Joe
Yundt, Steve
Yusoff, Sharifah
Zaccanti, Daniel
Zalaznik, Larry
Zan, Paula
Zane, Ellam
Zane, Janis
Zavaleta, Erika
Zemach, Charles & Mary
Zenzic, Judson & Pat
Zieman, Jonathan J
Zimet, Andrew & Anita
Zimmer, Ken & Linda
Zimmer, Martin J (Joe)
Zinn, Robert K
Zollinger, Fred
Zortman, Marion
Zuckert, Judi

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response to Comments

As described in the July 31, 2003 edition of the Frankly Speaking newsletter, and in the Decision Framework section of Chapter 1 of this FEIS, the actions being analyzed for decision in this FEIS have been restructured to reflect those that are programmatic in nature. Actions discussed in the DEIS or SDEIS that involve site-specific actions, are administrative in nature or are decided under other authorities have not been analyzed in this FEIS.

The comments summarized and responded to in the following pages relate to the actions or effects analyzed in the FEIS. Many additional comments have been received on actions or concerns that are not part of the purpose and need. Those comments have been summarized and are located in the planning record.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Resources

Outstanding Resource Values

- 1. The SDEIS fails to adequately describe the Outstanding Resource Values. The determination is that none of the alternatives would harm the ORV's, but the analysis needs to consider adjacent and up and downstream actions. (SDEIS)*
- 2. The SDEIS stated that none of the alternatives would degrade the ORV's is not accurate. The DEIS claimed that current use had driven some wildlife from the corridors indicating that any alternative that would maintain or increase use would be compromising the ORV's. (SDEIS)*
- 3. The Forest Service should set river use at a level to allow the return of extirpated species like bald eagles and Harlequin ducks. Failure to do so would violate the Wilderness Act, the National Forest Management Act, and the Endangered Species Act.*

Response: The ORV's assessment and effect have been expanded. See Appendix D and Chapter 4 section on Effects Common to All Alternatives.

- 4. The Forest Service admits that there are no resources concerns at the present use levels. (SDEIS)*

Response: Resource impacts are occurring at current use levels.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum – Mostly Rivers

1. The SDEIS failed to explain why the basic rules of the ROS were ignored in selecting the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS. (SDEIS)

Response to all ROS, PAOT comments:

The Forest Service acknowledges that we made errors in the way we used the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) system in the DEIS, particularly in the way we used the maximum potential people at one time (PAOT) numbers. Following the release of the DEIS we received criticism from many user groups about the ROS system. We listened and in the SDEIS we responded by developing a more realistic “anticipated use level” number for each alternative and by making other corrections to the way we used the ROS system.

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) is a system the Forest Service uses to inventory land areas on a National Forest based on the kinds of recreation activities the area is suited for. In the analysis of the Middle Fork and the Salmon River the Primitive, Semi-Primitive Non-motorized, and Semi-Primitive Motorized ROS classes are generally used. The ROS system can also be used to compare alternative management systems.

The ROS system uses 7 categories to describe the kinds of recreation activities one could expect to have in a given area. These categories are used determine the ROS class. The categories are; access, remoteness, size, evidence of humans, social setting, managerial setting, and facilities and site management. The system also uses an estimated capacity, usually described as a number of people at one time (PAOT), for each area based on the ROS class.

The Middle Fork meets the criteria for Primitive ROS in all seven categories for nine months of the year. During the summer months the criteria for social encounters do not meet the Primitive criteria, but the accumulation of inconsistencies are insufficient to warrant reclassification to the Semi-Primitive Non-motorized. On the Salmon River, where the CIWA mandates the continuation of jetboat use, the river corridor is in the Semi-Primitive Motorized ROS class.

Further review and public comment identified that ROS classifications, maximum potential PAOT, and anticipated PAOT are effects of various management actions rather than decisions being made. The FEIS displays ROS and PAOT as indicators of effect but the alternatives are not designed to achieve a particular ROS.

The comments received on ROS and PAOT are shown below.

2. The final EIS should examine the effects to the biotic community from land based recreation of all sorts rather than only focusing on affects on other users. (SDEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: The effects to the biotic community from land based recreation are disclosed in the DEIS, SDEIS and FEIS in the Biophysical Resources section.

3. The Forest Service should preserve Primitive and Semi-primitive settings and reduce Motorized and Roded natural areas. (SDEIS)

4. The Forest Service should manage use to maintain a Primitive setting. (SDEIS)

Response: The Alternatives B emphasizes a primitive setting in the river corridor.

5. The ROS process can be interpreted in many ways. Neither the Forest Service ROS Book nor the ROS User's Guide describes how the ROS can be applied to river situations.

5. The ROS system is confusing, ineffective, and should be replaced.

6. The ROS User's Guide shows how the guidelines were not followed and challenge the validity of using the PAOT concept in the DEIS.

7. Management of the experience for users of the river based on the ROS system seems to include artificial assumptions as to the type of experience that people expect.

8. The DEIS inappropriately uses the ROS and violates the Wilderness Act, especially where the Roded natural classification is used.

9. ROS classifications are of limited value for managing wilderness because they are not directly tied to any definition of wilderness character and value. The programmatic management plan should describe the connection between ROS classes and wilderness as designated in the Wilderness Act and the Central Idaho Wilderness Act rather than establishing goal s that realize a desired set of experiences. The management goals should be to maintain the wilderness character to the greatest extent possible within these laws.

10. The Forest Service should cap river use at a primitive setting. (SDEIS)

11. The Semi-primitive non-motorized classifications are inappropriate because the management goal should be to establish a Primitive setting everywhere that is not directly affected by legislatively allowed nonconforming wilderness uses.

12. The Forest Service should not allow a shift in the ROS from Primitive to Semi-primitive.

13. The Forest Service should prevent shifts in the ROS setting from Primitive to Semi-primitive and from Semi-primitive to Roded natural.1090

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

14. *The river corridors should be returned to a Primitive ROS classification. The Forest Service should allow fewer floaters on the rivers in order to provide a higher standard of excellence.*
15. *Water and land based recreation should be moved toward the Primitive end of the ROS.*
16. *The Middle Fork and Salmon River corridors should be managed to meet the Semi-primitive ROS. They should not, however, increase to Roaded natural.*
17. *The current summer use on the Middle Fork falls well within an ROS classification of Semi-primitive non-motorized.*
18. *The Forest Service should manage the Middle Fork for Primitive in winter, spring, and fall and for Semi-primitive in the summer. The Salmon should be managed to not exceed Semi-primitive motorized.*
19. *The Salmon River should also be classified as Roaded Natural ROS.*

Response: The current ROS class for the Salmon River is Semi-Primitive Motorized. All alternatives considered with the exception of Alternative C would retain the Semi-Primitive Motorized class.

20. *The ROS handbook states “there should be no bias toward primitive setting” yet in the Preferred Alternative Forest Service has violated their own ROS guidelines in developing this PAOT model.*
21. *Primitive or Semi-primitive conditions do not exist on the Middle Fork as long as inholdings with land rovers, ATV’s, and septic exist.*
22. *It is silly to attempt to apply a Primitive ROS classification to an area where the majority of visitors are outfitted, thus their basic party size exceeds the Primitive ROS of three per mile. Most visitors enter the Wilderness in parties that meet the Nonroaded ROS.*
23. *ROS should allow for maximum use and access under the prescribed guidelines rather than the minimum.*
24. *The ROS guidelines do not take into account such things as special language in the designating acts, local cultures and traditions, and site-specific considerations.*

PAOT and Theoretical Maximum Numbers.

25. **Response to all comments on Theoretical Maximum Numbers:**

Maximum Potential Use

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

The Maximum Potential Use is a calculated number that describes the largest possible number of people that could be on the river at one time under a given float boat system. The number is calculated as:

Maximum Launches / day X the Maximum People per Launch X the Maximum Length of Stay = the Maximum People At One Time or PAOT. The maximum potential use number can be useful in comparing alternatives. However, it is not an accurate predictor of anticipated actual use under a given alternative.

In order for the number to be reached on the river, all the following conditions would have to be met:

- Every permitted daily launch would have to be used and filled with the maximum number of people allowed
- Each of these launch groups would have to stay on the river for the maximum length of stay.
- This same scenario would have to occur every day through a period equal to the maximum length of stay.

Because of cancellations, and the choices of individual private permit holders on preferred party size and length of stay, and the outfitters' launch schedule and variable market demand, it is highly unlikely the maximum potential number would ever occur.

In the DEIS the analysis used the maximum potential numbers as predictors of use levels and used maximum PAOT numbers as the limiting factors in the alternatives. In the SDEIS the analysis used anticipated use levels for each alternative.

The FEIS once again displays the maximum potential PAOT as an indicator of the differences between alternatives, but not as a limiting factor.

26. In their analysis of PAOT and ROS, the Forest Service assumes that both commercial and noncommercial permits are being filled to capacity and that every group is launching every day. The Forest Service also has based their analysis on every outfitter trip lasting eight days when most outfitters do six-day trips because of limited turn around time.

27. The 510 PAOT on the Middle Fork is suspect because it assumes all commercial and noncommercial trips will be six days long and filled with the maximum number of people.

28. The Forest Service has overstated the PAOT condition and overreacted to this misconception.

29. It is not realistic to assume that all trips would ever be maximized in party size for every launch.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

- 30. The Forest Service should not calculate PAOT based on theoretical maximum use because this results in an over estimation of actual use by assuming all launch dates will be used regardless of no shows. Instead, historical data on actual average use should be used.*
- 31. Even though the average party size has been fairly constant at 10 people, the DEIS projects a theoretical maximum number for use, which assumes that all launches will be utilized and filled with the maximum party size. The Forest Service ignored the fact that the ROS instructs never to plan on the maximum theoretical capacity but to plan on a realistic practical maximum capacity.*
- 32. The reductions in Middle Fork use proposed in the DEIS, are not supported by any data. There is no reason to believe that the widespread campsite shortage and overcrowding predicted in the DEIS will actually occur.*
- 33. The DEIS assumes that use will increase to the maximum amount possible meaning that every launch will be filled with a group that is at the maximum size possible. Historical and current use levels do not support this assumption.*
- 34. The preferred alternative is based on a theoretical number that paints a scary picture of what river use could be; however it is extremely unlikely to be reached.*
- 35. The SDEIS should have disclosed that the “dumb number” was not based on actual use. The “dumb number” was the driving force for the reduced use in the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS, not actual use. (SDEIS)*
- 36. The use of potential numbers is irrelevant since actual use is much lower than what could potentially exist. (SDEIS)*
- 37. The Forest Service inappropriately continued to use the PAOT concept to quantify river use. PAOT is irrelevant for river use. This concept should not even be used for comparison sake because it does not make sense to compare things when the measure is irrelevant. (SDEIS)*
- 38. The SDEIS does not effectively defend the Forest Service’s use of PAOT regarding river use. (SDEIS)*
- 39. Historical and current use show that noncommercial use has been fairly stable at an average of 6.5-day trips with 10.5 people per party. Commercial use is only growing by one person every five to ten years, and if outfitters vary their trip length it is more likely to be shortened than lengthened.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

40. It has been reported that growth on the Middle Fork and Salmon River could be between 33,000 and 50,000, which is ludicrous. Over the last 18 years, noncommercial party size has been fairly static at 10 people per launch and commercial parties are around 23. The growth trend for noncommercial parties is about one additional person every 20 years, so overuse should not be a problem anytime soon. In addition, trip length averages 6.5 days for noncommercial parties and 6 days for commercial parties. The duration of noncommercial trips have been fairly static for the last 18 years and because of the launch schedule, commercial parties are not likely to extend their trip length. Therefore, the conclusions reached in the preferred alternative are not realistic.

41. Since use has not even come close to 1,488 PAOT, there is no reason to reduce it.

42. The projected PAOT of 1,488 for the campsites on the Middle Fork seems appropriate for an occasional high season peak. The tables in Volume II (Appendix E) suggest wide fluctuations in use on these rivers, rather than a linear increase, over the years even for commercial outfitters.

43. The Forest Service should base changes in the management plan on historic use pattern or likely future use rather than on hypothetical campsite shortages and overcrowding.

44. The Forest Service should use actual use trends to develop realistic PAOT numbers.

45. The Forest Service should acknowledge that although the theoretical maximum will never happen, the campsites could handle it.

Response: Analysis has shown that if the theoretical maximum contained in the existing plan ever did occur, the use would exceed campsite capacity on both the Middle Fork and Salmon River. See page 4-43, DEIS

46. Cannot figure out what PAOT would have to do with the type of wilderness experience a person would have within the Frank.

Response: The PAOT number represents the total number of people that could be on the river at one time, under a particular management system. With high PAOT numbers one would expect to see more people on the river than with low PAOT numbers. The number of people in an area can affect an individual's use and enjoyment of the area and feelings of solitude.

47. PAOT is flawed by definition and calculation, and therefore invalid.

48. The analysis used to determine the appropriate PAOT limit for the Preferred Alternative is questionable.

49. The PAOT analysis and the Forest Service's goal of managing the rivers as a Semi-primitive experience are good. The quantitative analysis is the only way to make a decision

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

about use levels, remembering that the thresholds stated in the DEIS were developed from exhaustive survey data.

Response: The Forest Service realizes there is a need for River PAOT coefficients. Because trail coefficients were available the least restrictive trail numbers were used to account for predominant one-way traffic moving at the same rate.

50. The concept of PAOT is not an appropriate tool to determine carrying capacity of a one dimensional wilderness river corridor because ROS definitions are based on two-way trail use while river use is generally one directional, parties tend to travel in a cohesive group rather than spread throughout the corridor resulting in fewer encounters.

51. Trail PAOT numbers should be doubled when applied to rivers because the pace of float trips is largely uniform, and parties have the same destination at the end of the trip.

52. Because of the smaller size, the Salmon River should have a larger PAOT than the Middle Fork.

PAOT Capacity vs. Encounters

PAOT is a measure of river capacity, not daily encounters.

The DEIS system for determining ROS and PAOT is not an accurate way to measure frequency of social encounters. All floaters travel in the same direction so encounters between groups become less frequent than speculated by the ROS. The configuration of the canyon also leads to a feeling of seclusion associated with being in a wilderness.

53. At the meeting in McCall, the Forest Service's poster of PAOT was misleading. Groups tend to spread out and not travel down the river all at once.

54. While campsite capacity is the ultimate limiting factor for overnight river use, the 1995 social survey suggested that camping out of sight and sound of other parties was one of the most important factors of an enjoyable river trip. However, the majority of river users indicated that this factor was being met under the current management plan. This further indicates that the PAOT calculations are not appropriate and likely used incorrect coefficients.

55. Social criteria is related closely to resource needs and physical capacity when too many boaters crowd the available space.

Specific Comments on the PAOT Numbers

56. The Forest Service should manage for 1,120 PAOT. (SDEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Alternative D and E, as described in the FEIS, results in a PAOT of 1,116 on the Middle Fork during the summer season.

- 57. The Forest Service should manage to maximize the PAOT on the Middle Fork (1400 PAOT). (SDEIS)*
- 58. The Forest Service should manage to maximize the PAOT on the Salmon River (2400 PAOT). (SDEIS)*
- 59. The Forest Service should manage to maximize PAOT numbers. (SDEIS)*
- 60. ROS should be secondary to the goal of maximizing public use of the rivers. (SDEIS)*
- 61. The Preferred Alternative does not fit the Forest Service ROS definition of the Middle Fork as Semi-primitive non-motorized and the Salmon as Semi-primitive motorized.*
- 62. The Forest Service should manage the Salmon River for Semi-primitive motorized. (SDEIS)*
- 63. The Salmon River should be managed with a higher PAOT than the Middle Fork based on size alone. (SDEIS)*
- 64. To keep the PAOT managed on the rivers, the Forest Service should give permits to campsites based on the number of people times the number of nights they want to stay.*
- 65. The Forest Service should control party size and/or length of stay by cumulative user day limits rather than by PAOT.*
- 66. The Forest Service should leave the maximum launches per day the same for both rivers. This would make the maximum PAOT for the Middle Fork 595 (40 percent of the current maximum). The maximum PAOT for the Salmon would be 1,120 (less than 47 percent of the current maximum).*
- 67. Maintaining the current maximum float boat length of stay at eight days would not result in a significant increase in the PAOT.*
- 68. The model used in the DEIS to calculate PAOT is flawed. There is no evidence that maintaining the current eight day maximum float boat length of stay would result in commercial or noncommercial trips that are longer than the current averages.*
- 69. The Forest Service should not restrict trip lengths to control PAOT. A reduction in launches would be better.*
- 70. The ROS should be set as it is outlined in Alternative 2 with the high use season maximum potential PAOT also set at Alternative 2 levels.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

71. The Forest Service should manage commercial use at 525 PAOT and noncommercial use at 560 PAOT on the Middle Fork and commercial use at 462 PAOT and noncommercial use at 448 PAOT on the Salmon River. These totals would be close to the upper limit of the Semi-primitive ROS class.

72. The Salmon River can absorb the extra 160 PAOT per day above Alternative 5 recommendations because of the large sandy campsites and the large variety of available special interest sites.

73. The figures concerning PAOT are not accurate and should be redone especially concerning jet boats.

74. The DEIS incorrectly assumed that if the maximum number of PAOT in the summer use period was lowered the use would spread out into the spring and fall seasons. However, water levels will limit use in these shoulder seasons.

75. The Forest Service should use the PAOT numbers outlined in Alternative 3 for the Middle Fork, the numbers outlined in Alternative 5 for the Salmon and a combination of alternatives 2 and 3 for the tributaries only allowing floating on Marsh Creek and the South Fork.

76. It is not necessary to manage the rivers for a Primitive ROS class during the spring and fall with PAOT capacities that do not match the high-end range for that ROS class. Natural limiting factors effectively limit off-season use.

77. In order to meet current use, the Forest Service should attempt to concentrate use. PAOT numbers should be fixed during the high use season at 1997 rates. PAOT should then be lowered during other months to the use levels outlined in Alternative 2.

78. The maximum PAOT for both the Salmon and Middle Fork Rivers is not approached in late May and early June due to high water flows and access trouble. The high use concerns should be addressed during the high use part of the season.

79. The Forest Service should manage the Middle Fork for Semi-primitive non-motorized during the summer and for Primitive the rest of the year. (SDEIS)

80. The reduction in PAOT presented in the Preferred Alternative is unnecessary and unfairly targets river users without addressing hiker or horse packer use in the river corridor.

81. In the DEIS, it seems that the interest in managing PAOT is tied mainly to river recreation. Thus, the Forest Service should not penalize non-river users in the Wilderness with limitations that would not significantly reduce the primary impact from the river users.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

82. *The conclusions of the Hunger study contradict any logic in developing the PAOT concept for rivers.*

83. *The photo and short paragraph on page 7 (of DEIS) are a biased and unrealistic perspective of the experience on the Middle Fork as related to PAOT.*

Response: The bell shaped curves displaying actual river use in the DEIS best represents the period of peak PAOT. That is the time period of most concern in regard to camp capacity and primitive experience. During this time hiker and stock supported visitors represent an extremely small portion of the visitors. The crowding picture at the Boundary Creek launch was balanced by numerous photos on the river.

(Hunger Study)

Research Standards

1. The Hunger Report is problematic because of limitations in sampling, interpretation and conclusions drawn from the data, and obvious omissions.

Response: *The Hunger study was conducted as a graduate thesis by a student working under the academic counsel and guidance of Ph.D. faculty at The Evergreen State College, University of Montana, Clemson University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and federal Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute. He adhered to traditional, objective research protocols, such as building upon previous, published social science research in the fields of personal expectations and experiences, recreation, Wild and Scenic Rivers and Wilderness (pp. 110-116, Hunger Study).*

Mr. Hunger adhered to non-bias, social science standards for random selection of days and boaters. This ensured a representative cross-section of the boating public, to account as much as possible, for factors affecting decisions such as time of season, day of week, commercial or private floater, years of experience, age, income and other demographic variables. This information is provided in Chapter Four of the Hunger Study.

The Hunger Study answers questions regarding respondent selection and distribution on pages 46-49. On page 49, Table 2 Launch Point Survey Distribution shows that a nearly equal number of private and commercial respondents completed the Middle Fork launch survey (150 and 153, respectively). On the Main Stem, numbers were different, with 240 respondents split approximately 60 percent private and 40 percent commercial.

What this means is that these numbers provide a statistically significant sample size for representing float boater use on these rivers. The study has a confidence rate for

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

representing float-boaters on the Middle Fork at 5 percent +/- and for the Main Stem at 7 percent +/-.

Standards in Approaching Objectivity

2. *The Hunger study seems to have a purist bias. The questions seem to require a negative response to the river trip.*

Response: **See previous response for description of independent research protocols.**

Mr. Hunger had his research instrument and methodology reviewed by independent and non-bias faculty, per The Evergreen State College, University of Montana, Clemson University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute. And he built the research project upon public scoping of Idaho residents, management input from agency staff, and wilderness research provided by leading wilderness faculty (pg. 38 Hunger Study).

Mr. Hunger places his research in the context of historical use (pg. 6), NEPA management direction (pg. 9), public scoping (pg. 11), and current research management tools, such as Level of Acceptable Change for identifying appropriate management indicators and standards (pg. 13). These are objective constructs for his study.

As per the second part of the question, all survey questions have a “no opinion” or “neutral” option. No respondent was faced with giving a negative response. Indeed, most questions were scaled enabling respondents to select from a range of responses. See the survey instrument in the appendix of the Hunger Study.

3. *The Forest Service should be asking river users questions such as “Was the people impact to your trip so great that you believe some of your group should have had their opportunity to experience this incredible resource take away? Should another group have been eliminated from this opportunity?”*

Response: **This type of question is contrary to scientific protocols for collecting unbiased data. It presents the answer in the question, thereby shaping how respondents treat the question. In fact, there was no predetermined outcome desired for questions presented in the survey. Questions were designed to measure visitor expectations and experiences within the framework of a float boat experience on the Middle Fork and Main Stem.**

This was an independent research project, undertaken by outside researchers, with a graduate student serving as principal investigator. Mr. Hunger had no benefit in the outcome of respondent’s answers, therefore would not have presented questions as clearly biased as the one suggested above.

Specific Study Findings and Interpretations

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

4. The Forest Service seems to be ignoring their own study - the Hunger Study-, which found users satisfied with their river experiences. The ROS social setting criteria allow encounters with 6 to 15 other parties in a semi-primitive non-motorized area such as the Middle Fork and up to 30 parties in a semi-primitive motorized area such as the Salmon River.

Response: One of the research questions presented in the Hunger Study was “Do private and commercial boaters place different rank importance on problems along the river corridors?”

A Mann-Whitney U test of independent samples determined that private and commercial respondents have minimal agreement on Middle Fork problems and high agreement on Main Stem problems (pp. 92-93, Hunger Study).

What this means is that on the Middle Fork, respondents agreed that low-flying aircraft were the top ranked problem, but they disagreed “how much of a problem it was.” Private Middle Fork respondents rated it as a “small-to-medium problem,” while commercial Middle Fork respondents rated it as a “small problem (p. 94). By either scale, Middle Fork respondents considered low-flying aircraft to be a problem.

On the Main Stem, both commercial and private respondents rated jet boat encounters on the river as a “moderate problem.” This also rated this as the top “problem” among both commercial and private float boaters (p. 96)

What this means is that float boaters did have concerns about motorized encounters on these rivers. Other areas of concern among Middle Fork and Main Stem boaters include: time in sight of other parties, number of modern structures, human-caused vegetation loss at camps, number of people seen on the river, and human tree damage at campsites. All of these issues were scaled as either a “small problem” or moderate problem.” There was variance among commercial and private respondents to where these were ranked. For more detailed review of social and environmental variables, see the tables on pages 94 –96.

5. According to the Hunger study, visitors to the Middle Fork and Salmon River are satisfied with their experience, campsites are adequate, and there is some vegetation damage in certain campsites. However, the preferred alternative suggests shifting some use to the spring, which is a critical time for vegetation to rehabilitate. In the best interest of the resource, the Forest Service should not encourage a shift in use to the shoulder season.

Response: See previous response regarding problems on the rivers.

Methodology of Measurements

6. The Hunger Study does not support the use restrictions that are proposed in Alternative 5. On the contrary, the study reports that river users do not view social

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

encounters as a negative experience, nor did they find reductions in party size, number of craft per party, or number of overall launches acceptable. Further, there is no evidence that reducing party size will improve the conditions of campsites or lessen the effects to the river resource. In fact, river managers have stated that conditions in the river corridor have improved over the last decade.

Response: The Hunger Study asked respondents to rate potential management actions within three general areas: river accessibility; natural resource management; and social issues. A range of Strongly Support to Strongly Oppose was provided for each question. Respondents could also select No Opinion as an answer.

Within river access, respondents were asked the following questions pertaining to access: How much do you support “Increasing daily launch permits?” and How much do you support “Decreasing daily launch permits?”

On the Main Stem, respondents opposed increasing daily launch permits and were neutral to decreasing daily launch permits (p. 66). On the Middle Fork, respondents were opposed to both increasing and decreasing daily launch permits (p. 83) This shows support for maintaining the current number of launches per day on both rivers.

When measuring support or opposition to number of people per float party, Main Stem and Middle Fork respondents were neutral.

When measuring support or opposition to number of boats per float party, Main Stem and Middle Fork respondents were neutral.

The Hunger Study survey instrument asked respondents to record their experiences on the river and at their campsites, over four days of their river trip. This data provides a baseline for social experience variables and their acceptability or unacceptability. On both rivers, respondents were asked to provide the number or time for each of the following questions and whether it was acceptable: seeing (#) of float parties; time within sight or other float parties; amount of time delayed at a rapid by float parties; number of times delayed at a rapid by float parties; and number of parties camped within sight or sound.

For each of the above variable, respondents specified a number of encounters or duration of time that was unacceptable. The reviewer has misinterpreted the Hunger Study by stating that “river users do not view social encounters as a negative experience.” See Table 6a for Main Stem Visitor Perceptions of Social Conditions (p. 56). See Table 14a for Middle Fork Visitor Perceptions of Social Conditions (p. 72).

What this means is that float boaters on the Main Stem and Middle Fork did establish a threshold for unacceptable social encounters. From a Wild and Scenic Rivers research perspective, these numbers provide monitoring standards for these conditions. For

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

example, Middle Fork respondents established that seeing more than three other float parties in one day were unacceptable (p. 72).

7. The Hunger Study, although valuable in some ways, did not differentiate between jet and float boat traffic on the Salmon River. A definite majority of float boaters would single out jet boat traffic as the biggest effect on their experience. The results of the study were manipulated to support the preferred alternative. The study should have included permit applicants as well as river users. The results would have been entirely different.

Response: This reviewer suggests creating one survey instrument for several different river population strata - jet boaters; float boaters; people who apply for a permit but don't get one; and commercial guides. Each group has its own unique visitor characteristics, such as jet boaters who travel upriver at a motorized rate of speed, and guides who work the river as a business. To create a combined survey for all river users would have diminished its effectiveness as a float boater survey by diluting the questions.

The Hunger Study was designed as a float boater study to establish baseline data on float boater expectations and experiences on the Middle Fork and Main Stem.

A similar survey was designed for jet boaters and administered separately. This was because jet boaters can enter the Main Stem from different portals, such as Vinegar Creek and head upriver; they can traverse the river from Corn Creek to Vinegar Creek (81.2 miles) in one day; and they have different experiences, such as using a motorized boat on their trip.

Results from the Salmon River jet boat survey are reported in the Frank Church– River of No Return Wilderness Programmatic and Operational Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement Vol. II C2-C3 (January, 1998). Survey findings are based upon 64 valid questionnaires administered by Hunger and forest personnel during the summer, 1995.

Bias and Access

8. Although the Hunger Study was biased towards a purist wilderness experience, the study still concluded that visitors are satisfied with their Middle Fork experience and would not like to have access opportunities reduced.

Response: See response to comment under “Specific Study Findings.”

9. Forest Service planners manipulated the responses to the River Visitor Survey in order to rationalize their reductions in river use. In addition, the survey was biased toward a negative experience. The survey may as well be disregarded.

Response: See responses 2 and 3 under “Standards in Approaching to Objectivity.”

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

10. *The Hunger Study results were manipulated to show support to the preferred alternative. The Forest Service planners ignored many of the comments from both commercial and non-commercial users. Overall, the Hunger Study proved that river users are happy with their river experience on the Middle Fork and do not support the reductions in use.*

Response: See previous response to comment regarding problems on the rivers.

11. *The Forest Service should have informed survey respondents on the consequences of their answers.*

Respondents and Survey Results

Response: See previous response to comment regarding bias questions. This was an independent research project. There were no presumed consequences as a result of a respondent's answers.

12. *The method used by the Forest Service to evaluate the people per mile and the people chosen to be questioned about their experiences were not an adequate representation.*

Response: See previous response about random selection of survey respondents.

13. *When collecting unbiased data, no leading questions should be asked.*

Response: No leading questions were asked. This reviewer may be concerned about the social, natural and experience variables that were measured with the survey instrument. These were based upon prior social science, public scoping and FC - RONRW management specialists. The questions were designed to establish baseline social and experiential data. The data were statistically measured to answer a number of research questions in the Hunger Study. (See Chapter Five, pages 86-98)

These questions included 1) Are visitor expectations of social and resource conditions on the rivers met? 2) Do visitors have different expectations of social and resource conditions for boating on the Main Stem and Middle Fork? 3) Are the rank importance of indicators, problems and support for management actions different between rivers? 4) Do private and commercial boaters place different rank importance on problems along the river corridors? 5) Are visitors to both rivers motivated to experience similar wilderness experience dimensions? 6) Are conflicts among visitor groups minimal and site specific?

Jet Boat Survey

14. *The user survey conducted by Hunger was biased against jet boaters.*

Response: The Main Stem float boat survey asked questions about jet boats because the use of motorized boats on the river is permitted by the Central Idaho Wilderness Act.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Questions were designed to collect data on the number of float boaters who had taken prior trips on a jet boat, would be using a jet boat during their current float trip, and encountered jet boats while on their current float trip. Their answers were used to establish baseline data on jet boat use.

A separate jet boat survey was administered for strictly jet boat users. This was because jet boaters can enter the Main Stem from different portals, such as Vinegar Creek and head upriver; they can traverse the river from Corn Creek to Vinegar Creek (81.2 miles) in one day; and they have different experiences, such as using a motorized boat on their trip.

Results from the Salmon River jet boat survey are reported in the Frank Church – River of No Return Wilderness Programmatic and Operational Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement Vol. II C2-C3 (January, 1998). Survey findings are based upon 64 valid questionnaires administered by Hunger and forest personnel during the summer, 1995.

15. *The Forest Service does not have any evidence that river users are unhappy with their experience. The Hunger Study was valuable in some ways, but it did not differentiate between jet boat and float boat traffic on the Salmon River. The majority of float boaters would report that jet boat traffic was the main factor detracting from their experience.*

Response: See previous response on the acceptability of various social and resource conditions. Also see the previous responses on using separate surveys for float boaters and jetboaters.

Comments About Both Rivers – the Middle Fork and the Salmon

(Note: for more specific information see Middle Fork, Salmon River, and River ROS – PAOT sections in this “Response to Public Comments: chapter.)

Conditions and Expectations

- 1. *There is no justification for reducing river use. The rivers are not overcrowded. Campsites are clean and wildlife is present.***
- 2. *The Forest Service justifies a need for a 50 percent reduction in use on campsite capacity. However, campsite capacity is not currently being exceeded, nor is it likely to occur.***
- 3. *The Cole Study shows that campsites are in good condition and that visitors are taking good care of the river.***
- 4. *The conditions of the resource have improved over the last 13-22 years due to the care of the river users and the Forest Service.***

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

5. There does not seem to be any evidence to support changing the management of the FC–RONR Wilderness from the current plan. The resources are in good condition.

6. Once a visitor leaves the put-in on either the Middle Fork or Salmon River, the wilderness experience begins.

Response: Alternative B in the FEIS would reduce the use levels on both the Middle Fork and the Salmon River. The new preferred alternative (D) was added in the FEIS. The alternatives provide a range of use levels including both increases and reductions in use. The Preferred Alternative (D) would maintain existing use levels and allow for some growth, but not to the extent that would be allowed under the current plan.

7. What is generating the concern that the experience on the Middle Fork and the Salmon River is not a wilderness experience?

8. The wilderness experience has diminished over the last 15 years in the FC–RONR Wilderness. Campsites have been degraded and the fish have gotten smaller.

9. The Forest Service should reduce the number of visitors to the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers because the rivers are overused, especially at the campsites.

Response: The conditions necessary to meet individual expectations for a Wilderness experience are highly variable. While managing to meet the Wilderness experience for individuals as diverse as the American people is likely impossible, the Forest Service did look at a wide range of Alternatives in the Draft and Supplemental EIS. These Alternatives were designed to offer a range of experiences from the primitive Alternative B to an emphasis on access to some user groups, Alternative C. The preferred Alternative D seeks to offer a broad range of experience opportunities, especially when considered over a 12-month time frame. For example, the Forest Service has decided to manage the Middle Fork Salmon River with an emphasis for “use and enjoyment” during the highest demand summer season, while emphasizing opportunity for a more primitive experience in the Spring, Fall and Winter months.

In terms of campsites, the Forest will attempt to minimize additional degradation by concentrating use on already impacted sites and by restoration of those most seriously degraded sites.

10. The Forest Service should prohibit the outfitters from dominating the ramp for two days.

Response: Generally all visitors understand the importance of not dominating a launch or take out Ramp. Checkers at Boundary Creek and Corn Creek will facilitate launches to prevent any party from unnecessarily dominating a launch ramp. We expect each party to respect other groups and to do the same at the take out ramps.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Solitude

11. The DEIS puts too much emphasis on outstanding opportunities for solitude. Current river use should be maintained and the emphasis changed to a Primitive and unconfined type of recreation.

12. The Forest Service needs to remember that people do not have an exclusive right to be alone in the Wilderness.

13. Wilderness visitors are willing to tolerate brief encounters with other visitors if their opportunity to access the wilderness increases.

14. The Forest Service should help floaters realize that during the peak use period, solitude might be more limited than during other times.

Response: Your opinion that current levels of solitude along the river corridor are acceptable or that use levels should not be reduced to enhance solitude are noted. Alternatives D and E would keep use levels at about their current levels, with some room for growth.

15. Opportunities for solitude have not changed very much over the last 11 years.

Response: Your opinion on lack of change in opportunities for solitude is noted.

16. It is not realistic for the Forest Service to manage for solitude near major portals. (SDEIS)

17. Solitude is not an issue in the Wilderness because visitors simply need to walk a short distance to be alone.

Response: Your opinions that while solitude is not available in some areas of the wilderness, it is available fairly nearby are noted.

18. The Forest Service should manage the Wilderness to promote solitude and primitive settings.

Response: Your preferences are noted. Alternative B would provide more opportunities for solitude than the other alternatives.

General River Management

19. The DEIS is an insult to the reader's intelligence because of the misleading facts and information.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

20. In the DEIS, the Forest Service draws conclusions not supported by their own data.

21. The conclusions of Forest Service planners regarding the FC–RONR Wilderness plan are based on flawed and incomplete data and are a waste of tax dollars.

Response: The Forest Service acknowledges your dissatisfaction with the DEIS. The agency incorporated public input to create a Supplement to the DEIS which presented new information where needed, changes in methodology and/or analysis methods, and contained six new alternatives. These changes are included in the Final EIS.

22. As the population of the United States continues to grow so does the demand for accessing the natural resources. Thus, the Forest Service should concentrate on increasing access rather than decreasing it. In addition, reducing access to the wilderness portion of the Salmon River will increase the demand on the lower portion, which is already used to near capacity.

Response: All places such as the upper portion of the Salmon River and the lower portion of the Salmon River have a physical capacity to accommodate human use. The role of the Forest Service is to balance demand for resources within the ability of the resources to accommodate that demand.

23. The DEIS inaccurately states that under the current management plan the Middle Fork and Salmon River experiences could be obtained by floating rivers that are of similar white water length located in a non-urban natural setting.

Response: The discussion was comparing relative use levels on the two rivers. The Forest Service realizes that there are limited opportunities to engage in the same activities in a similar setting to the Middle Fork or Salmon River. These experiences cannot be easily replicated in another location.

24. The Forest Service should closely examine the assessment of need for significant interventions on the issues of river traffic and of further restricting or eliminating commercial backcountry strips.

Response: The Forest Service has been delegated by congress through the CIWA to manage the Frank Church–River of No Return Wilderness as wilderness. Managing resources and human use and enjoyment of those resources including river traffic and access via air, water, or land is a large component of that mandate.

25. The Forest Service needs to realize that river conditions, weather, access, necessary skills, and natural dangers already regulate river use.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: The Forest Service realizes that river conditions influence river use. The agency further recognizes that some regulation of river use above and beyond that provided by nature is necessary in order to achieve resource protection objectives.

26. *How much recreation is enough in the FC–RONR Wilderness? (SDEIS)*

Response: Finding the appropriate level of recreation use for the wilderness is one of the more difficult issues being analyzed in this planning process. The decision makers will consider all the factors, wilderness values, resources, historical use, legislation, including public comments on this FEIS in making their decisions.

Reduce Use

27. *The Forest Service should curb the number of visitors to the Wilderness. The agency should reduce hikers, planes, boats, and bikers (SDEIS).*

28. *The Forest Service should begin a gradual decrease of historic uses.*

Response: Your preferences for reducing use are noted. Alternative B would reduce use levels in the wilderness.

Fix the Following Things Rather Than Reduce Use.

29. *Rather than decreasing use, the Forest Service should focus on management techniques that would allow current use to continue and the environmental impacts could be lessened.*

30. *The Forest Service should not reduce access to the Middle Fork, South Fork, or Salmon Rivers. Management should not limit use based on how well the resource can recover on its own. Instead they should use techniques to assist in resource recovery in order to sustain use.*

31. *The DEIS seems to focus on use limits as management tools rather than anything else. The Forest Service should consider not re-issuing cancelled permits, limiting off-season use, staggering launch times, adding additional portals, limiting trip length to six days, assigning campsites based on party size, and strengthening the number and attitude of Forest Service personnel involved with visitor management as management tools.*

32. *On the Middle Fork, the Forest Service should continue the current commercial allocation of launch dates in the pre and post season and in the control period. This would eliminate the congestion of calls from people trying to obtain cancelled dates and make the distribution of access broader by using the lottery to refill these cancelled launch dates.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

33. The Forest Service could solve the problems listed in their study by limiting trip length to six days, staggering start times, or opening a Dagger Falls launch site, and by closing campsites for a season if they look damaged by use.

34. The Forest Service should consider developing an additional launch site and additional campsites in the future.

35. Some minor modifications to the current system that the Forest Service should consider are: not plowing the road to the Boundary Creek put-in in the spring, re-open the Dagger Falls launch and the take-out at the confluence of the Middle Fork and Salmon River, assign campsites based on party size, limiting camping below Big Creek to one night, limit trip length to six-days during peak use, develop new campsites, temporarily close heavily used campsites for rehabilitation, and implementing a weighted lottery system for noncommercial floaters. With these changes, the current management plan would continue to protect the resources.

Response: Your suggestions for specific action to reduce visitor impacts are noted. These suggestions are considered and analyzed in the range of alternatives in the DEIS, SEIS and FEIS.

36. Rather than reducing access, adjustments that would limit numbers during peak use times should be possible.

37. Rather than attempting to limit river use during the peak use season, the Forest Service should try to find ways to increase visitor use while minimizing the effects to the resources.

38. The Forest Service should put some faucets into place to deal with use problems as they come up. One action that that should be included in the plan is how cancelled permits are to be handled.

Response: Options such as re-issuing the permit to smaller parties or not re-issuing the permit at all would help to limit use during the peak season without some of the reduction in party size, launches, or trip length proposed in other alternatives. The use of these mitigation measures can be applied to many of the Alternatives.

39. The Forest Service should clarify when faucets would be applied and consider using the month of July as the first step rather than the peak six weeks. There is no need to restrict the full six weeks on a first step. (SDEIS)

40. The Forest Service should not implement a faucet that would limit re-issued noncommercial permits to six-day trips. This is especially true on the Salmon River. Current use does warrant the restrictions on trip length, party size, or campsite assignment. (SDEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Your concerns for the specific details of the faucets are noted.

Education

41. The Forest Service should do more to educate users before imposing additional use limits or regulations. According to the DEIS, the limits to date are not adequately protecting the environment.

42. The Forest Service should focus on educating visitors rather than reducing access. (SDEIS)

43. The Forest Service should use all available methods to educate river users before they enter the river.

44. Educating visitors on low impact camping techniques would be a better solution to preserving the Wilderness than reducing access.

45. Rather than reducing the number of permits issued below current numbers, the Forest Service should increase enforcement and education with the proposed user fees.

Response: Education can be a very useful tool to help reduce the impacts of visitor use. The Forest Service is actively engaged in programs like the National Leave No Trace Program and development of minimum impact camping techniques. This practice would continue under any alternative.

The Forest Service refines their educational messages at the launches to incorporate new issues and concerns or messages every year. However, education is only successful to the extent that users modify their behavior in response to message.

Throughout the season, river patrols monitor resource conditions and users compliance to river rules and regulations.

46. The Forest Service should initiate an informational plan informing wilderness users of wilderness etiquette to reduce conflicts between user groups.

Response: The effort to inform wilderness users of wilderness etiquette operates at the national level with the leave-no-trace program and locally with the pre-launch presentation.

47. Ecological impacts to the campsites on both the Middle Fork and Salmon River are on the decline except during hunting season because people saturate the area during this period.

Response: The leave no trace educational programs are targeted to all users of the wilderness. The more people learn and use these techniques the less impact they will have on wilderness resources.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Use of Data

48. The Forest Service must set use limits based on data collection.

49. The Forest Service seems to have ignored data and historical information gathered to prepare the DEIS. Therefore, there is no justification for the drastic changes in management of the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

50. The Forest Service needs to gather accurate data and seek user input on noncommercial jetboat use before making a decision.

Response: The Forest Service has extensively analyzed all known and available data and historic information that we have been able to obtain. We changed some of the methods we used in the analysis between the DEIS and the SDEIS.

Monitoring

51. The Forest Service should implement a monitoring plan to test the success of the wilderness management plan. (SDEIS)

52. The Forest Service should include a monitoring program in the management plan. The agency should ask all wilderness visitors to obtain free, self-issued permits for use in order to gain information regarding amount and location of use. This data would help to establish benchmarks so that an accurate determination of trend in wilderness character can be made. (SDEIS)

Response: The Forest Service recognizes the need for accurate data collection. All of the alternatives being considered would result in better data collection for use in future planning efforts.

Forest Service Presence

53. The Forest Service should have more of a presence during peak use periods and emphasize river etiquette to noncommercial floaters.

Response: There is a fine line between accepted presence and (big brother, heavy handed) too much presence. In a primitive setting, visitor management is conducted off site to the maximum extent possible such as through orientation talks at the launch or brochures. The more the agency actively manages visitors while recreating in the wilderness the more the experience moves away from primitive. It is difficult to maintain presence without affecting the wilderness experience.

54. There should be restrictions on when and how often Forest Service trips should be launched.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: The Forest Service uses the rivers to access lands along the corridor for administrative purposes such as noxious weed treatment, archeological site monitoring, and campsite restoration work. This work is associated with restoration of the resources and we try to schedule such trips during lower use seasons whenever possible.

Other Comments

55. *The capacity of people using the river has just about been reached on the Salmon and has been exceeded on the Middle Fork.*

Response: During the high use season there are days when every launch is filled on both rivers. However, not all launches are maximum size parties.

56. *The Forest Service should standardize the procedures for floating both rivers because what is good for the Middle Fork is good for the Salmon River.*

Response: This planning process is attempting to apply consistent standards on both river corridors to the maximum extent possible while still allowing for differences mandated by the CIWA.

57. *The Forest Service should allow no visitor, noncommercial or commercial guest, to float more than one trip per month.*

Response: The Forest Service does not keep track of every individual who floats the rivers. Outfitters are permitted to take a certain number of people per trip. Non-commercial permit holders are also limited to a certain number of people per trip. We do not dictate which people a permit holder can take.

Outfitter Services

Demand and Potential Capacity

Editor's note: Three factors determine the maximum potential capacity for commercial and noncommercial uses; the maximum number of launches, the maximum number of people and the maximum length of stay. Multiplying these factors gives a maximum potential number of people at one time for each group. For each group the number of launches allowed is the basic limiting number under the current permit system. (See River ROS section of this Response to Public Comments document) This subsection responds to comments about measuring the public demand for the potential capacity and how it is being met.

58. *The SEIS incorrectly states that noncommercial demand exceeds commercial demand. Outfitters must turn away clients. (SDEIS)*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

59. *The Forest Service inaccurately states that commercial demand is being met while noncommercial demand is not. The outfitters filter out the portion of the commercial floaters that do not obtain access to the river so the agency never hears about it. The Forest Service needs to recognize this demand that is not being met. (SDEIS)*

60. *In the SEIS, the Forest Service inaccurately states that 100 percent of the commercial demand is being met while the noncommercial demand is not being met. The agency hears from the unsuccessful noncommercial lottery applicants, but the outfitters filter out the unsuccessful commercial clients. Outfitters also deal with last minute cancellations that cannot possibly be re-booked. Commercial use on the Middle Fork would definitely grow if additional commercial launches were granted. (SDEIS)*

Response: The SDEIS says on page 1-13 “the Forest Service is meeting virtually 100 percent of the commercial demand for such trips, as witnessed by the unused capacity that is allocated to outfitters.” A similar statement is found on page 2-31.

On the Middle Fork, commercial outfitters use very nearly every available launch during the summer. On the Salmon River there are a number of commercial launches that go unused every year. The statements in the SDEIS concerning commercial demand are more indicative of the situation on the Salmon River than on the Middle Fork.

Furthermore, the number of launches and the number of clients are not indicative of the total market demand. Outfitters may be turning away prospective clients because the outfitter has filled the launch or because the launch schedule does not fit the client’s plans.

The noncommercial demand is based on the number of people applying for private launches through the lottery.

61. *The Forest Service claim that outfitters are only using 15 percent of their service days is misleading. That number is based on a ten-day potential length of stay. The total percentage of use for the Salmon River over the last ten years shows that outfitters have used a higher percentage of their potential use than noncommercial floaters have used. (SDEIS)*

62. *The Forest Service should not re-allocate commercial use to the noncommercial sector at this time. Currently, outfitters are using 21.4 percent of their allocation while noncommercial floaters are using 17 percent of theirs. Changes should come in the permitting system for noncommercial floaters before changes are made in the allocation. (SDEIS)*

Response: Service days only show part of the picture. The commercial service days and the percentages are based on maximum potential numbers – launches, times number of people times, length of stay, compared to the actual use. On the Salmon River only about 60 percent of the commercial launches are consistently used each summer and launch schedules make it so outfitters very rarely use the maximum 10 days stay. So, the total actual use percentages

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

appear quite low. However, the percentages are also low for noncommercial users because they choose average party sizes of about 11 people (the maximum is 30) and generally choose to stay about 6 days per trip (maximum is 8).

On the Middle Fork both groups use nearly every available summer launch while the average lengths of stay are 6 commercial and 7 noncommercial (8 days maximum for each). The average party sizes are 18 commercial (30 maximum) and 9 noncommercial (24 maximum). (See SDEIS page 1-23)

63. *The Forest Service needs to remember that the average noncommercial party size does not reflect the demand for noncommercial permits. However, the average commercial party size does reflect demand.*

Response: The number of people applying for launch permits through the lottery is an indicator of the demand for noncommercial permits. The average party size for noncommercial trips is indicative of the preference of party size of those who were fortunate to have received a permit.

The number of clients an outfitter has on trips is only one indicator of the commercial demand. (See comments above in this subsection.)

64. *Noncommercial demand justifies a need to increase the number of launches available on the Middle Fork and Salmon River. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your opinion that noncommercial demand justifies an increase is noted.

65. *The Forest Service needs to realize that there is little to no unused commercial capacity on the Middle Fork. (SDEIS)*

Response: The Forest Service realizes that during the control season on the Middle Fork nearly every commercial launch is used and that the launch schedule does not allow most outfitters to use more than 6 day trips. Also many of outfitters take large parties on the Middle Fork. (See comments above in this subsection.)

66. *Any issue involving unused commercial launches can be dealt with outside the scope of the final during the five-year launch review with individual outfitters. The agency should clearly outline launch date management rules within the Outfitter-Guide Administration Guidebook and implement these rules. (SDEIS)*

67. *The Forest Service should deal with outfitters who are not using their allocation outside the scope of the EIS process. (SDEIS)*

68. *The Forest Service has management tools for dealing with outfitters who are under utilizing their allocation. The agency should use those tools to deal with non-use. (SDEIS)*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: The issue of unused commercial launch can be dealt with outside the NEPA process. The unused launches were discussed in the SDEIS as part of the overall discussion of river uses. The Forest Service will continue to manage commercial use according to manual direction.

Don't Reduce Outfitted Use

69. The Forest Service should not reduce outfitted services on the Middle Fork or Salmon River.

70. The Forest Service should not reduce commercial use. Launch dates with outfitters are difficult to obtain. (SDEIS)

71. A reduction in access to the outfitters would result in higher competition for commercial services causing the price to go up making the rivers inaccessible to the common public.

72. By reducing access to the rivers the Forest Service will drive the cost of an outfitted trip up to a point where only the rich will be able to float the rivers.

Response: Your preferences for not reducing outfitted use are noted. A reduction in the number of launches could cause an increase in price if the demand for trips greatly exceeds the number of service days available. However, not all the control season commercial launches on the Salmon River are currently being used. On the Middle Fork very nearly all the summer season commercial launches are used.

73. Limiting use to what was regulated prior to 1964 would be destructive to people who have built their lives around the rivers.

Response: The Forest Service agrees.

74. The Forest Service should allow commercial trips to increase on the Salmon River as a trade off for no increase in commercial use on the Middle Fork.

Response: Your suggestion for a trade off for commercial launches between the two rivers is noted. The current plan allows more summer season commercial launches on the Salmon River than are now being used. The summer commercial launches on the Middle Fork are nearly all used.

Buy Out Commercial Permits

75. The Forest Service should consider buying out existing commercial permits from willing outfitters. Permits the agency is able to buy out should either be retired or reallocated to smaller parties.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

76. The Forest Service should buy out commercial permits as they come up for sale and limit use of the resource for both commercial and noncommercial floaters in number of PAOT that were bought out.

77. Another option for limiting growth would be to purchase and retire permits that come up for sale.

78. In order to increase the permits available for noncommercial boaters while still recognizing the need for commercial services, the Forest Service should buy licenses from outfitters wishing to sell their businesses.

79. The Forest Service should buy out commercial permits as they come up for sale and limit use of the resource for both commercial and noncommercial parties in number of PAOT that were bought out.

80. The Forest Service should use the fee demonstration money to buy out outfitters. (SDEIS)

Response: The Forest Service has no legal authority to purchase permits or buy out businesses. The agency does have the authority to retire a permit for non-use. This direction and process is outlined in the Outfitter and Guide Guidebook.

Shift Use from Commercial to Noncommercial

81. In the SEIS, the discussion on page 1-13 titled “Allocation of float boat opportunities between commercial and noncommercial” is biased toward shifting some commercial use to noncommercial boaters. (SDEIS)

Response: Your concern about a possible bias in the SDEIS is noted. Discussing the possible reasons for shifting some unused commercial use launches to noncommercial does not necessarily indicate a bias. (See Demand and Potential Capacity subsection above)

83. The Forest Service should not transfer commercial use to the noncommercial sector by limiting commercial parties to 20 people. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preference is noted. Alternatives that suggest limiting commercial party sizes do so to reduce the overall number of people on the river, not to transfer the numbers directly to noncommercial. Alternative that propose shifting use from commercial to noncommercial generally propose shifting launches.

84. The Forest Service should have outfitters give back four of their 10 days between launches making this six days. (SDEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Under the current system the maximum length of stay for commercial and noncommercial trips is 10 days. The outfitters generally use six days for their trips and the average noncommercial trip is six days. When either user group uses less than the maximum length of stay those user days go unused. There are no extra days to give back or to be used for additional launches. Often the outfitters only have two days between trips. They use the time between take out and launch to prepare for the next trip and to give their employees a short break.

85. *The Forest Service should consider the inappropriateness of this statement since Alternative 6 would manage growth by the variable trip length and party size option. Further, the agency should not develop a capped pool of commercial use allowing for some undesignated amount of growth. No rules for allocating use from the pool have been defined and there should be no cap on commercial use unless noncommercial use is also capped. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your concerns about the variable trip length option, a capped pool of commercial use and equitable caps on use are noted. The variable trip length option, considered in alternatives 6 and the final decision, would encourage noncommercial parties to continue to choose smaller party sizes by tying party size and length of stay together – as party size increases length of stay decrease. On the Middle Fork, where nearly all noncommercial launches are used, this system could allow growth in party sizes, with a commensurate decrease in average length of stay. The commercial use on the Middle Fork would have a little room for growth in party size.

On the Salmon River the variable trip length option would also be used for noncommercial float boat parties. Each year there are consistently a number of commercial launches that are not used. Some of these unused launches could be used as a pool for commercial users. Some could be transferred to noncommercial users. (See subsection on Variable Trip length option below)

Equity

82. *In order to reduce the number of commercial floaters, the Forest Service should reduce the number of commercial launches not party size. Those launches should be shifted into noncommercial launches to attempt to meet the demand. Since noncommercial parties tend to be smaller, effects on resources would be reduced.*

Response: Your preference for shifting commercial launches to noncommercial use is noted. Alternative D would shift some of the consistently unused commercial launches on the Salmon River to noncommercial use. (Also see Commercial and Noncommercial subsection, in the Equity section of this Response to Public Comments)

132. *Commercial and noncommercial parties should have the same maximum party size limitations. (SDEIS)*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

170. The Forest Service should create less of a gap between commercial and noncommercial launches and party size.

Response: The higher number of people allowed on commercial trips, (30 commercial vs. 24 non-commercial) on the Middle Fork is to account for guides. On the Salmon River the number of daily launches, 4 each and the maximum party sizes are the equal, 30 each. (See the section on Equity and Conflict in this document on Response to Public Comments.)

Non-Use

86. The Forest Service is correct in attempting to limit growth of river use. They should achieve this by revoking commercial permits that have not been used for a given length of time.

87. If an outfitter does not use any of their launches for two years, the Forest Service should take the permit and make it available to a different outfitter or make it an additional launch available to noncommercial parties via the lottery.

88. The Forest Service should base whether or not to renew a commercial permit on past performance of the outfitter. (DEIS)

Response: The Forest Service has a standard policy to deal with non-use by outfitters, which can be found in the agency Outfitter and Guidebook. On the Salmon River the existing commercial permits are used at varying levels. A number of launches are consistently not used by some of the outfitters.

Access

(Note: for more information on Access see sections on River ROS, Middle Fork, and Salmon River.)

Increase Access

89. The Forest Service should allocate more permits to float the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers, not less.

90. The Forest Service should allow unrestricted kayaking and canoeing on the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

91. The Forest Service should maintain or increase current river use levels.

92. The Forest Service should not put a cap on river use.

93. The Forest Service should not restrict noncommercial use in any way.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

94. The Forest Service must attempt to retain the highest use from June to August because this is when families with school age children are on vacation.

95. The Forest Service should allow for a slight increase in river use. (SDEIS)

96. The Forest Service should allow more access to commercial parties on the rivers.

Response: Your preferences for allowing use levels to continue to grow are noted.

Don't Reduce Access

97. The Forest Service should not reduce access to the rivers of the FC-RONR Wilderness because society benefits as a whole as more people are allowed to experience the rivers.

98. The Forest Service should consider alternatives that do not limit the number of permits allocated to noncommercial boaters.

99. The Forest Service should continue to allow current river use levels on the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

100. If the number of floaters was reduced, I fear that the "land of no use" constituency would be given more ammunition to oppose any further efforts to protect the few remaining unspoiled areas within Idaho.

101. The current use and its effects do not warrant the drastic reduction proposed in the DEIS. The proposal of 50 percent reductions to Middle Fork use and 30 percent reductions on Salmon River use goes too far.

102. By reducing access to the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers, the Forest Service is actually denying wilderness experiences to taxpayers.

103. Restricting access on the Middle Fork and Salmon River will make drawing a permit via the lottery nearly impossible.

104. The Forest Service should not reduce access opportunities to the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers for noncommercial boaters.

105. It is not in the best interest of the general public to reduce access to the rivers. Reductions would eliminate the average users from being able to afford a river trip.

106. There is no justification to reduce use of the Middle Fork or Salmon River.

107. The Forest Service should cap river use with the last few years as a guideline.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

108. The Forest Service should only cap use to protect water quality. (SDEIS)

109. River user surveys reflect visitor satisfaction with current use levels. Concerns with the current management plan are only minor.

110. The Forest Service should not further reduce access to the FC-RONR Wilderness beyond the original agreement in 1980. If this is not going to be the case, the agency should place the area back into general multi-use. (SDEIS)

111. The reductions in river use are not supported by evidence of environmental degradation, rapid annual growth rate, public opinion, Congressional intent, or needs assessment.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining or not reducing the current use levels are noted.

Reduce Access

112. The Forest Service should limit use on both the Middle Fork and Salmon River below current levels because of disruptions to wildlife.

113. The Forest Service should limit float permits to prevent degradation of the resources, which is happening at current use levels.

114. The Forest Service should not increase use levels on the rivers. (SDEIS)

115. The proposal in the DEIS to limit total river use is appropriate.

116. The Forest Service proposal to reduce permits for floating the Middle Fork and Salmon River is appropriate.

117. The Forest Service should maintain float boat use at the 1980 levels on the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

118. The Forest Service is correct to attempt to reduce human impacts and crowding on both the Middle Fork and Salmon River.

119. The Forest Service should reduce river use to protect the area, but a 50 percent reduction is too drastic. (SDEIS)

120. The Forest Service should reduce use levels on the rivers. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preferences for reducing use on the rivers are noted.

Eliminate Use

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

121. If possible, the Forest Service should eliminate Middle Fork and Salmon River use completely.

Response: Proper use and enjoyment of the wilderness is a key element of the Wilderness act of 1964. Totally eliminating use would be inconsistent with the legal mandate.

122. The Forest Service should not shift use to the fall because of wildlife concerns.

Response: Your concerns for the effects of shifting use to the fall on wildlife are noted.

Launches

Maintain - Don't Reduce Launches

123. The Forest Service should maintain the number of launches from Boundary Creek and Corn Creek because the number of trips that currently go down the rivers has not adversely affected the resources, and a reduction in launches would create a recreational opportunity that only the rich could afford to access.

124. There is no need to reduce the number of launches below current levels. The busiest day ever apparently was July 17, 1995 when 901 people were on the river, which equates to nine people per mile. This is not too many.

125. The current lottery system is fair enough except there should be more noncommercial launches available. Perhaps, one additional launch every other or every third day or a reduction in party size would make it possible.

126. Commercial and noncommercial parties should have an equal number of launches. There should be six launches per day on both the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

127. Because people should expect to see others on the rivers and because having multiple parties on the river enhances safety, the Forest Service should not reduce the number of permits issued on the Middle Fork or Salmon River.

128. If the number of permits issued or party sizes were limited it would make drawing a permit even more difficult and the pressure from people wanting to go on a given permit would be intense.

Response: Your preferences for increasing or maintaining the number of launches allowed per day are noted.

Reduce Launches

129. The Forest Service should reduce the number of launches on each river to five per day with three noncommercial and two commercial launches.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

130. The Forest Service should consider reducing the number of launches in half for one week per month to provide people applying for these dates a more isolated experience despite tougher competition for access.

131. The Forest Service should allow only one commercial and one noncommercial launch per day. 239

Response: Your preferences for decreasing the number of launches allowed per day are noted.

Party Size

Reduce Party Sizes

133. The Forest Service should reduce party size for commercial and noncommercial groups.

134. The Forest Service should reduce maximum commercial party size.

135. The Forest Service should limit party size rather than total permits to reduce overall river use.

136. The Forest Service should consider setting party size limits between 3 and 26 people for commercial and noncommercial parties on the Middle Fork as well as Salmon River because groups larger than 15 people can be difficult to control and smaller parties have less impact on the resources.

137. The Forest Service should limit parties larger than five people. (SDEIS)

138. The Forest Service should set the maximum party size at 16 people for commercial and noncommercial parties.

139. The Forest Service should reduce party size for commercial and noncommercial parties by 20 percent.

140. In order to reduce PAOT, commercial party size should be restricted to 20 to 24 people on the Middle Fork and Salmon River. (SDEIS)

141. The Forest Service should limit float trips to a maximum of 15 people per launch. (SDEIS)

142. The Forest Service should limit river trips to a maximum of 20 people including guides. (SDEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

143. The Forest Service should reduce party size rather than trip length to limit use. Smaller parties with long trips are preferred. (SDEIS)

144. The Forest Service should reduce party size for commercial and noncommercial groups to 15 or less. Outfitters could charge more to make up the difference. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preferences and suggestions for reducing party sizes are noted.

145. The Forest Service should implement user day limits rather than party size limitations.

146. Party size should be reduced by either restricting the number of people or by a user day limit for each permit. Reducing with a user day limit would be preferred because it would allow smaller groups to have longer trips.

Response: Alternatives B, D and E use a variable trip length option that is similar to a user day limit. (See subsection on Variable Trip length option below)

Maintain – Don't Reduce Party Sizes

147. The Forest Service should maintain the party size limits as they are under the current plan.

148. The proposed reductions in party size and access will make it near impossible for average families to experience the Wilderness.

149. Reducing party size is not the best approach to protecting the river or enhancing the wilderness experience.

150. The reductions in party size seem to be based on sociological theories rather than actual resource damage.

151. The Forest Service should not reduce maximum party size as drastically as has been proposed.

152. Reducing party size by half does not seem warranted.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining or not reducing the maximum party sizes are noted.

153. The noncommercial average party size has not changed in years and commercial use is only growing at a rate of about one person every five years. Without more risk of growth in river use the Forest Service cannot justify the huge reductions in access.

154. The Forest Service's historical data shows almost no growth in annual river use.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Our latest analysis of growth on the Middle Fork shows about 1-1/2 percent annual growth and the Salmon River growth has slowed to about ½ percent.

155. The Forest Service should not reduce noncommercial party size to ten people. Noncommercial and commercial party size limitations should be the same. Commercial guides should be counted in the commercial total. (SDEIS)

156. The Forest Service should count guides into the total commercial party size. (SDEIS)

Response: The guides are counted in the total party size on both the Middle Fork and the Salmon River.

157. The Forest Service should reduce party size only if additional launches would result. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preference for only reducing party size to create additional launches is noted.

Variable Trip Length Option – Party Size

158. The Forest Service should implement the variable trip length option in order to give parties the opportunity to take longer trips. (SDEIS)

159. Forest Service should encourage small parties by offering longer stays (up to eight days) for smaller parties. Smaller parties have less of a visual and noise related impact on visitor's wilderness experience. (SDEIS)

160. Rather than reducing the maximum noncommercial party size on the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers, the Forest Service should offer incentives in order to encourage small parties.

Response: Your preferences for a variable trip length option are noted. Alternatives B, D and E offer a variable trip length option. .

161. If adopted, the Forest Service should apply the variable trip length option equally to commercial and noncommercial parties. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preference for applying the variable trip length option to both commercial and noncommercial parties is noted.

162. If the Forest Service adopts the variable trip length option they should consider having the number of launches be dynamic depending on the size of the successful parties. Party size would have to be determined at the time of the lottery. (SDEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Your suggestion for varying the number of launches depending on the party size is noted. Varying all three of the factors – launches, party size, and length of stay would make for a very complicated and cumbersome lottery system.

Party Size and Safety

163. The Forest Service should not reduce noncommercial party size to a maximum of ten people because boater safety would be compromised; fifteen people would be more appropriate.

164. Noncommercial party size should be 15 for safety reasons.

165. The Forest Service should not reduce noncommercial party size too drastically because small parties can be a safety concern. (SDEIS)

166. The Forest Service should not reduce noncommercial party size too drastically because safety would be compromised. (SDEIS)

Response: Your concerns for safety and your preference for 15 people per party are noted.

Party Size Miscellaneous

167. The Hunger Study provided no evidence to justify a reduction in party size, and the users who were surveyed did not find the river crowded or suffering environmentally.

Response: The Hunger Study did not provide information that alone would lead to reductions in use.

168. The Forest Service should include guides in the maximum commercial party size.

169. Guides should count in the commercial party size total.

Response: The outfitters and their guides are counted in the commercial party size total along with the clients.

171. Although outfitters are causing the bulk of the impact problems due to 30 person party sizes, Alternative 5 actually penalizes noncommercial groups by maintaining smaller party sizes for noncommercial parties and larger for commercial groups.

172. Alternative 5 unfairly limits boater numbers to six per party. Land-based visitors are not limited despite the fact that they impact the area more, especially with horses.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Your concerns about Alternative 5 are noted. The alternative would limit commercial parties to 15 people and noncommercial parties to 10 people. Alternative 5 is no longer the preferred alternative. (See Don't Reduce Party Sizes above.)

Length of Stay

Maintain – Don't Reduce Trip Length

173. The Forest Service should maintain the current options for trip length in order to provide opportunities for visitors to explore the river corridors and layover, to enhance boater safety allowing time to scout rapids, and because it can be difficult to float long days, especially at low water.

174. The Forest Service should recognize that reducing length of stay would increase rather than decrease congestion on the rivers and create additional crowding rather than limiting the number of encounters. With a staggered schedule parties taking longer trips will be behind parties taking shorter trips and in front of parties launching later on the river.

175. The Forest Service should maintain the eight and ten day maximum trip lengths for the Middle Fork and Salmon River to allow visitors to explore the canyons beyond the rivers enjoying the Wilderness.

176. A six-day trip length is not enough time to float the rivers. Seven days would be much more reasonable.

177. Limiting trip length to five days is not appropriate. It may even increase jetbacks.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining or not reducing the maximum lengths of stays are noted.

Reduce the Length of Stay

178. Reducing the length of stay for commercial and noncommercial parties is acceptable and would still provide an opportunity for layover days. The Forest Service should maintain the historical ratio between commercial and noncommercial use.

179. The Forest Service should limit the maximum trip length to six days because six days is enough time for maximum enjoyment of the rivers.

180. Noncommercial parties should be allowed a maximum trip length of seven days. Commercial parties should be allowed five to six day trips.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

181. A five-day maximum trip length on the Salmon River and a six-day maximum trip length on the Middle Fork are acceptable.

182. The maximum trip length on the Middle Fork should be maintained, but on the Salmon River it should be reduced to five nights.

183. The Forest Service should limit all river trips to a five or six day maximum. (SDEIS)

184. The Forest Service should limit all river trips to a six or seven day maximum. (SDEIS)

185. The Forest Service should limit the maximum trip length during peak use to avoid congestion.

Response: Your preference for reduced lengths of stays are noted.

186. The Forest Service should make some allowance on trip length for preferred types of trips and also for the practicality of the number of river miles a group can make in a day at certain water levels. The trip length also limits the amount of other activities a party can participate in such as fishing and hiking.

Response: Alternatives B, D and E offer a variable trip length option that provides incentives for smaller smaller party sizes by allowing for a longer length of stay.

187. The Forest Service needs to recognize that it is nearly impossible for outfitted trips to be eight days long.

Response: The current outfitters' launch schedules generally give outfitters launches every eight days during the summer season. The schedule and necessary turn around times make it impractical for outfitters to have trips longer than six days during the summer.

188. The Forest Service should allow eight or nine day trips in order for visitors to have layover days.

189. The Forest Service should allow commercial and noncommercial parties layover days at chosen campsites in order for visitors to explore areas around the river corridor.

190. The Forest Service should not allow layovers at popular campsites.

191. The Forest Service should allow layovers.

192. The Forest Service should limit campsites to a 30 person maximum.

Response: Your support for and against layovers is noted.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

193. The Forest Service should limit length of stay to three to four days at any one site along the river outside of the control season. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preference for limiting the length of stay at campsites outside the control season to four days is noted.

194. Alternative 5 reduces trip length too much.

Response: Your dissatisfaction with Alternative 5 is acknowledged. Alternative 5 is no longer the preferred alternative. (See “Don’t Reduce Length of Stay” above.)

Launches, Party Size, Trip Length, Combinations

195. The Forest Service should reduce party size to 16 people on the Middle Fork and 20 people on the Salmon River and allow more launches per day creating more access opportunities.

196. In order for visitors to have their desired type of experience, the Forest Service should provide users with flexibility in determining length of stay and group size.

197. Cutting party sizes while maintaining the number of launches will not make people feel any different about crowding within their own party, and it will do nothing to alleviate the feelings of crowding when parties encounter each other.

198. The Forest Service should issue more permits for smaller parties and allow smaller parties to have a longer trip length.

199. Noncommercial floaters should be permitted for four launches with a maximum party size of 16 and four launches with a maximum party size of 8. This would put a maximum of 96 noncommercial floaters on the river at one time, less than under the current plan, and increase the opportunities for noncommercial floaters to draw a permit.

200. In order to cap river use, the Forest Service should reduce commercial and noncommercial party size and commercial use in general, but they should not change the maximum trip length.

201. The Forest Service should restrict use by reducing party size and commercial use.

202. The Forest Service should control party size and trip length by cumulative user day limits.

203. In order to reduce impacts on the larger campsites, the Forest Service should reduce maximum party size. However, they should not reduce trip length, especially in the spring and fall when there is less travel.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

204. The Forest Service should reduce the number of floaters on both the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers by reducing the number of launches and party size.

205. The Forest Service should reduce maximum party size to 10 or 15 people and increase the number of permits issued.

206. The Forest Service should reduce the maximum party size for commercial and noncommercial parties, but maintain the current trip length.

207. The Forest Service should reduce party size and increase the number of launches so that people have increase opportunities to obtain a permit to float the Middle Fork or Salmon River. 1284

294. Commercial party size and number of launches should be maintained. Noncommercial party size should be reduced and number of launches increased so that people have increase opportunities to obtain a permit to float the Middle Fork or Salmon River.

208. The Forest Service should consider increasing the number of noncommercial launches to five per day and reducing the maximum party size to 20. The result would still be a maximum of 96 people launching every day and better odds for noncommercial users to obtain access.

209. The visual impact of seeing other parties depends more on number of parties than party size. Seeing two parties of 15 people has more impact than seeing one party of 30 people.

210. Because smaller parties use small campsites and have less impact on resources, the Forest Service should allow more launches of smaller parties. This would allow the Forest Service to close or restrict use of the larger campsites for a few years to enhance rehabilitation. Eight to ten launches per day with parties of 12 people and a seven-day trip length would be desirable.

211. The Forest Service should reduce the maximum party size for commercial and noncommercial parties and allow more noncommercial launches. In addition, the Forest Service should allow up to and eight-day trip length on the Middle Fork and up to ten days on the Salmon River.

212. On both the Middle Fork and Salmon River, the number of trips and the number of people on the trips should be capped, and noncommercial floaters should be given a greater proportion of the permits.

213. Length of stay should be set at a four night, five day maximum.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

214. The Forest Service should implement a 100-user day limit for the Middle Fork and a 125-user day limit for the Salmon River. Under this system, trip length would be determined by party size with guide included in the commercial total. For example, a party of 20 people could launch for a five-day trip on the Middle Fork or a party of 12 could launch for an eight-day trip.

215. The Forest Service should increase opportunities to float the river by reducing party size and increased launches. (SDEIS)

216. The Forest Service should shorten the trip length for large groups, retain cancelled permits, and assign campsites based on party size, trip length, and number of launches per day rather than reducing access. (SDEIS)

Response: Your comments and suggestions are among many that contain a mix of ideas for varying two or all three of the factors governing river use – launches, party size, and length of stay. All of the comments and suggestions are noted. The Forest Service cannot design alternatives for every possible permutation of these factors and varying combinations of commercial and noncommercial use. However, many of the suggestions are within the range of the alternatives.

Shoulder Season Use

Shifting Use – Summer to Spring and Fall

217. The preferred alternative is based on the flawed assumption that if summer access is reduced floaters will use the river during March, April, October, and November. This is a flawed assumption.

218. It is ridiculous for Forest Service planners to believe that if people are denied access during the current permit season they will go down the river in March, April, October, or November. Currently, the noncommercial demand during the permit season cannot be satisfied, and these boaters do not use the river during the shoulder season as a result.

219. Reducing use during the summer will not result in visitors utilizing launches during the shoulder seasons. Competition for noncommercial permits demonstrates the time period during which people want to access the rivers.

220. The assumption that if river use levels during the permit season are reduced then boaters will utilize the shoulder season, and thus no loss of revenue for surrounding communities is not based on actual data or historic use patterns.

221. There appears to be no rationale for the restrictions to use outside of the permit season.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

222. Extending the floating season into early and late months does not make sense. If floaters wanted to use the river at this time of year they would already be doing so.

223. Historically, there is very little river use during the shoulder seasons. This is in part because families with children vacation during the summer months.

224. The extension to the lottery season outlined in Alternative 5, was developed without an accurate picture of preseason boating and without proper scoping of preseason boaters. The extension basically takes away the option of an early season run on the Middle Fork and turning the corner and running the Salmon.

225. The DEIS claims that shoulder season use could grow. However, if use increases the Forest Service could control the growth. Also, water levels, inaccessibility due to snow, and typical family vacation schedules keep many users from visiting the rivers outside of the control season.

Response: In the DEIS the Forest Service wilderness planners assumed that in alternatives that lowered the use below the current actual maximum levels, the displaced use would move to the shoulder seasons creating no net loss in use. As noted in your comments, because of cold weather, high water in the spring or low water in the fall, early season access problems, and the traditional summer vacation schedules most of the displaced users would choose not to shift their use to the shoulder seasons. The Forest Service acknowledges that the redistribution of use was an incorrect assumption.

226. The Forest Service should shift some river use to the shoulder seasons, particularly the fall.

Response: The Forest Service can reduce use during the summer season and allow and encourage more use in the spring and fall. However, the Forest Service cannot force a shift in use from one season to another. (See response immediately above.)

Use Levels Spring and Fall

227. Float boaters should be allowed more access prior to the permit season on both the Middle Fork and Salmon River.

Response: Your preference for increased access in the spring is noted.

228. Rather than encouraging spring and fall season use, the Forest Service should concentrate use during the summer. Wildlife needs to be able to use the corridor during the spring and fall seasons.

229. During the fall and spring seasons, there should be two launches total with the recipient of the launch having the Freedom of Choice on whether or not to use an outfitter.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

230. The Forest Service should limit off-season use to just one launch per day.

Response: Your preferences for not encouraging or for limiting use in the off-season are noted.

231. Pre and post-season use will never be as heavy as use during the peak use season. Therefore, the Forest Service should allow the same numbers of launches outside the peak use season as are allowed inside. This will allow visitors some flexibility to plan off-season trips. If the Forest Service begins a reservation system for this time period, then consideration should be given to those who have used them in the past.

232. The Forest Service should maintain summer use at current levels. Other season use should be maintained, but the Forest Service should monitor and allow for changes in the future.

233. The Forest Service should not restrict use outside of the permit season.

234. High water during the spring and low water during the fall limit the number of people on the rivers during these periods resulting in minimal impacts.

235. Since spring and fall use is self-regulating, the Forest Service should not change current management.

236. The Forest Service should not impose limitations during the noncontrol season; the water flow is self-limiting. A self-issued permit system for data collection would be fine.

237. The Forest Service should not restrict use outside the summer high use season.

238. Not many people visit the Wilderness when it weather conditions are cold and wet or when the rivers are at high water levels.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining current spring and fall use levels, or for having no limits, are noted. The suggestions and comments are covered within the range of the alternatives.

239. The permit system should allow more permits during high water. If the Forest Service would allow more trips with smaller parties, the odds of obtaining a permit would increase, but impacts to river corridor would not change. (DEIS)

Response: During high water there are fewer campsites available on the rivers. For example, on the Middle Fork 37 out of 102 campsites either lose capacity or are under water during high water. If spring use increases, the condition of campsites could degrade due to trampling of plants during early season growth and increased erosion when soils are moist.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

For more discussion regarding campsite conditions, refer to the effects section, chapter 4, for each alternative.

240. Float boaters are the only river users who camp during the spring and fall seasons. The Forest Service should study use during the spring and fall.

241. Visitors to the Salmon River never see any Forest Service personnel during the fall and spring seasons at or below Corn Creek. This indicates that the Forest Service does not have enough knowledge about shoulder season use. The only information they have must come from commercial guide input, which may be why the proposal suggests a ten commercial and four noncommercial jetboat ratio.

Response: Permits are required year round for the Middle Fork. Using these permits and other information gathered during the spring and fall season the Forest Service will have more useful information for future planning efforts.

Stewardship

242. The Forest Service should continue to require use of firepans and port-a potties, emphasizing the pack it in, pack it out philosophy. (DEIS)

All Same

243. The Forest Service should hold commercial and noncommercial parties to the same stewardship standards such as waste removal. (DEIS)

244. The Forest Service should require all river corridor users, including floaters, jetboaters, and hikers, to use firepans and port-a potties within and outside of the permit and/or control season. (DEIS)

245. The Forest Service should require all visitors using the river corridor, boaters, packers, pilots, fishermen, etc., to follow the same rules such as carrying fire pans and carrying out waste.

246. The Forest Service should develop an alternative that basically maintains current use, but focuses more attention on campsite use by non-river users. River runners tend to take better care of the campsites than do the non-river users, and conditions are better in the middle of August than at the end of April or beginning of May. Specifically, Sheepeater, Marble Creek, and Camas Creek get degraded.

247. The Forest Service should require all visitors using the river corridor, boaters, packers, pilots, fishermen, etc., to follow the same rules such as carrying fire pans and carrying out waste.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

248. All river corridor users, including packers and hunters, should be required to use minimal impact camping techniques.

249. The Forest Service should require all wilderness visitors to use the same leave-no-trace standards. (SDEIS)

250. The Forest Service should require land-based visitors to comply with river standards when camping in the corridors such as using firepans and packing out waste. (SDEIS)

Response: Your concerns and suggestions for stewardship requirements are noted. All alternatives being considered require all parties to follow the same stewardship rules. Use of specialized equipment, such as firepans and porta-potties, is a proven method of resource protection and their use would continue under any of the alternatives being proposed in the Final EIS.

Exemptions

251. The Forest Service should not require parties who are self-supported and can prove that they have a stove and fuel should not be required to carry a firepan and ash container. (DEIS)

Response: Your preferences for exempting some parties from the fire pan requirement are noted.

Stewardship Education

252. The Forest Service should do a better job of educating visitors about firepan and port-a potty use and other stewardship issues. (DEIS)

253. The Forest Service needs to educate visitors accessing the river outside the float season on low impact camping because this is when the resource is most sensitive to impacts. (DEIS)

254. Before the Forest Service issues a permit they should ensure that the trip leader has knowledge of stewardship, river and land ethics, and river etiquette. (DEIS)

255. The Forest Service should make sure that groups have ample SCAT boxes to support the number of people in the party. (DEIS)

Response: All alternatives being considered require all parties to follow the same stewardship rules. Use of specialized equipment, such as fire pans and porta-potties, is a proven method of resource protection and their use would continue under any of the alternatives being proposed in the Final EIS.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

(Campsite Capacity and Condition)

Campsites Missing from the DEIS Inventories

- 1. Forest Service planners discussed the potential for overcrowding at campsites, yet they omitted 12 campsites in their campsite analysis. All available campsites need to be included in the final campsite analysis.*
- 2. The omission of over 12 campsites from the campsite inventory list in the DEIS is inexcusable for a document that took over five years to prepare and cost \$800,000.*
- 3. In the DEIS, the Forest Service printed an incomplete list of available campsites along the rivers. Of those that did make the list, many discrepancies exist regarding user numbers.*

Response: The Forest Service corrected the campsite inventories for the SDEIS with help from the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association and private float boaters. (See FDEIS Appendix G.)

Campsite Reservation System

- 4. The Forest Service should prohibit the practice of pack stock operators dropping off trail ride parties at desirable river campsites not to be picked up until several days later. Land based parties should not be allowed to take the river campsites over a river based visitor. (DEIS)*

Response: The Forest Service recognizes and encourages shared use of campsites. Nonboaters who contact the Forest Service ahead of time are encouraged to camp outside of the corridor.

- 5. The Forest Service needs to make campsites along the Middle Fork available to stock users. (DEIS)*

Response: None of the alternatives propose making all campsites along the Middle Fork unavailable to stock users.

- 6. The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River similar to the one on the Middle Fork in order to limit competition for campsites.*

- 7. The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River during peak use.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

8. *Campsite assignment may become necessary on the Salmon River in order for the Forest Service to control camp use.*
9. *The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system with assignments based on party size.*
10. *The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River to prevent commercial parties from sending a boat ahead to grab a campsite.*
11. *If the Forest Service implements a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River, reservations should be based on party size and no parties should be allowed to layover for more than one day at any campsite.*
12. *The Forest Service should assign large campsites to commercial groups because they generally larger parties than noncommercial groups.*
13. *The Forest Service should either implement a total campsite reservation system on the Salmon or leave it first come, first serve.*
14. *The Forest Service should not implement a partial campsite reservation system on the Salmon River because it would be complicated.*
15. *The campsites on the Salmon River should remain on a first come, first served basis.*
16. *On the Salmon River, the Forest Service should discourage parties from sending a single boat ahead to grab campsites.*
17. *The Forest Service should not implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River.*
18. *In order to reduce conflicts between parties, the Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River.*
19. *The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system because feelings of solitude would be enhanced due to a lack of competition over preferred campsites.*
20. *The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system to allow current use levels to continue without degradation of the river corridor.*
21. *The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River for all river corridor users including jetboaters. (DEIS)*
22. *The Forest Service must establish a way for noncommercial jet boaters to reserve campsites if a campsite reservation system is implemented on the Salmon River. (SDEIS)*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

23. The Forest Service should implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River to help alleviate the perception of kicker motor use to race to campsites. (DEIS)

Response: Any decisions made regarding campsite reservations will be made outside of this FEIS.

24. The Forest Service should not implement a campsite reservation system on the Salmon River because many campsites on the Salmon River are below the high water line making a campsite reservation system difficult to implement.

25. The Forest Service should not implement a campsite reservation system because the current system offers parties the freedom to float long or short days and choose whichever campsite they want.

26. If a campsite reservation system is going to be implemented, the Forest Service should go with a partial reservation system with some campsites, such as those occurring only at low water levels, excluded from the list of sites available for reservation. The Forest Service would have to develop a map of all campsites and a minimum of 12 people should be set for occupying large campsites.

27. The Forest Service should implement a partial campsite reservation system, but should not allow layover days at the most popular campsites.

28. If a campsite assignment system should become necessary, assignments should be limited to the larger, more popular campsites.

29. A campsite reservation system would favor commercial parties.

Response: The campsite partial reservation system has been implemented on the Salmon River for several years now. Any final decisions will be made based on the trial system and visitor response outside of this FEIS.

Campsite Conditions—Middle Fork

30. The Forest Service should recognize that campsites along the Salmon River are in good condition.

Response: The Forest Service recognizes that approximately 40 percent of the campsites inventoried along the Salmon River are in Frissell Condition Class III or better (see figure 3 in the FEIS). Conversely, approximately 52 percent of the campsites inventoried along the Salmon River are in Frissell condition class 4 and 5. For a description of campsite condition standards see Appendix E of the FEIS.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

31. *The Forest Service should not base their campsite figures only on camps available at high water. Many of the more popular sites are sand bars that are only available as water levels decline.*

Response: More campsites are available as water levels decline. The information contained in Appendix F offers campsite location and capacity at high and low water for information purposes.

32. *The Forest Service should regulate float and jet boat numbers on the river based on the number of available campsites.*

Response: The number of campsites available on river is one piece of information the Forest Service uses to determine physical capacity in the corridor. The effects analysis contained in Chapter 4 of the final EIS examines the capacity situation that would exist under each alternative.

33. *The Forest Service should base campsite assignments on party size.*

34. *During the control season, the Forest Service should base campsite assignments on party size and trip length to mitigate campsite shortages in Impassible Canyon.*

35. *The Forest Service should not assign campsites based on party size. All parties should have access to any campsite they desire.*

36. *Even though smaller parties create less environmental impacts to campsites, they are penalized through the campsite reservation system because they are too small for some campsites.*

Response: The Forest Service recognizes that small parties can camp in large campsites and allows this whenever possible. However, some sections of the river have a limited number of campsites available and during high use season parties may have to be assigned to campsites that match their party size.

37. *The Forest Service should not allow commercial parties to have preferential camp assignments.*

38. *The Forest Service should only allow commercial parties to camp at three hot springs, Big Loon, Whitey Cox, and Hood Ranch, but they should have priority at these three sites. Noncommercial parties should get priority to camp at Hospital Bar and Sheepeater. Noncommercial parties could camp at the three designated for commercial parties only if the sites were open. No parties should be allowed to camp at Sunflower.*

Response: Your comments and concerns about preferential treatment of outfitters are noted.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

39. The Forest Service should designate large campsites as holding 20-30 people, medium 10-19, and small 1-9. Regardless, more medium and large campsites are available for use in the 100 miles of river even if all parties have a maximum party size.

Response: The Forest Service uses this designation system.

40. The Forest Service needs to develop an accurate campsite inventory and properly manage portage to limit congestion in the lower canyon.

41. The SDEIS mentioned the error in the campsite list for the Middle Fork, but it should have re-listed the campsites and their capacities so that the public would get an accurate idea of camping potential on the Middle Fork. (SDEIS)

42. The Forest Service should incorporate the following corrections to the list of Middle Fork campsites as presented in the SDEIS.

Mile 2.4 – Change low water to 30 people at Gardells.

Mile 6.9 – Change high water to ten people at Trail Flat.

Mile 15.5 – Change high water to 20 people at Johns Camp.

Mile 15.9 – Greyhound comes before not after Dome Hole. Change high water to 20 people.

Mile 15.91 – Dome Hole

Mile 19.0 – Dolly Lake and

Mile 19.1 – Big Snag are listed in the correct order.

Mile 21.4 – Change high water to 20 people

Mile 32.6 – Correct typo (Lost Oak).

Mile 34.5 – State land left was replaced by Stateland since river left is state land. Should read closed since it is practically inaccessible at low water.

Mile 37.6 – To keep use off of the upper beach Jackass should be close at high water and at 10 people for low water.

Mile 45.9 – Change high and low water to ten people at Culver Creek.

Mile 51.75 – Change low water to ten and high water to five people at Cave.

Mile 64.3 – Change high and low water to one person at Normandy.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Mile 72.9 – Because of poison ivy, change high water to five people at Wilson.

Mile 73.0 – Correct typo and change high and low water to 30 people at Grassy 1. 56

Response: Your concerns for the Middle Fork campsite inventory and your suggestions for updating the inventory are noted. The Forest Service has updated the campsite inventory since the SDEIS with help from the Idaho Outfitters and Guides association and private float boaters. This new list is Appendix G in the FEIS.

43. The Forest Service should maintain the one night camping restriction below Big Creek.

Response: Your preference for the restriction is noted.

44. The Forest Service should sign trailheads explaining that Middle Fork campsites are assigned, but trail traffic should be allowed to share campsites with boaters.

Response: Your suggestion for signing is noted as is your preference for campsite sharing between user groups.

45. The Forest Service should increase the number of campsites on the Middle Fork. Campsites should be assigned based on party size. (SDEIS)

Response: (See the Increase the Number of Campsites subsection in the Both Rivers section of the Response to Public Comments.) (May want to copy/paste if section still exists)

Campsite Conditions

46. According to information provided by the Forest Service in the DEIS, adequate campsites exist for current and increased use levels. Therefore the present system is working fine.

47. Conditions at the campsites on the Middle Fork are better than they were 30 years ago.

48. The crowding described in the DEIS is not realistic.

49. The Forest Service should keep camping concentrated on the already designated campsites.

50. The Forest Service should consider that riparian vegetation is no more likely to be damaged by camping on a sand bar than by campers walking through the vegetation to access the water from a camp 200 feet away.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

51. The Forest Service needs to address the poor conditions at most of the large campsites on the Middle Fork.

52. The Forest Service should close sites with irreplaceable archeological resources to overnight camping. Current use levels could continue without these campsites.

53. The Forest Service could better manage campsites on the Middle Fork to lessen resource impacts.

54. The Forest Service needs to recognize that horse packers have caused the only significant damage at campsites along the Middle Fork.

55. The Forest Service should consider developing campsites on the opposite side of the river as the trail for boaters where possible.

56. The Forest Service should consider developing new campsites.

Response: Your various concerns and comments about campsite conditions on the Middle Fork are noted. The Forest Service considered a range of campsite management actions from increased efforts at public education through total campsite closure. The range of alternatives all attempt to balance ecological conditions with provision for human use and enjoyment. All of the alternatives in the FEIS will be guided by the Programmatic Agreement (Appendix H) to protect cultural sites within the Wild River Corridors. The only action proposed above that the Forest Service is not considering is the designation of new, additional campsites. A site-specific inventory of the Middle Fork corridor, where this action has been proposed in the past, has revealed that there is virtually no opportunity for additional, new campsites given terrain, water flow conditions along the river bank and the sensitivity of heritage resources.

Campsite Rehabilitation

57. The Forest Service should take advantage of the campsite assignment system and use the opportunity to rest overused sites.

58. The Forest Service should keep current campsites available for use.

59. The Forest Service should consider taking two to three campsites out of the rotation for two to three year periods to allow sites to rehabilitate. This may mean that other sites need to be developed.

60. For rehabilitation purposes, the Forest Service should consider closing campsites on a rotation cycle during the spring, fall, and winter seasons.

61. The Forest Service should rotate camps out of use every year on the Middle Fork.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

62. For vegetation recovery, the Forest Service should consider closing ten percent of the campsites each year, or limiting some of the larger campsites to smaller parties for a year.

63. The Forest Service should close degraded campsites for an appropriate amount of time for recovery or even closed permanently.

64. The Forest Service should not develop more campsites on the Middle Fork, nor should the existing sites be expanded.

65. The Forest Service should consider posting signs would to help alleviate some of the resource impacts at campsites.

66. In the DEIS, Forest Service planners insist on reducing party size to limit campsite impacts. However, elsewhere in the document planners state that a reduction in party size from 30 to 15 will have very little effect on campsite conditions.

67. The Forest Service should consider a reduction in party size and a longer trip length to limit overcrowding and resource impacts to campsites.

Response: The Forest Service considered a range of campsite management actions from increased efforts at public education through total campsite closure. The range of alternatives all attempt to balance ecological conditions with provision for human use and enjoyment.

68. The information contained in the DEIS regarding campsite condition trends under each of the alternative contradicts related research. The Forest Service is using the misleading information to justify a reduction in use on the Middle Fork.

Response: Research showing that most impact to resources resulting from camping occur within a relatively short period is correct most of the time. Continued use of existing sites often adds relatively few additional impacts, certainly fewer impacts than closing one campsite while developing another. On the other hand, continued growth of party size and greater periods of peak use results in large parties using medium camps, and medium parties on small camps expands the footprint of the campsite, resulting in additional resource impacts. (See FEIS Chapter 3, River Campsite Conditions and River Campsite – Physical Capacity)

Both Rivers

Campsite Conditions

69. Forest Service planners discussed the potential for overcrowding at campsites, yet they omitted 12 campsites in their campsite analysis. All available campsites need to be included in the final campsite analysis.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: The Forest Service agrees, we have corrected the campsite inventories for the SDEIS with help from the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association and private float boaters. See Appendix G, FEIS. The newest information has been used in the FEIS.

70. The Forest Service justifies a reduction in use by claiming a campsite shortage, but within the DEIS the agency offers data that campsites are not ecologically impacted by numbers of people.

71. The DEIS is contradictory claiming that campsites are ecologically affected by numbers of visitors and claiming that they are not.

72. Campsites are in good condition.

73. The Forest Service should consider resting heavily used campsites along the river corridors, especially the Middle Fork.

74. The Forest Service should keep existing campsites open regardless of degradation because it concentrates the impacts.

75. The Forest Service should enlarge and improve campsites on the rivers.

Response: Your various concerns and comments about campsite conditions are noted. The Forest Service considered a range of campsite management actions from increased efforts at public education through total campsite closure. The alternatives all attempt to balance ecological conditions with provision for human use and enjoyment.

Increase the Number of Campsites

76. If the Forest Service is concerned about campsite crowding, they should increase the number of camps.

77. The Forest Service should build more campsites along the Middle Fork. Some of the larger campsites should be divided into two so that more than one party may stay there at once. (SDEIS)

78. The Forest Service should make an effort to spread out campsites and to designate additional campsites.

79. The Forest Service should create additional campsites for small parties. (SDEIS)

80. The Forest Service should create additional campsites on the Middle Fork. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preference for the designation and development of new, additional campsites on the rivers is noted. A site-specific inventory of the Middle Fork corridor, where this action has been proposed in the past, has revealed that there are virtually no opportunities

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

for additional, new campsites given terrain, water flow conditions along the river bank and the sensitivity of heritage resources.

Campsite Reservation System

81. *The Forest Service should allow camping only at designated campsites. (SDEIS)*

Response: On the Middle Fork, where campsites are limited and use is high during the summer, it is necessary to designate campsites. A similar situation exists on the Salmon River, however, many of the popular campsites are on sandy beaches and the spring high water can change the size and locations of these beaches. Under these conditions it is not necessary to designate every campsite.

82. *The campsite assignment system does not minimize impacts. Rather, it maximizes use.*

Response: The campsite reservation system on the Middle Fork allows for efficient use of the available campsites and reduces conflicts about campsites on the river.

83. *The Forest Service should adopt a policy that after a certain time, such as five o'clock in the evening, river based visitors cannot ask land based visitors to vacate a campsite on the river. (SDEIS)*

Response: *Thank you for your suggestion.*

84. *The Forest Service should restrict layovers at popular campsites. (SDEIS)*

Response: If the camps are not needed to handle additional visitors, a layover in a popular camp is a valid wilderness experience.

85. *The Forest Service should not require campsite sharing on either river. This degrades the feeling of solitude for visitors. (SDEIS)*

Response: Generally campsite sharing is not needed. However, during peak use periods campsite sharing is needed.

86. *The Forest Service should assign campsites based on party size. (SDEIS)*

87. *The Forest Service should not assign campsites based on party size because large parties are rewarded for being large.*

88. *Campsites should be given on a first come, first serve basis regardless of group size.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Your preferences in favor of or opposition to camp assignments based on party size are noted. The Forest Service recognizes that small parties can camp in large campsites and allows this whenever possible. However, some sections of the river have a limited number of campsites available and during high use season parties may have to be assigned to campsites that match their party size.

89. *The campsite reservation system should have provisions to accommodate parties with persons confined to wheelchairs. Campsites with easy gradients for wheelchair access and shade from afternoon sun would be most appropriate for parties with persons in wheelchairs.*

Response: Campsites in the river corridors are undeveloped. The riparian conditions may make wheelchair access difficult. If an individual with special needs contacted the agency in advance, special provisions could be made to assign the party campsites that most closely fit those special needs.

Campsite Rehabilitation

90. *In order to rehabilitate vegetation in campsites, the Forest Service should reduce commercial trips by 50 percent. No float permits should be issued before May 25 or after September 1.*

91. *Rather than reducing the number of launches or party size, the Forest Service should manage the larger campsites more strictly. Use of popular campsites could be limited to the peak use period enabling the camps to recover during the other seasons.*

92. *The Forest Service should develop a rotating system for campsite closures for rehabilitation and clean-up opportunities.*

93. *Rather than closing campsites along the rivers, the Forest Service should focus on rehabilitation and getting users to practice low impact camping techniques.*

94. *The Forest Service should close degraded campsites, such as Camas Creek and Ship Island, on an alternating basis for rehabilitation purposes.*

Response: The Forest Service considered a range of campsite management actions from increased efforts at public education through total campsite closure. The range of alternatives all attempt to balance ecological conditions with provision for human use and enjoyment. The preferred alternative (FEIS) and the proposed accompanying Management Plan, display the range of management actions proposed, along with the sequence of steps to be undertaken when considering management of degraded campsites.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Everything Floating

Middle Fork

1. *All Middle Fork parties should be required to launch from Boundary Creek. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your preference for requiring all Middle Fork launches from Boundary Creek is noted.

2. *The Forest Service should reduce the Boy Scout launches by 40 percent. Current use is unfair to other users. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your preference for reducing the launches for the Boy Scouts of America is noted.

Outfitters Services

3. *The Forest Service must reduce use on the Middle Fork during July and August. Retiring or buying outfitter permits would reduce commercial use by 50 percent. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your suggestion for reducing use on the Middle Fork by retiring or buying out commercial permits is noted. (See the Outfitters Services sub-section in the Both Rivers section of this Response to Public Comments.)

4. *The Forest Service should manage the commercial allocation on the Middle Fork by launches. This is supported by the Outfitters and Guide Administrative Handbook and a Forest Service decision at a winter 1975 meeting. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your preference for managing the commercial allocation by launches is noted.

5. *The Forest Service should prohibit deadheading by commercial trips and require that they arrive at Indian Creek no later than six o'clock pm. (SDEIS) .*

Response: Your preference for not allowing deadheading is noted. Deadheading allows outfitters to launch from Boundary Creek with boats only and pick up their guest the following day at Indian Creek.

6. *Outfitters should be required to provide raft support for noncommercial parties for a fee. Noncommercial parties such as kayakers may need to have gear transported. This would help bridge the gap between expensive commercial trips and exclusive noncommercial trips.*

Response: Your suggestion is noted. Having outfitters provide support for noncommercial groups would require that both groups share campsites or at least camp in close proximity to one another, which could be difficult to schedule.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

7. The Forest Service should not allow the Middle Fork to be ruined by too much commercial activity.

Response: Your concern about the level of commercial activity is noted. The alternatives provide a range of options for levels of commercial use.

8. The Forest Service should not allocate priority launch dates to outfitters during May 28 to June 23 since the current allocation already unfairly favors commercial parties.

Response: Your opposition to priority launch-dates for outfitters between May 28 and June 23 is noted.

Access

This sub-section responds to comments dealing with the opportunities for people, particularly float boaters, to access the Middle Fork of the Salmon River. It includes comments, suggestions and opinions concerning access. Later sub-sections deal with the individual components of access and use – launches, party size, and length of stay.

9. The Forest Service must limit the number of people on the Middle Fork. (SDEIS)

10. The proposed 50 percent reduction of use on the Middle Fork is appropriate.

11. The Forest Service should reduce overall use on the Middle Fork by reducing party size and/or the number of launches.

12. During late June and early July, there are too many people on the Middle Fork for both human and wildlife capacities.

13. The Forest Service needs to address the following major items of concern on the Middle Fork: the need to reduce the number of launches per day and the party size, the need to rehabilitate campsites, crowding and congestion at launch sites and major rapids, extensive social encounters between parties, and noxious weeds.

Response: Your preference for reducing the use on the Middle Fork is noted. Alternative B reduces use levels on the Middle Fork to emphasize a primitive recreation experience. The effects of this alternative is displayed in chapter 4.

14. The Forest Service should not reduce access by 50 percent because it would be even more difficult to get a permit.

15. The Forest Service should not reduce use on the Middle Fork because it would take the opportunity to float the Middle Fork away from many people including native Idahoans.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

16. The Forest Service should maintain current use of the Middle Fork with no further restrictions on access.

17. The Forest Service should not reduce access to the Middle Fork unless there is evidence that the resource is being degraded.

18. The Forest Service should cap use at current levels. This would provide for high use in the summer and keep use low in the spring and fall when the river corridor is critical for wildlife use.

19. Current use levels for commercial and noncommercial users are at a near acceptable level. It may get busy during peak use, but minor compromises are available.

20. The Forest Service should not reduce access for noncommercial floaters.

21. The Forest Service should focus on “best use management” and not lower numbers on either the Middle Fork or Salmon River.

22. The Forest Service should not implement additional restrictions that would make it even tougher for a noncommercial floater to get a permit for the Middle Fork.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining use levels at or near the current levels are noted. Alternatives C, D, and E would allow current use levels and some growth. However, they all have lower maximum potential use numbers than the current plan.

23. The Forest Service should work to increase the number of people that are allowed to float the Middle Fork.

24. The Forest Service should manage for increased access for noncommercial floaters.

Response: Alternative A would allow more increase in use than any other alternative, while Alternative C emphasizes use for noncommercial float boaters on the Middle Fork.

25. The Forest Service should consider that use restrictions, such as commercial party size reductions, would result in a significant increase in cost to commercial clients making it impossible for some families and/or kayakers to afford a Middle Fork trip.

26. Less access and higher costs would not be in the interest of long-term preservation and enhancement of the river resources and the result would be elitist access to the rivers with less public support for resource conservation.

27. The Forest Service must do what is best to preserve the environment even if the trade is higher costs for less traffic.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Your various opinions of the balance between resource protection and economic impacts are noted. The economic effects of each of the alternatives are discussed in chapter 4 of the FEIS.

28. *The Forest Service should consider allowing river access to people who have recreational property along the river without having to compete with other boaters through the lottery. This use could be accommodated without compromising the rules that are applied to other users.*

Response: The traditional access for the private property along the river is horseback and hiking on trails and by aircraft. The limited launches are in high demand. Allowing additional launches for private property owners would increase the number of parties on some sections of the river and could appear to be unfair to other users.

29. *The Forest Service cannot enhance the wilderness experience by simply reducing access to the Middle Fork. The buildings and structures and heavy regulations detract from the wilderness experience more than the number of daily social encounters.*

Response: Reducing access is just one of many tools the Forest Service can use to enhance the wilderness experience. Your concern of structures and the number of regulations are noted.

30. *The Forest Service should consider that if wilderness preservation is the goal of the DEIS, reducing the number of commercial trips will not have any significant effect because outfitters are meticulous in their care of the river corridor.*

Response: Most of the float boaters, both commercial and non-commercial, are meticulous in caring for the resources in the river corridor. They use fire pans, and pack out their garbage and human waste. Such actions help to lessen the impact of recreational use on the river resources.

31. *The Forest Service has no rational reason for proposing such drastic changes to the management plan.*

32. *The data reported in the DEIS does not support the necessity for drastic reductions in use. The cuts seem to be based on social perception rather than resource needs.*

Response: Alternative B in the FEIS would reduce use below the current levels. Alternatives A, C, D and E would allow various levels of growth above current use, while reducing the maximum potential use. The effects of the various alternatives are discussed in chapter 4.

33. *If the fourth of July is too crowded, the Forest Service should put a limit on the eight days surrounding it, not the entire season.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

34. The only high use problem on the Middle Fork occurs during July. The Forest Service could deal with some of this use by not reissuing one cancelled launch each day during the high use period and by limiting all reissued launches to a party size of ten with a maximum stay of six days.

Response: The type of mitigation measure you suggest is seriously considered for any of the alternatives.

Launches

35. The Forest Service should maintain the same number of commercial and noncommercial launches per day as allowed under the current plan.

36. A reduction in launches will not lead to a reduction in degradation of the river corridor that does not appear to be degrading. Reducing launches will only make it more difficult for the common person to access the river.

Response: Your preference for maintaining or not reducing the current number of launches per day is noted.

37. The Forest Service should not increase the number of launches because of the number of social encounters and the possibility of having to share campsites.

38. The Forest Service should reduce the number of launches per day for commercial and noncommercial parties.

39. To limit growth, the Forest Service should decrease the number of launches to three commercial and three noncommercial launches each day.

Response: Your preference to reduce or not increase the number of launches per day on the Middle Fork is noted.

Party Size

40. The Forest Service should maintain the maximum party sizes allowed under the current plan.

41. The Forest Service should not reduce party size to 15 people.

42. A reduction in noncommercial party size would be unfair.

43. The Forest Service should not cut noncommercial party size by 60 percent because family and friends may not be able to travel together.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

44. The Forest Service should not reduce noncommercial party size below 16 or 20 people because it is so difficult to draw a Middle Fork permit enabling people who do draw a permit to invite their friends.

Response: Your preference for no reduction in the party sizes is noted. .

45. The suggestion of a four-person maximum trip size did not consider safety.

46. The Forest Service should recognize that a party size of ten is not safe on the Middle Fork.

47. The Forest Service should not reduce noncommercial party size from 24 to 10 because party size reductions would limit the number of people a permit holder could invite and could be a safety hazard.

Response: Your concern that smaller party sizes could be a safety hazard is noted.

48. The Forest Service could slightly reduce commercial party size, but 15 people would be too small for outfitters to economically survive and would damage the quality of the experience.

49. The Forest Service should consider party size restrictions during the high use season.

50. The Forest Service should reduce party size because large parties, groups of ten or more, detract from the wilderness experience.

51. The Forest Service should consider a 10 to 20 percent reduction in party size rather than a drastic cut.

52. The Forest Service should set party size limits at 10 or 12 people.

53. The Forest Service should reduce commercial party size.

54. The Forest Service should reduce both party size and total number of people accessing the river.

55. If reductions in the number of people on the river are necessary, limiting party size is the best way to do it.

56. The Forest Service should limit the number of large noncommercial launches, but allow more, smaller noncommercial groups.

57. The Forest Service should limit noncommercial party size to 20 because they are generally 15 people or smaller anyway.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

58. The Forest Service should set noncommercial party size at ten or less.

59. The Forest Service should reduce both commercial and noncommercial party size by as much as half.

60. The Forest Service should make any reduction in party size an equal reduction for both commercial and noncommercial parties.

61. The Forest Service should set party size limits at 12 to 18 for noncommercial groups and at 15 to 24 for commercial groups.

62. The Forest Service should set party size limits at 10 to 20 people for both commercial and noncommercial parties.

63. The Forest Service should reduce commercial party size to eliminate the need for the agency to mandate who can camp where. This favors large commercial groups.

Response: Your various preferences for reducing party sizes are noted. Alternatives B, D, and E use variable trip length options that link party size and lengths of stay.

64. During the fall and spring seasons all parties should be limited to ten people with no floating in the winter.

Response: Alternative B proposes reduced party sizes outside the summer season.

65. The Forest Service should include guides in the commercial total.

Response: Under all the alternatives the guides on commercial trips are included in the maximum party size.

66. The Forest Service should consider allowing a maximum of 20 people for commercial trips not including guides would be more appropriate.

Response: Your preference of party size, including guides is noted.

67. The Forest Service should allow outfitters to have 30 guests during the control season and not penalized for smaller groups.

Response: Outfitters would be allowed to have 30 people per party in Alternatives A, C, D and E. The party size the outfitters actually take vary with market demand.

68. The Forest Service should encourage smaller parties by giving them options like longer trips or desirable campsites.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: Alternatives B, D, and E encourage smaller party sizes, with variable trip length options that allow smaller parties to stay longer than larger parties.

69. The Forest Service should consider that on a river trip the number of people encountered is not as significant of an impact as the number of parties encountered.

Response: The ROS system recognizes that the number of other parties encountered per day is more significant than total people. The social criteria category, one of seven categories, uses the number of encounters with other groups and the number of other groups visible from a campsite as the factors determining various levels.

Trip Length

71. The Forest Service should consider allowing maximum trip lengths of nine to ten days.

72. The Forest Service should provide a minimum of an eight-day length of stay.

73. The Forest Service should consider allowing commercial trip length to be extended to seven days and changing the nine-day schedule rotation as it is now set up.

Response: Your preference for extending the current lengths of stay is noted.

74. The Forest Service should not reduce maximum trip length. Decreasing trip length does not address concerns for solitude or reduce resource impacts. It would increase congestion along the corridor and at the ramps, and many visitors should not try to float from Boundary Creek to Corn Creek in less than eight days, especially at low water.

75. The Forest Service should realize that noncommercial boaters would be the ones affected by cuts to trip length.

76. The Forest Service should maintain the eight-day maximum trip length on the Middle Fork. With shorter trips, every party would follow the same schedule resulting in congestion and parties are not rushed creating an opportunity to explore the side canyons.

77. The Forest Service should maintain the eight-day maximum trip length except during the peak use season between July 1 and August 15 when the maximum should be six days. The agency could do this by putting the outfitters on a nine-day, rather than eight-day, rotation during peak season use. 1454, 1557

78. As a minimum, the Forest Service should allow a seven-day trip in order to allow time for scouting rapids; eight days would be preferred.

Response: Your preference for maintaining - not reducing - the lengths of stay are noted.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

79. The Forest Service should not reduce maximum trip length from eight to six days because it would be a safety hazard for canoeists. It takes canoeists longer to scout rapids than rafters, so scouting would be rushed and long days paddling could result in running rapids while fatigued.

80. The Forest Service should be aware that six-day trips are a struggle at low water levels and may not be desirable or safe for the floaters.

81. The Forest Service should not cut trip length to five days because it would compromise trip safety. Six to eight days would be a more logical reduction.

Response: Your concern that shorter trips could cause safety problems is noted. Also see response directly above on maintain existing length of stay.

82. The Forest Service should limit all trips to six days.

83. The Forest Service should limit all trips during the high use season to six days.

84. The Forest Service should limit noncommercial trips to six days during July and then allow stays of eight to ten days outside of peak use.

Response: Your preference for reducing the length of stay to 6 days is noted.

85. The Forest Service should manage for a range of trip lengths so slower parties can spread out from the fast parties.

Response: Alternatives B, D and E have variable trip length options that allow smaller parties to take longer trips.

86. The Forest Service should limit all parties to a five day length of stay in the spring and a six day stay in the fall with no floating in the winter in order to give plants and animals within the corridor a rest.

Response: Alternatives B and D have a variety of differing trip length options during the spring, winter fall.

87. In order to limit trip length, the Forest Service should consider encouraging self-contained parties. This could be done by allowing groups without raft support to go for four or five days. These parties would not have to carry toilets or firepans. Instead, they could carry a gas stove and have certain sites with toilets for self-support only.

Response: The requirement for all groups to pack out human waste and use fire pans has been very successful in reducing the impacts to river campsites. No alternatives were considered that would allow float boat groups to use the river without these important tools.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Layovers

88. *The Forest Service should allow all trips to have a one to three day layovers.*
89. *The Forest Service should allow noncommercial trips to have maximum of two layover days.*
90. *The Forest Service should maintain the eight-day maximum trip length in order to provide the opportunity for a layover day.*

Response: All of the FEIS alternatives provide opportunity for more than a six-day trip.

91. *The Forest Service should not allow commercial trips to have layover days.*

Response: Your preference for not allowing commercial trips layover days is noted. Most outfitters are on eight-day turn around schedules that allow time for only six-day trips. This makes it difficult for them to have layover days.

Party size, Trip Length, and Launches in Combinations

92. *The Forest Service should allow seven noncommercial launches per day with four of the launches set at a 16 person maximum party size and three would be restricted to eight people.*
93. *The Forest Service should explore the possibility of increasing the number of noncommercial launches if the party size is set at a level well below sixteen. This might create a necessity for smaller groups to share campsites.*
94. *The Forest Service should maintain the eight-day trip length.*
95. *The Forest Service should increase the number of launches based on a decrease in party size.*
96. *If party size was reduced to ten and trip length increased to a maximum of ten days, there might be a reduction in user days.*
97. *Commercial and noncommercial parties should be restricted to a maximum party size of 15 and both types of parties should be limited to a seven day trip, not six.*
98. *Raft parties should have a 15 person maximum party size and kayak parties should be limited to 10 people. Also, launches should be limited to one commercial and one noncommercial launch per day.*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

99. Noncommercial boaters should have eight days to float the river and be limited to 12 people per party. Commercial parties should be reduced by the same percentage as noncommercial parties, and guides should be included in that number.

100. Party size and trip length will not change noticeably just because people do not want to use their permits or they change their use patterns. In July 97 percent of the permits are used.

101. Most of the campsites on the Middle Fork are below Indian Creek. This causes congestion and pacing so that parties do not end up on top of each other. Maximum party size and trip length would overburden campsites.

102. Three commercial and four noncommercial launches per day are acceptable. However, the reduction in commercial party size to 15 is not acceptable because outfitters might be forced to increase their prices. The reduction in noncommercial party size from 24 to 10 is acceptable.

103. The total number of people on the river each day should be limited by either reducing the number of permits issued daily or by reducing party size.

104. The total number of people on the river each day should be limited by reducing both party size and the number of permits issued daily.

105. To increase the wilderness experience, the Forest Service should limit launches to five per day and party size to 16 people.

106. The noncommercial allocation during the permit season should allow four launches with a maximum party size of 16 people and three launches with a maximum of eight people. This would be an eight percent decrease from the current noncommercial opportunities to float per day.

107. There should be a reduction in the total number of trips, both commercial and noncommercial, launched on the Middle Fork each day. Commercial and noncommercial party size should be limited to 15 to 18 people and trip length should be between seven and nine days.

108. The number of launches per day should be maintained at three commercial and four noncommercial. Party size should be 20, including guides, for commercial groups and 16 for noncommercial. Trip length should be six days for commercial groups and eight days for noncommercial. The result would be 360 PAOT for commercial use and 384 PAOT for noncommercial.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

109. The number of noncommercial trips per day should be increased, but the party size should be limited to 14 to 16 people and length of stay should not change from the current plan.

110. The launch allocation should be two commercial and three noncommercial launches per day in the summer and two launches per day in the spring and fall with launch recipients having the Freedom of Choice to use an outfitter or not. During the winter there should be no floating so that the wildlife and vegetation get a break from people. The party size should be limited to 20 commercial and 10 noncommercial in the summer and 10 during the spring and fall regardless of whether the launch was commercial or noncommercial. Trip length should be restricted to six days for all parties in the summer, five days in the spring and six days in the fall.

111. The Forest Service should allow five launches a day, three being noncommercial and two commercial. Party size should be set at a maximum of 15 for both commercial and noncommercial with a ten-day maximum trip length. No campsite should be pre-assigned except for the last day.

112. The Middle Fork launch allocation should allow three commercial launches of 25 people for seven days. The noncommercial allocation should be five launches of 16 people for seven days. The result would be 525 PAOT for commercial trips and 560 for noncommercial trips.

113. Commercial and noncommercial parties should both be limited to a maximum party size of 15 and a six day maximum trip length. At seven launches a day, three commercial and four noncommercial, PAOT would be.

114. The Forest Service should not reduce the number of launches per day, trip length, or party size for noncommercial parties.

115. On the Middle Fork, the Forest Service should consider phasing-out the airstrips, reducing commercial activities, and closing certain campsites to restore the wilderness character. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preferences for various combinations of party size, length of stay and launches are noted.

Launches, Party Size, Trip Length

116. The Forest Service should limit commercial parties to a maximum of three launches per day, 30 people per party, and a six-day trip on the Middle Fork. (SDEIS)

117. The Forest Service should limit commercial parties to a maximum of 20 to 24 people and some noncommercial launches should be limited to 10 to 15 people while other

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

noncommercial parties could be as large as 20 people. No parties should be allowed to stay beyond 7 days. (SDEIS)

118. The Forest Service should limit noncommercial parties to four launches per day, 11 people per party and a seven-day trip on the Middle Fork. Commercial parties should be limited to three launches per day, 30 people per party and a six-day trip. (SDEIS)

119. The Forest Service should offer three commercial and six noncommercial launches per day using faucets to control use on the Salmon River. Commercial parties should have a maximum party size of 30 people and noncommercial should be 30 for two launches and ten for four launches. Trip length should be determined by party size. Larger parties would have a shorter length of stay and smaller parties would have a longer stay. (SDEIS)

Response: Your comments and suggestions are among many that contain a mix of ideas for varying two or all three of the factors governing river use – launches, party size, and length of stay. All of the comments and suggestions are noted. The Forest Service cannot design alternatives for every possible permutation of these factors and varying combinations of commercial and noncommercial use.

120. The Forest Service’s proposal to limit both party size and length of stay would jeopardize the safety of all noncommercial groups.

Response: Your concern for safety problems that may occur with reductions in party size and length of stay are noted.

Redistribution of Use, Shoulder Season Use, and Lottery Season Extension

121. The assumption that if Middle Fork use is restricted during peak use time people will float in the spring and fall instead is inaccurate.

122. The Forest Service assumption of redistribution of river use is flawed. The study conducted by economist Chris Neher found that only 17 out of a possible 854 permits were issued to noncommercial boaters for river trips during March, April, October, and November. The road access to the Middle Fork launch sites is snowed in until June. Therefore, floaters unable to draw launch permits during the peak season do not generally go during the cold weather spring and fall months.

123. Use during the shoulder season is largely self-regulating due to weather, access, and water level.

124. The Forest Service should not change the off-season permit system on the Middle Fork. It is absurd to assume that all people days will be utilized because not all parties fill their permit, the road to Boundary Creek is generally closed during the early permit season and Marsh Creek is a dangerous run that many people are not willing to do. Also, during the late season the water may be too low to efficiently run the river. .

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

125. Most visitors would not use the Middle Fork during May, early June, October, or November because the river is cold and dangerous.

126. The Forest Service should maintain late and early season access as it is under the current system since use during the shoulder seasons is limited due to weather and water levels.

127. During the spring and fall, the number of launches and party size limits should remain the same as during the summer season because water levels regulate use.

128. Many noncommercial floaters would not use the river outside of the lottery season because of cold weather and dangerous water levels.

129. Encouraging floaters to utilize the fall and spring season will not make up for restrictions during the peak use time. Weather and typical vacation schedule are not conducive to floating outside of the summer.

130. Forest Service planners incorrectly assume that people who do not get a permit for the summer season will decide to launch during the spring or fall seasons. The weather will prevent this from happening. Regardless, the Forest Service used this inaccurate assumption in their economic models to analyze impacts to rural communities.

131. Even if the lottery season is extended, historical data suggests that use will not likely redistribute over a longer season. Middle Fork use realistically will not begin until the road is free of snow.

132. The idea of increase spring use is ridiculous because of the danger in floating at high water. 392

180. Pre and post-season use is not suitable or possible for most users. Outfitters would have a particularly difficult time finding clients to fill pre and post-season dates.

133. If use levels were capped during the historical peak season, the outfitters would not see an increase in use during the shoulder season. This is because many clients would not be suitable for high water trips and because typically kids are in school during this timeframe.

Response: In the DEIS the Forest Service wilderness planners assumed that in alternatives that lowered the use below the current actual maximum levels, the displaced use would move to the shoulder seasons creating no net loss in use. As noted in your comments, because of cold weather, high water in the spring or low water in the fall, early season access problems, and the traditional summer vacation schedules most of the displaced users would chose not move their use to the shoulder seasons. The Forest Service acknowledges that the redistribution of use was an incorrect assumption.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

134. No changes should be made to the current system regarding spring and fall floating because the seasons are self-regulating. Reducing the groups size to four or five would create a safety concern.

Response: Your concern for possible safety problems that could be caused by changing the current spring and fall seasons are noted.

135. The Forest Service should accurately record spring and winter use by commercial and noncommercial parties. Once use levels have been determined, the Forest Service should cap use during the spring and winter seasons.

Response: The Forest Service continues to record information on use levels by commercial and noncommercial users during all seasons on the Middle Fork. The data are used in this planning effort to show the effects of the various alternatives.

136. Since spring and fall trips tend to be limited to more experienced rafters, the Forest Service should allow two to three small party launches with longer trip lengths.

Response: Alternative C allows for 3 additional noncommercial launches for small parties year-round.

137. Use should not be encouraged during the spring because of the adverse affect heavy traffic would have on the canyon.

138. Encouraging use in the shoulder season would result in increased impacts to the river corridor because plants are most vulnerable and soils are most likely to erode during this period.

139. Spring use is more detrimental to the environment than summer use.

Response: Your concerns for the increase of impacts that could be caused by encouraging use during the spring “green up” period are noted.

140. If the Forest Service wishes to encourage spring use, they will have to plow the road to Boundary Creek before June 1.

Response: Snow on the Boundary Creek road is an important factor in spring access to the Middle Fork.

141. During the fall season on the Middle Fork, trip length should not be limited to five days because fall trips are supposed to be managed with an emphasis on hunting and fishing.

Response: Your preference for longer trips, for hunting in the fall, is noted.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

142. The Forest Service should allow some noncommercial use during the winter in order to reduce the demand for summer use.

143. The Forest Service should allow some winter use.

Response: Your desire for the opportunity to use the Middle Fork in the winter is noted.

144. The Forest Service should limit float permits to prevent degradation of the resources, which is happening at current use levels.

145. The Forest Service proposal to reduce permits for floating the Middle Fork and Salmon River is appropriate.

146. The Forest Service should maintain float boat use at the 1980 levels on the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

Response: Your preference in reducing float boat use is noted.

147. Launches should be defined as one group that travels progressively downstream to a final destination. (SDEIS)

148. The Forest Service should maintain the number of launches from Boundary Creek and Corn Creek because the number of trips that currently go down the rivers has not adversely affected the resources, and a reduction in launches would create a recreational opportunity that only the rich could afford to access.

149. There is no need to reduce the number of launches below current levels. The busiest day ever apparently was July 17, 1995 when 901 people were on the river, which equates to nine people per mile. This is not too many.

150. Commercial and noncommercial parties should have an equal number of launches. There should be six launches per day on both the Middle Fork and Salmon Rivers.

151. Because people should expect to see others on the rivers and because having multiple parties on the river enhances safety, the Forest Service should not reduce the number of permits issued on the Middle Fork or Salmon River.

152. If the number of permits issued or party sizes were limited it would make drawing a permit even more difficult and the pressure from people wanting to go on a given permit would be intense.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining the number of launches allowed per day are noted.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

153. The Forest Service should reduce the number of launches on each river to five per day with three noncommercial and two commercial launches.

154. The Forest Service should consider reducing the number of launches in half for one week per month to provide people applying for these dates a more isolated experience despite tougher competition for access.

155. The Forest Service should allow only one commercial and one noncommercial launch per day.

Response: Your preferences for decreasing the number of launches allowed per day are noted.

157. The Forest Service should reduce party size for commercial and noncommercial groups.

158. The Forest Service should reduce maximum commercial party size.

159. The Forest Service should reduce party size rather than trip length to limit use. Smaller parties with long trips are preferred. (SDEIS)

160. The Forest Service should reduce party size for commercial and noncommercial groups to 15 or less. Outfitters could charge more to make up the difference. (SDEIS)

161. The Forest Service should limit float trips to a maximum of 15 people per launch. (SDEIS)

162. The Forest Service should limit river trips to a maximum of 20 people including guides. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preferences and suggestions for reducing party sizes are noted.

163. The Forest Service should implement user day limits rather than party size limitations.

164. Party size should be reduced by either restricting the number of people or by a user day limit for each permit. Reducing with a user day limit would be preferred because it would allow smaller groups to have longer trips.

Response: Alternatives 2 and 4 use a variable trip length option that is similar to a user day limit.

165. The Forest Service should maintain the party size limits as they are under the current plan.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

166. The proposed reductions in party size and access will make it near impossible for average families to experience the Wilderness.

167. Reducing party size is not the best approach to protecting the river or enhancing the wilderness experience.

168. The reductions in party size seem to be based on sociological theories rather than actual resource damage.

169. The Forest Service should not reduce maximum party size as drastically as has been proposed.

170. Reducing party size by half does not seem warranted.

Response: Your preferences for maintaining or not reducing the maximum party sizes are noted.

Congestion at the Launches and Take-Outs

171. The Forest Service should make it clear that Boundary Creek and Cache Bar, the major areas of congestion, are not within the Wilderness. (DEIS)

172. The Forest Service should let users know to expect congestion at Boundary Creek. (DEIS)

Response: The facilities at Boundary Creek and Cache Bar on the Middle Fork, and Corn Creek and Vinegar Creek and Carey Creek on the Salmon River are all outside the Frank Church – River of No Return Wilderness boundary. These launch and take-out points are vital for ingress and egress and can become crowded.

173. The Forest Service should recognize that visitors are willing to tolerate crowding at the put-in and additional parties for an increased chance of drawing a permit. (DEIS)

174. The Forest Service should not expand the launch area despite congestion. The crowding acts as a form of self-regulation. (DEIS)

Response: Your observations about crowding at the launch points are noted. The Forest Service will continue to look for ways to alleviate crowding at the launch sites.

175. Once a party leaves the launch site they see very few other parties. (DEIS)

176. It is inaccurate for the Forest Service to base use levels on congestion at the put-in. Parties spread out as they start down the river. (DEIS)

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: The analysis in the FEIS assumes that, while there can be some congestion at rapids and popular features, the float boaters tend to spread out and travel downstream at fairly even rates. The analysis is not based on the crowding at the launch and take-out points.

Economic Analysis

177. The economic study in the plan appears to be flawed because of the assumptions that it is based on. (DEIS)

178. The economic study in the plan is unbelievable. The preferred alternative would be an economical catastrophe to the river communities. Forest Service planners should consider the IOGA study because it is much more realistic. (DEIS)

179. The economic analysis in the DEIS regarding the impact on local communities and the outfitting industry was inaccurate. The SDEIS should have contained IOGA's economic review. (SDEIS)

180. The Forest Service should revisit the economic analysis addressed in the Neher Report. (DEIS)

181. The economic analysis of the planning team is ridiculous. Extending the permit season would not offer the local communities the same total yearly income. People would not be willing to float the rivers during adverse weather or water flow levels.

Response: Following the publication of the DEIS and after hearing public comments, the Forest Service updated the Economic Analysis based on new information provided during public comment period. We spent considerable time working with the IOGA economist to update the information and analysis used in the Supplement and Final EIS. The FEIS and the decisions in the ROD are based on the best information available.

182. The Forest Service should not reduce commercial access to the rivers. Outfitters would likely have trouble staying in business. And, with limited outfitter presence and stewardship, conditions along the rivers would suffer. (SDEIS)

183. The regional economies will be better served by full protection of the wilderness. Wilderness health should be the priority. (SDEIS)

184. The economic analysis from the DEIS and SEIS incorrectly assessed the benefit that noncommercial jetboaters have on local economies. The economic analysis seems biased toward Salmon, Idaho and the upper end of the river. Riggins has taken a loss due to reductions in noncommercial jetboat use. (SDEIS) 863, 1046

Response: Your concerns about the economic analysis are noted. The analysis did consider the effects of the alternatives, including the noncommercial jetboat use.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

General Motorized and Mechanized Uses

Eliminate - Prohibit Motorized Use

- 1. The Forest Service should eliminate all mechanized uses in the Wilderness except those necessary for administration purposes or as directed in the Wilderness Act.*
- 2. The Forest Service should not allow any motorized or wheeled vehicles into the Wilderness including jet boats and aircraft. (SDEIS)*
- 3. The Forest Service should not use chainsaws or motorized equipment for trail maintenance within the Wilderness.*
- 4. The Forest Service should not use chainsaws or other mechanized equipment for administrative use.*
- 5. The Forest Service should prohibit or reduce use of all motors within the Wilderness.*
- 6. The Forest Service should not allow off-highway vehicles or snowmobiles within the Wilderness.*
- 7. The Forest Service should prohibit generators and chainsaws within the Wilderness.*
- 8. The Forest Service should continue to restrict motorized and mechanized use in the Wilderness where prohibited by law. (SDEIS)*
- 9. The Forest Service should not allow chainsaw use in the Wilderness. (SDEIS)*

Response: Your preferences for not allowing motorized or mechanized equipment use in the wilderness are noted. The Wilderness Act of 1964 only permits motorized or mechanized use for administrative purposes under strict guidelines and approval authorities, which are defined through the minimum tool analysis on a case-by-case basis.

- 10. The Forest Service should favor non-motorized recreation opportunities. (SDEIS)*

Response: Non-motorized recreation predominates throughout the FC–RONR Wilderness. However, the CIWA allows motorboats, including motorized jet boats, and the landing of aircraft where this use was previously established. (See sections on Jetboats and Aviation in this Response to Public Comments.)

Allow Some Motorized Use

- 11. The Forest Service should use the most cost effective method for management practices such as clearing trails or weed control. This could include using chainsaws or herbicides. (SDEIS)*

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

12. The Forest Service should allow chainsaws to be used for trail maintenance because it would be more efficient and safer especially in areas of heavy blow-down.

13. The Forest Service should designate a two-week period in June for chainsaws to be used in trail maintenance and to cut firewood. Many outfitters would cooperate during this time to keep the trails useable.

Response: Your preferences for allowing some use of chainsaws in the wilderness are noted. (See response to comments above.)

14. The Forest Service should allow landowners within the corridor to use chainsaws for cutting wood.

Response: In the Salmon River corridor, chainsaw use for the collection of firewood may be approved by permit. Permits are only issued to private landowners or Special Use permittees to be used only outside the floating control season. The Salmon River corridor is managed under the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as amended, (CIWA, Section 9(F)(b).

15. The Forest Service should prohibit use of all motors within the Wilderness including jetboats.

16. The Forest Service should always use the most primitive tools possible for maintaining the Wilderness including airstrips and trails. (SDEIS)

17. The Forest Service should not allow any motorized or wheeled vehicles into the Wilderness including jet boats and aircraft. (SDEIS)

Responses: Your preferences for prohibiting all motorized or wheeled vehicles, including jetboats and aircraft, are noted. The Wilderness Act of 1964 generally permits motorized or mechanized use only for administrative purposes under strict guidelines and approval authorities. However, the Act does allow for the continuation of the use of aircraft or motorboats where the use was previously established. The Central Idaho Wilderness Act specifically allows motorboats including jet boats and landing of aircraft at established airstrips within the Frank Church–River of No Return Wilderness. Use of motorized equipment outside of the Salmon River corridor is prohibited. (See sections on Jetboats, and Aviation in this Response to Public Comments.)

18. The Forest Service should allow for the most effective and efficient methods for airstrip maintenance regardless of whether or not this would involve mechanized equipment. Beside, since horses are not native to Idaho there is not reason to insist upon use of them.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Response: (See the Maintenance subsection in the Aviation section of this Response to Public Comments.)

19. *The Forest Service should investigate the hydropower facility being put in at Taylor Ranch. The diversion point is to be on National Forest Land. (SDEIS)*

Response: Diversions and hydropower use are subject to special use permitting regulations and outside the scope of this analysis.

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

Fisheries

1. The loss of salmon and steelhead, the keystone species to this area, is arguably the number one ecological threat to the Wilderness. The plan should prioritize restoration of these species because it is a Wilderness issue. (SDEIS)

2. The Forest Service should consider halting use on the rivers during critical Salmon migration. Getting Salmon back to the Middle Fork is a major ecological concern. (SDEIS)

Response: Your concerns for salmon and steelhead are noted. The FEIS has been consulted on with concurrence of the NOAA Fisheries Service concerning these species. The new or amended management plan would also need the concurrence of NMFS.

3. The Forest Service cannot implement any management plan that is not in cooperation with treaty tribes and that may affect tribal treaty reserved fisheries. The agency must prioritize habitat restoration that coincides with salmon recovery efforts. (SDEIS)

Response: None of the alternatives propose any actions that would adversely affect tribal treaty reserved fisheries rights.

4. The Forest Service should adopt the Society for Conservation Biology policy regarding fish stocking. Under this plan within 36 months all fish stocking would halt, fish removal and drainage restoration would be priority. (SDEIS)

Response: The Forest Service works cooperatively with State fisheries agencies regarding fisheries management. If such a policy were to be adopted it would have to be at a state or regional level, and is outside the scope of this analysis.

Wildlife

1. The Forest Service should focus wilderness management on restoration of grizzly, wolf, salmon, and bull trout species. Use levels should not be so high that wildlife is displaced. (SDEIS)

Response: Nothing proposed in this Analysis would preclude restoration of grizzly, wolf, salmon or bull trout species. In fact, the Fish and Wildlife Service has completed analysis and introduction of wolves since this planning effort began. Similarly any decisions regarding introduction of Grizzly would be a function of the Fish and Wildlife Service working in cooperation with the State and local interests. Habitat and population conditions for bull trout within the FC–RONR Wilderness are functioning under predominantly natural conditions and there is no indication that restoration of that species would be needed. The Forest Service agrees that restoration of native Salmon within the FC–RONR Wilderness

Chapter 5 – Public Involvement

would be a desirable however the Regional/ National level of this issue places it outside the scope of this Analysis.

2. The Forest Service should allow no predator control within the FC–RONR Wilderness because it is not compliant with the Wilderness Act. (SDEIS)

Response: Your preference for no predator controls in the Wilderness is noted. Under certain conditions the Courts have found that predator control is an acceptable practice within designated Wilderness.

3. The Forest Service should prioritize the re-introduction of Grizzly bears. (SDEIS)

Response: Nothing proposed in this Analysis would preclude restoration of grizzly bears. Any decisions regarding introduction of grizzly would be a function of the Fish and Wildlife Service working in cooperation with the State and local interests.