Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument Resource Management Plan

Alternative Development Comment Summary

January 23, 2004

Lewistown Field Office
Airport Road, P.O. Box 1160
Lewistown, Montana 59457

January 23, 2004

Introduction

Last summer, as part of a continuing effort to invite public participation in planning for the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument, the BLM asked for the public's help in formulating alternatives.

A newsletter was sent out in July 2003, which included the Overall Vision and Management Goals for the Monument and a request for public comments on the Vision and Goals and ideas for the alternatives. The BLM also held 11 alternative development workshops during July in the same communities where the scoping open houses were held the previous year:

July 14	Winifred	July 23	Cleveland
July 15	Lewistown	July 24	Malta
July 16	Big Sandy	July 28	Hays
July 17	Fort Benton	July 29	Great Falls
July 21	Havre	July 30	Billings
July 22	Chinook		

About 350 people attended these alternative development workshops, and by year end, the public provided 7,167 comments, including numerous copies of seven identified form letters or organized campaign forms.

All comments were read and 2,647 specific comments were identified and coded into 64 subject categories and subcategories (see Table).

Following are the 2,647 specific alternative development comments by category and subcategory.

I want to thank the individuals and organizations who participated in our alternative development process. Your interest is appreciated.

Gary Slagel
Monument Manager

Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument
RMP Alternative Development Comment Codes

Subject Category or Subcategory	Category No.	Subcategory No.
Resources		
Resources - General	1000	
Air Quality	1050	
Cultural Resources	1100	
Fish and Wildlife	1150	
Wildlife Species		1151
Habitat		1152
Animal Damage Control		1153
Wildlife and Grazing		1154
Geology	1200	
Paleontology	1250	
Special Status Species (includes Animals, Fish, Plants)	1300	
Species and Habitat Inventories		1301
Prairie Dog		1303
Sage Grouse		1304
Additional Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species		1305
Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species and Grazing		1306
Soil	1350	
Vegetation/Native Plants	1400	
Riparian		1401
Upland		1402
Noxious and Invasive Plants		1403
Visual Resources	1450	
Water	1500	
Resource Uses		
Resource Uses - General	2000	
Forest Products	2050	
Lands and Realty	2100	
Public Access		2101
Access		2102
Utility and Communication Corridors		2103
Livestock Grazing	2150	
Minerals	2200	
Oil and Gas Activity		2210
Oil and Gas Resource Value and Monument Lands		2211
Oil and Gas Leasing within Monument		2212
Oil and Gas Lease Validity		2213
Oil and Gas Operations Management		2214
Oil and Gas Impacts within Monument		2215
Internal Oil and Gas Requirements		2216
Oil and Gas Lease Management		2217
Recreation	2250	
Camping		2251
Floating		2252
Motorized Watercraft		2253
Outfitting		2254
Hunting		2255
User Fees		2256
Non-Motorized Trails		2257
Transportation	2300	
Aircraft Landings		2310
Aircraft Overflights		2311
Roads (General)		2320
Roads (Upland)		2321
Roads (River Access)		2322
Fire		
Use and Suppression	3050	
Rehabilitation		3051
Ecology and History	3100	
Risk and Hazard	3150	
Special Designations		
ACECs	4050	
Wild and Scenic Rivers	4200	
Wilderness Study Areas	4250	
Wilderness Evaluation	4300	
Social and Economic Conditions		
Economic	5050	
Development		5051
Communities		5052
Private Land		5053
Facilities		5054
Analysis		5055
Health and Safety - Emergency Services		5151
Health and Safety - Waste Management		5152
Social	5200	
Process		
Process - General	6000	
Management	6050	
Conserve		6051
Maintain		6052
Multiple Use		6053
Preserve		6054
Primitive		6055
Protect		6056
Restore		6057
Wilderness		6058
Planning/NEPA	6100	
Analysis		6101
Budget/Staff		6102
Public Involvement		6103
Regulations		6104
Outside Scope	6500	

Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument RMP Alternative Development Public Comments Through December 2003

Subject Code No.	*Alternative Development Comments*
1050	
	Develop and implement plans that would maintain Class I air quality.
	Maintain Class I air quality and, where appropriate, address threats to that air quality from sources outside the Monument.
	Maintain the Monument as class I air quality. The BLM should be actively involved in the proposed coal fired plant in the Roundup area as well as other proposed coal development sites.
	A review for compliance with existing air quality laws and policies should accompany any site-specific proposals affecting the Monument. Mitigation should be incorporated into project proposals to reduce air quality degradation, and projects should be designed to minimize further degradation of existing air quality. New emission sources should be required to apply control measures to reduce emissions.
	The Monument should be managed as a Class I Air Quality Area. All requirements for such a designation, outlined in Section 164 of the Clean Air Act, are met or exceeded in the Monument. Air quality protection considerations should be included in a BLM actions and use authorizations.
	Develop and implement plans that would maintain Class I air quality.
1100	
	Identify historic landmarks, structures and other objects of historic or scientific interest. Stabilize their demise.
	The BLM should inventory (using outside agencies as needed) the archaeological and paleontological sites in the Monument The management plan should protect and preserve these sites (including protection from livestock).
	Historic, Native American religious and historic resources must be identified by the Native American nation, and their legal rig and cultural/religious needs fully protected by our public agencies, e.g. BLM.
	Archaeological sites are a concern. Don't want public trampling archaeological sites.
	BLM should: - Integrate President Bush's "preserve America" stewardship mandates into the RMP; - Integrate Section 110 of the NHPA into the RMP process by identifying, evaluating, and nominating properties to the National Register; - Ensure that allowed uses within the National Monument will not diminish BLM's ability to identify and protect historic properties in the future; - Adopt specific measures to protect cultural resources from artifact collectors, looters, and vandals.
	The history of the Monument area includes the rich oral and written stories reaching back to the first inhabitants, the coming o the trappers, the steamboat era and the homestead era. Management should preserve and maintain all of the history of the monument area, not just the "modern" post-war era.
	Enforcement and public education are keys to preventing vandalism, damage and degradation of archeological and paleontological sites in the Monument.
	Bricks at Power Plant Ferry – is this on private land and is it considered historical?
	Old homesteads should probably have a 100 meter buffer with respect to vehicle routes, to prevent vandalism and preserve t historic setting and feeling.
	BLM should initiate consultation with all Native American tribes who have had a historical presence in the area as early as possible. BLM should allow Native American tribes who are interested in the RMP process an adequate opportunity to provid information and engage in consultation. BLM should comply with all federal laws requiring consultation, as well as BLM's policies and directives on consultation.

Does the BLM have a "cultural control program" in the Monument area?

The BLM should continue to inventory for archaeological resources to evaluate their potential for protection, conservation, research, or education.

BLM should use the information collected to create a better understanding of cultures and should work with the appropriate Native American tribes to preserve and interpret remnants of native cultures within the Monument.

Sites recognized by contemporary Native American Indians as important to their cultural continuity should be identified, respected, and managed for preservation and continued traditional use.

All proposed projects should include a site inventory for sensitive sites; alternatives should include avoiding the site altogethe

The BLM should inventory and identify the archeological and paleontological sites in the Monument including sites already known to exist on adjacent private land. The management plan should protect and preserve these objects through redirecting motorized access, enforcement and public education to prevent vandalism, damage and degradation. The agency's legal obligation to do so are clearly explained in the national Historic Preservation Act. Appropriate signs should be erected at key locations in the Monument to educate the public about the value and necessary protection of these features. The BLM shoul integrate information and artifacts from the Billings Curation Center in the Monument visitor center.

The history of the Monument area includes the rich oral and written stories reaching back to the first inhabitants, the coming o the trappers, the steamboat era, and the homestead era. Management efforts should preserve and maintain all of the history the Monument area and not just focus on the modern era. The entire history should be featured at the visitor center. The BL should work closely with Indian Nations, public and private historians and ecologists. The BLM should seek federal or private resources to maintain existing, historic homestead cabins and other historical sites.

Provide historical hiking trails with guides and historical interpretation and perspective.

Historic sites must be protected so that its history, prehistoric and recent, remains intact. It is always a pleasure for instance recognize a site as described by early explorers, or history comes alive when one visits the trail used by Chief Joseph of the C Island crossing.

Look to Native American community to work with them.

Should Gist Ranch buildings be destroyed to make the area more Lewis and Clark-like?

1150

Preserve and protect Sage Grouse habitat and big game habitat. Identify and protect prairie dog towns and keep prairie dog towns off limits to shooters. There should be no prairie dog shooting allowed in the monument. Prairie dog towns should not controlled within certain acreage limits. The towns should be permitted to expand or contract naturally. Identify areas in the Monument where bison can be introduced in order to propagate a wild bison herd. A wildlife landscape which includes bison prairie dogs, plovers, terns, and other prairie animals should be encouraged.

The Monument shall be managed to the benefit of wildlife preferentially over commercial uses that compete for essential rang and habitat resources.

A commitment to continue/expand scientific study of wildlife and plant ecosystems in the Monument which sometimes may intrude on the solitude and other wilderness aesthetics of the area. Scientists can learn much about functioning ecosystems an area like the breaks.

I wouldn't mind seeing some bison (brucellosis free of course) on some of those grasses.

Wildlife health concerns must take priority over recreational uses of the Monument.

Develop formal agreements between BLM, FWP, FWS for proactive wildlife management schemes and streamline law enforcement capabilities.

The BLM should work to enhance and preserve the viability of wildlife corridors, migration routes, and access to key forage, birthing, nesting, and spawning areas within the Monument.

A small wild bison herd should be established within the Monument and managed through regulated public hunting. Bison we once the dominant native ungulate along the Missouri River and they should be reintroduced to this area.

1151

Perform more inventory of wildlife and tailor management accordingly. Existing wildlife data (including plant life) is highly inadequate and should be improved in order for sound management to occur.

Ferruginous hawk nest sites should have seasonal 1/4 mile buffers with respect to any kind of occupancy (e.g. camping, mine activities).

How about introducing some buffalo?

Wildlife should be made a priority in the management plan. They should be managed using sound science not landowner preference.

In select areas in the breaks, bison herds should be reintroduced as a means of returning the area to a faunal condition which existed during historical times.

We would be interested in seeing some livestock grazing converted to bison grazing. We suggest that the plan provide flexib for a trial bison grazing program in some areas of the Monument, possibly Bullwhacker Creek. Of course, this kind of a progr would require a grazing permittee that was supportive and agreeable.

The BLM should make restoration and maintenance of wildlife species a priority over private commercial activities and uses.

Manage the wildlife (elk, deer, antelope, grouse) with a maximum population in the Monument area. Currently it is managed minimum population.

Prohibit interference with sage grouse on spring leks and bighorn sheep lambing and elk calving areas.

Valid science should direct management actions for wildlife species, i.e. prairie dogs and coyotes.

The BLM should plan for the expansion and/or re-colonization by wildlife species in the Monument, as well as the possibility o habitat restoration and linkage to areas contiguous to the Monument.

1152

Develop a habitat plan for native wildlife - sage grouse/sharptail/elk/deer.

BLM must use an intergovernmental agency strategy for such management issues as wildlife habitat development.

Protection of the wildlife habitat such as sage grouse spring leks, elk calving areas, big horn sheep lambing areas and all riparian habitat.

Prioritize protection and restoration of intact wildlife habitat in all management decisions, especially road and rangeland plann

Study mule deer populations and habitat.

Wildlife habitat must be protected and restored, where necessary. The draft EIS should describe the current condition of thes resources and the desired future condition. Additionally, the draft EIS should describe how the desired future condition would achieved.

Restoration of intact wildlife habitat in road and rangeland planning should be at the top of that list.

Prioritize wildlife habitat security.

If these populations must be lost or degraded due to habitat fragmentation associated with intensive energy and agricultural development on private lands and private mineral rights, then let's protect other important big sagebrush-grassland ecosystem occurring on public lands such as the Dillon Resource Area in southwestern Montana and the Missouri Breaks in central Montana.

Focus on protecting the landscape and the river from habitat fragmentation.

Critical wildlife habitats must be clearly identified on maps so that we the public can evaluate, update, and monitor for violatio by human users and activities.

Please consider protection of the wildlife habitat in the decision process. Some fences may be necessary to protect the shoreline habitat, however.

Wildlife habitat security must be a predominant consideration in the designation of open collector routes.

Provide adequate habitat security for wildlife propagation.

Place a high priority on maintaining intact wildlife habitat. Intact ecosystems are essential for conserving natural habitat for wildlife. Currently, the Missouri Breaks provides unfragmented habitat for many species of birds, fish, animals, and plants.

Species of special vulnerability should receive priority attention from the cooperating agencies: i.e. BLM should cooperate wit

MFWP to improve and expand the available habitat for bighorn sheep and Sage grouse on the Monument.

Restore wildlife and plants.

1153

Prohibit animal damage control activities except in emergency situations wherein the specific, offending animal is targeted.

Prohibit the indiscriminate killing of predators except for animal damage control when the specific predator is the target.

Allow predator control by shooting prairie dogs and coyotes.

A major component of any management plan for the area must encompass a plan for predator control. Introduced non-indigenous predators (raccoons, foxes, etc.) must be controlled in any sage grouse or other game bird management plan. Coyotes and lions must also be controlled if deer, elk, etc. populations are to be managed at a proper balance. Hunters are t best traditional method of controlling game populations.

Prohibit animal damage control activities that target predators as a group. Individual offending predators that are known to ha attacked livestock may be targeted.

Work with APHIS and responsible agencies to prohibit animal damage control activities except in emergency situations where the specific, offending animal is targeted.

Prohibit animal damage control activities except in emergency situations.

Manage the range for multiple use -- game and livestock. Control predator population.

Any wildlife damage control efforts should be clearly limited to the individual problem animal, and only where a verified livesto kill has taken place, rather than eradication at a population level.

No predator control actions should be permitted in the Monument. BLM has the authority to do this under the national agreem between the BLM and Wildlife Service (APHIS).

Prohibit animal damage control activities except in emergency situations wherein the specific, offending animal is targeted.

Prohibit animal damage control activities except in emergency situations wherein the specific, offending animal is targeted.

1154

Wildlife and cattle can co-exist.

The population of elk, deer, bighorn sheep has exploded in the past 15 years within the Monument, showing that the current AUM capacity is correct.

The animal usage both wild and domesticated needs to be closely monitored.

1200

The BLM should educate the public about the variety of geologic features in the Monument including the Eagle Sandstone formations, Judith River formations and igneous intrusions. The BLM should manage uses in the Monument to prevent dama to geologic formations and should prohibit scientific exploration that extracts or has the potential for damaging geologic formations.

1250

Need to look at collecting (petrified wood, fossils).

No removal of fossils, petrified wood, historical artifacts.

Prohibit removal of archaeological petrified wood and fossils.

No removal of historical or cultural artifacts, petrified wood, large fossils.

1300

The BLM should not allow disturbance and should not designate roads as open near known or potential nesting sites for any special status birds.

1303

How does the BLM plan to control prairie dogs?

Populations of black-tailed prairie dogs in the Monument should be protected from recreational shooting.

Black-tailed prairie dog populations should be protected from any shooting, poisoning, trapping, or any other lethal varmint control measures. Any management actions requiring control should involve translocation of the animals to another suitable location.

The BLM should work with the USFWS and the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and members of the Montana Prairie Dog Working Group to maintain existing prairie dog habitat and distribution on Monument lands. Furthermore the BLM shoul implement a plan for restoring prairie dogs to suitable habitat within the Monument in order to augment the overall population

In accordance with the Judith/Valley/Phillips RMP "the loss of prairie dog habitat on private land may be compensated for by developing additional habitat on BLM land in the vicinity of the habitat loss." This strategy should be extended to cover all Monument lands.

Recognize the special status of prairie dogs and the unique habitat created by prairie dog towns. Prohibit commercial sport shooting of prairie dogs and other non-game animals.

Do not manage prairie dog towns to specific acreage limits.

Prohibit sport shooting of prairie dogs and other non-game animals.

Prairie dog management should include present shooting restrictions limited to March 1 through May 31, a defined acreage a population, and clearly state the control methods used to keep them at designated levels and from moving to private property

Open to shooting prairie dogs.

Prairie dog towns should be managed only if they grow too big.

1304

Do not disturb dancing grounds and wildlife reproduction areas, habitat or riparian areas.

We request the highest consideration for sage grouse including limited seasonal entry or no motorized travel within 1.5 miles sage grouse leks.

Manage grazing practices to comply to sage grouse working group recommendations.

Allow cattle grazing in sage grouse areas to enhance feed and sage grouse habitat.

Sage grouse management needs to be incorporated into the state sage grouse management plan. Many of the managemen ideas included in the handouts make the assumption that cattle grazing is detrimental to the health of the sage grouse. However, in Section V of the state plan, Grazing and Herbivory, Beck and Mitchell (2000) identified both positive and negative direct effects of livestock grazing on sage grouse habitat. It is also stated that a properly managed grazing system can impro both quantity and quality of summer forage for sage grouse. Before strict rules are written that restrict grazing turn out dates and miles relative to leks, it must be recognized that grazing is compatible with sage grouse. As more research is complete d sage grouse, there must be flexibility that will allow this research to be reflected in future management decisions.

BLM should adopt a precautionary management approach with this species, providing the maximum amount of habitat and protection possible.

The BLM should adopt the sage grouse habitat guidelines defined by Connelly et al. 2000.

The BLM should adopt a no-net loss of big sagebrush habitat policy. Emphasis should be placed on maintaining, protecting a expanding large, contiguous areas of sage grouse habitat.

The BLM should adopt rangeland management policies and practices that set goals for the restoration of the sage grouse to historic levels. The BLM should limit activities that compromise, degrade, or inhibit restoration of habitat for sage grouse.

Have a predator control program for protection of sage hens.

Restrict roads and use within 1 1/2 miles of sage grouse leks.

1350

Inventory the soil types in the Monument and create a map for the public showing the various soil types and their location. Manage the uses in the Monument to prevent the degradation of soil through erosion and compaction by equipment.

1400

Any exotic grasses previously used in range improvement projects should be phased out in favor of native vegetation.

Protect its communities of native plants and wildlife.

Manage to sustain the diversity of plants and animals. Special attention should be given to segments of the biodiversity that a threatened for one reason or another. For example, cottonwood protection and regeneration should be given priority attention Maintaining the sagebrush/grassland type is important for Sage Grouse as well as other obligate species.

Protect and restore the native plants and animals.

Restore native vegetation and habitat (e.g. well-developed cottonwood stands, control of exotic and invasive species, etc.).

Follow Upper Missouri Watershed Plan which provides for upland and riparian health.

In keeping with the overall vegetation objectives and Presidential Executive Order 11312, native plants should be used for all projects in the Monument.

All proposed developments or surface disturbing activities should be required to include a site assessment for impacts to vegetation.

Please protect and restore native plants and wildlife.

No new reservoirs.

The BLM should manage for a natural diversity, abundance and distribution of native vegetation types.

In areas requiring restoration or revegetation, only native plants should be used in order to return the damaged area to a natu condition.

Protect and restore healthy communities of native plants and wildlife.

Provide protection for native species habitats.

Any native plant and animal life should be restored as near as possible to its "original" condition. To do this, it is imperative to develop very few touring routes with controlled access.

Livestock prescriptions should be used to modify vegetation communities.

As a student of ecology and lifelong outdoorsman, I have yet to encounter a situation wherein rangeland was operated in a manner that preserved a natural landscape. While I recognize the importance of the cattle industry and I recognize the importance of natural landscape to our society, I cannot reconcile the coexistence of the two on one piece of land.

Protect and restore healthy communities of native plants and wildlife, and prioritize protection and restoration of intact wildlife habitat in all management decisions, especially road and rangeland planning.

Restore native vegetation.

The other thing I would like to see is an emphasis on native vegetation and controlling invasive weeds.

Restore native plants and wildlife.

I think at the very least we should keep the cows out of the river. Most conscientious ranchers are piping the water out of the riparian ways up on to the benches where the grass is. So not only would our range land be enhanced, the recreational use would greatly benefit. Fence the cows out except at certain spots or preferably pump it up to tanks.

The BLM should work to maintain and protect contiguous grassland habitats from fragmentation and exotics.

The issue of managing healthy vegetation is the taproot for management of all other subsequent issues. If attention is paid to grass, shrub, and tree formats, it automatically takes care of other matters.

Priority for restoration or revegetation should be given to projects where Monument resources are being damaged, such as a

the river corridor. These sites would likely be in areas near development and/or heavy visitor use and the BLM should consid site-specific limits on visitor use in order to promote recovery.

The BLM should identify existing sage grouse habitat and potential areas of restoration. Restoration of big sagebrush should emphasized; generally the treatment should be that which is least disruptive and has the most rapid recovery time.

Are conflicts due to recreation causing areas to not meet standards? Should be addressed the same as livestock grazing.

Cattle could be used to improve vegetation (wildlife) if used properly.

Protect and restore wildlife and native plants.

Priority should be placed on protecting riparian and sagebrush communities.

I would like the BLM to protect and restore healthy communities of native plants and wildlife, and to prioritize protection and restoration of intact wildlife habitat in all management decisions, especially road and rangeland planning.

1401

The BLM should place a priority on restoring and maintaining riparian areas to provide nesting and roosting sites as well as important avian habitat.

The BLM should work with the USFWS, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a plan to restore natural spring flow variability to the Monument in order to protect declining fish species and riparian zones.

Install off-river watering facilities and manage livestock to keep them out of the riparian communities. Restore instream flows purchasing water rights from willing sellers.

Develop specific riparian monitoring plans with timelines and corrective actions regarding areas, soils and rangelands.

The discouragement of hot season grazing will be an important factor in reestablishing cottonwoods.

Management should reestablish the cottonwood and upland habitats that were seen by Lewis and Clark.

BLM must work cooperatively with federal allotment holders to determine conditions of the riparian health. If there are areas concern, a range of alternatives needs to be identified and evaluated with input from affected parties. In some cases, off-rive watering sites, riparian enclosures or developing watering sites on the river may prove to be the most effective way to addres concerns.

Protect cottonwood groves from grazing.

I have seen no evidence that you have developed and implemented a plan to replace the now aging cottonwoods along this corridor. This should be a clearly stated component of your management plan.

Adopt and implement a management plan that restores native species such as cottonwoods.

The BLM should set out an explicit goal for regenerating cottonwood, willow, and other understory species within the Missour River corridor from Coal Banks Landing to Woodhawk Campground.

The plan should provide for substantially reducing "hot season" grazing in riparian areas, and for protecting wildlife in the uplands.

Hot-season grazing (June-Aug.) in riparian areas should be prohibited. Grazing in riparian areas in general should be very limited.

Control livestock grazing to maintain cottonwoods. Plant new cottonwoods for the next generation.

The BLM needs to do more to encourage good grazing practices. The lack of cottonwood regeneration is downright scary wh you think of the possibility of the Missouri without cottonwoods. Action to reestablish natural waterflows and fencing of new growth is required.

The BLM should place a priority on protecting riparian and water resources within the Monument, as they are of supreme importance to the majority of fish and wildlife species.

Grazing in the river riparian zone must be more closely managed for better habitat health. Cottonwood regeneration in the riv riparian corridor is an issue of major concern. Cottonwood sprouts must be protected from cattle grazing long enough for the to grow beyond vulnerability.

Within 5 years, adjust grazing allotments so as to remove all domestic livestock from riparian areas including a one-half mile

strip both sides of the 148 miles main stem of the Missouri River that is within the Monument.

Allow restoration of heavily grazed riparian areas.

Hot season grazing in riparian areas should be prohibited and grazing of riparian areas in general should be minimized.

The BLM should work with the appropriate federal and state agencies to restore natural flow regimes in the Missouri River. T restoration should be in the form of increased spring discharge from upstream reservoirs, in particular the Tiber Dam on the Marias River and Canyon Ferry Lake.

It is critical that BLM Standards and Guidelines for grazing are met on all allotments containing riparian areas.

In order to have a healthy and natural riparian system on the Upper Missouri, cattle should be banned year round from the riparian areas on the entire 149 miles of the Wild and Scenic River.

Cottonwood regeneration should take priority in the river riparian zone with "checkerboard" fenced enclosures to allow both c use and seedling protection.

The plan should provide for substantially reducing "hot season" grazing in riparian areas, and for protecting wildlife in the uplands.

Permanent livestock removal immediately is the only biologically feasible cottonwood forest and riparian vegetation restoratio solution available at any cost to the American public owners of this environment.

Cottonwoods will not return without water changes and protection from beaver. The few old trees along the river should e protected with woven wire.

Restore cottonwoods to river ecosystems.

We can have good riparian management (cool season, time rotations, etc.) without the use of exclosures.

Restore impaired riparian areas to properly functioning habitats. Reduce or eliminate hot weather grazing along the river.

I would like to see the riparian standards changed to reflect the fact that the Missouri is not a free flowing river. Ranchers hav been asked (unfairly I feel) to bear the burden with regards to lack of cottonwood regeneration. The absence of periodic flood stages is the primary culprit.

Joint monitoring of riparian and range sites would be acceptable to us.

Livestock should be excluded from riparian zones where wildlife habitat has been degraded by grazing and trampling.

Create a riparian corridor. Buffer zone around riparian corridor.

Long-term management of the Monument requires maintaining the riparian cottonwood ecosystem for the future. Developme of water sources away from the river and protection of riparian areas from grazing are needed to maintain the health of the riparian habitat for wildlife, and will also enhance the visitor experience. Managers should look for natural barriers to cattle an areas where limited fencing could protect a significant area of riparian habitat.

Travel to the Little Missouri River in the Williston, ND area for field examination of what the original riparian ecosystem was, a still is there, as well as for about 50 miles below the Garrison Dam in North Dakota. These sites should be the baseline, the biological template, used by BLM to restore the 149 miles of Missouri River between Fort Benton and the CMR National Wild Refuge.

Minimize impact of grazing by protecting regeneration of cottonwood stands.

Every effort should be made to minimize impacts on resources necessary to sustain fish and wildlife. An example are the cottonwood trees growing in the corridor. Every effort should be made to protect these trees and special efforts should be ma to establish new growth of cottonwoods.

Flooding of these areas should be encouraged - no bank stabilization structures should be allowed in the Monument now or i the future.

Concern about fencing cattle out of riparian zones. Need more done to restore cottonwoods. Restrict cattle several years in cottonwood zones. Use cold season grazing in “potential” areas.

Might want to develop reservoirs away from river to get livestock away from riparian areas. Also need to be able to maintain existing reservoirs.

If a goal of managing the wild and scenic area includes restoration of cottonwood groves in the clearings and draws along the

river (as I think it should be), then frontage areas along the river will have to be fenced to keep cattle from destroying young trees. Regions at the end of fenced areas can open on the river for watering cattle, but they are destroying all young cottonwoods.

We ask BLM to include in the plan an analysis of the conflicts between existing livestock grazing and wildlife habitat values, addressing topics such as: Is grazing impairing riparian wildlife habitat, prairie dog towns, sage grouse habitat? (In which areas?) Then include in the plan measures to remove the impairing effects and restore natural habitat conditions.

1402

15-50% sagebrush, how is percentage determined?

"Chaining" should not be used as a management tactic.

1403

Eradication efforts on noxious weeds should be emphasized.

Biological control of noxious weeds should be utilized whenever possible; use of herbicides should be used only in extreme circumstances and only in very specific locations.

Noxious weeds spread most rapidly when areas are disturbed. So don't disturb the land anymore. No roads, no blading for airstrips, no construction of new trails, etc. and monitor those cows.

MWF believes the BLM should adopt and fund an invasive plant species eradication program. MWF also believes a formal weed free feed policy should be established, and enforced.

Do control weeds, leave Russian olives to provide bird feed.

Prevent the spread of noxious weeds by using public education and adopting regulations that control irresponsible ORV use; adopt a weed-free feed policy for livestock; prevent the spread of weeds from the river corridor into the uplands; and reduce a eliminate the infestation of weeds.

Revegetation projects need to be discrete. Get some herds of goats down to the river (with Basque herders) to gobble up tho weeds.

Chemical methods should generally be restricted to the control of noxious weed species. Biological control methods should b used exclusively for the control of noxious or exotic weed species.

The overriding priority of noxious weed control should be to achieve native vegetation objectives.

The best way to control noxious weeds is to prevent their introduction. The BLM should require certified weed-free hay and mandatory machine washing.

An array of control methods should be used, however aerial spraying of chemicals should be prohibited.

Control efforts should target noxious species in prioritized manner – considering the invasiveness of the species, the extent o invasion, the sensitivity of the area being invaded, and the accessibility within the Monument. Exceptional or special status species habitats should take priority.

A program for monitoring the effectiveness of control should be instituted.

As far as noxious weeds go, where and when did they become a problem that the BLM should take care of?

Invasive non-native plant species should be eradicated and replaced with natives.

Facilitate research into new treatment methods. Maximize use of biological control and reduce herbicides.

Prevent the spread of noxious weeds by using public education and adopting regulations that: control irresponsible ORV use; adopt a weed free feed policy for livestock; prevent the spread of weeds from the river corridor into the uplands and reduce a eliminate the infestation of weeds.

The best way to manage noxious weeds is to prevent their spread.

Clean weeds along river.

Don’t preclude the use of livestock for weed control.

How can those people floating the river help with control of noxious weeds?
- Education is most cost-effective reason how to do things right.
- Need interaction among all agencies, including counties.

Internet interactive program to identify weeds along the river and in the uplands.

Look at wildlife spreading weed seed.

Maintain sweet clover along roadways.

People need to be more aware and watch (weeds).

Should give pictures of weeds to campers and encourage them to pull weeds. What about floaters being given “bugs” to release?

Weeds are distributed downstream by the river. Infestations on river are close to river bank and can be transported via recreation users.

Certify equipment weed free and/or wash vehicles to ensure weed free.

Noxious and invasive weeds must be prevented and removed. Education, control of weed seed introduction and dispersion, chemical and biological treatment must be harnessed in the battle.

Control weeds.

Precautions should be taken to prevent the spread of noxious weeds by requiring certified weed-free hay.

Who is monitoring species locally and regionally to identify and anticipate problems before they reach epidemic proportion? Example: leafy spurge

There must be a serious effort to control noxious weeds and to protect native vegetative growth.

How many acres are infected by leafy spurge in the Monument area?

Implement an aggressive weed control program. Coordinate efforts with county weed supervisors. Educate public land users and neighboring landowners to help prevent spread of weeds.

Control of imported weeds is a huge item here.

Use public education and direct management action to prevent the spread of noxious weeds including the spread of weeds caused by overgrazing. Adopt regulations to prevent the spread of weeds by limiting ORV use by BLM and permittees to established roads only. Adopt a weed-free feed policy for recreational livestock. Prevent the spread of noxious weeds from t river corridor in to the uplands by educating the public about how humans may cause the spread of weeds. Eradicate infestations of weeds with biologically safe methods including the use of insects.

Priority should also be given to aggressive weed control programs in cooperation with weed control districts and private landowners. Weeds are one of the most serious threats to the ecological integrity of the area. In the category of weeds we would also recommend that Russian Olive and Salt Cedar (Tamarisk) be aggressively controlled.

Weeds are a serious threat. Expand cooperative agreements/partnerships across ownerships and agencies. Facilitate research into new treatment methods. Maximize biological controls.

BLM needs to control weeds on this area.

Prevent weed spread.

The BLM should place a priority on the control of noxious weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species This control should be a collaborative effort between the BLM, relevant counties, agencies, and private landowners in the Monument.

The BLM should minimize herbicide use when controlling noxious weeds in big sagebrush habitat. Research demonstrates a harmful effect of herbicide on sage grouse.

Extra effort should be made to get leaseholders and general public involved in control of weeds. I feel the BLM should mainta responsibility for weed control in and around the main camping and recreational areas.

I am concerned with noxious weed infestations mainly from ATV and pickups from the western part of Montana spreading spotted knapweed. I would like to see signs (educational) limiting access for at risk areas and increased monitoring for weed invasion.

Control noxious weeds.

Maintain aggressive integrated management program on noxious weeds to prevent movement from river corridor into non-infected sites. IWM methods would include the most effective treatments to contain and control noxious weeds. Expand cooperative efforts with private, state, and county entities.

A noxious weed management plan using integrated pest management techniques, and a management scheme to protect an encourage native plan species.

1450

All Monument lands should be designated Class I or Class II VRM areas.

The visual resource contrast rating system should be used as a guide to analyze potential visual impacts of all proposed actio

All proposed actions must consider the importance of the visual values and must minimize the impacts the project may have these values.

There should be no Class III (only partially retain the existing character of the landscape) or Class IV (provide for managemen activities which require major modification of the existing character of the landscape) VRM units within the Monument, as this contrary to the Proclamation.

The BLM should work to prevent, eliminate and minimize development activities that adversely affect the visual resource.

Study and identify the natural, night sky in the Monument and use this standard as the benchmark to prevent light pollution. There should be no artificial light in the Monument. The BLM should work with willing landowners to modify lights around residences and outbuildings in order to eliminate lights that intrude on the Monument landscape.

Visual resource management considerations should be used to site all gas and oil extraction activities to prevent these activit from diminishing the wilderness experience of visitors to the Monument.

1500

Use Monument water rights (including those reserved through Congressional designation of the area as a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System and those reserved through the Proclamation for Judith River and Arrow Creek) for th benefit of the Monument and do not convey or lease any water right appurtenant to the Monument.

Rescind the water reservation in Arrow Creek and the Judith River. This reservation is without authority and is not quantifiab

I am not in favor of a "don't touch it" policy on hydrology improvement. Good engineering and a sensitive approach to hydrolo improvement makes sense.

The water reservation in Arrow Creek and the Judith River is not quantifiable and its true reasons are unknown. This reserva should be rescinded.

No development of new reservoirs in Irvin Ridge, Bullwhacker, Cow Creek and Antelope Creek areas.

Water development must be maintained to enhance wildlife and distribute livestock.

Water rights should be purchased form willing sellers to improve water flow from tributaries of the Missouri.

Rescind the water reservation in Arrow Creek and the Judith River. This reservation is without authority and is not quantifiab

Rescind the water reservation in Arrow Creek and the Judith River. This reservation is not quantifiable and its true reasons a unknown.

No new reservoirs.

The water reservation in Arrow Creek and the Judith River is not quantifiable and its true reasons are unknown. This reserva should be rescinded.

Develop all water when possible to dams or reservoirs.

Water from the Judith River and Arrow Creek should not be reserved for the monument.

The BLM, under no circumstances, should relinquish or convey Monument water rights.

Use Monument water rights (including those reserved through Congressional designation of the area as a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System and those reserved through the Proclamation for Judith River and Arrow Creek) for th benefit of the Monument and its resources.

Establish/coordinate policies that recreate the natural patterns of water volume in the river.

The Proclamation reserves a quantity of water in the Judith River and Arrow Creek to meet the needs of the Monument. Aga the President's authority to make this declaration appears lacking and this reservation of water is neither understood nor quantifiable. Unless the BLM is able to connect the relevance of this water reservation to meeting the needs of the monumen (ostensibly to protect objects of antiquity), this water reservation should be rescinded.

The Monument should have no control of the water right from Arrow Creek and the Judith River. I feel that all rights to this wa have already been used up. The flow is already very low without the Monument having a certain amount -- they will have to l with the flow of the Missouri River.

Water developments (reservoirs, watersavers, springs) should continue to be developed and maintained to help wildlife resources and range quality.

Drainage from BLM to private reservoirs.

Livestock watering is enhancing wildlife by providing water in dry years.

Will BLM take away stock water rights on the river (if water right is on allotment)?

Article IX of the Montana Constitution provides that all water in Montana is the property of the state for the use of its people. validity of the Proclamation reserving water in Arrow Creek and the Judith River to meet the needs of the monument is highly suspect and demands legal investigation. The water reservation is not quantifiable and should not be implemented. The specific needs of the monument have never been documented or quantified and there is no relevance to the protection of the objects of antiquity.

Obtain water rights or purchase water rights for visitor facilities. Have potable water available at a few interpretive sites in the Monument. Monitor water quality within the Monument to determine impacts from gas development, cattle grazing and erosio from roads.

Water developments should only be used where necessary to protect Monument resources. Water developments should not used to increase livestock numbers.

Diversion of water out of the Monument should not be permitted.

Water monitoring should be implemented to ensure inflow is adequate.

The BLM should develop a water quality monitoring program that ensures no water sources are classified as type 303d.

Rescind the water reservation in Arrow Creek and the Judith River. This reservation is without authority and is not quantifiab

I don't feel the BLM should have any control over the waters in the monument. These waters are the property of the State an are available to be used by individuals that have obtained water rights along these tributaries.

2000

No limit on commercial use. The less restriction on use the better.

Restoration and biologically-correct riverine management of the Missouri River corridor requires complete removal of all lives and uses thereof permanently, immediately, from all federal land within the corridor.

Airplanes, ORVs and resource extraction should be allowed only in those rare instances where they will not adversely affect quiet recreational pursuits.

Weigh impact of development in the context of the preservation of other values.

Maintaining existing sites, rights-of-ways, enclosures and trenches.

If any additional motorized use road building, development, and/or commercialism can be prohibited or discouraged, it would a huge benefit to the Monument.

Leave some areas, particularly near wildlife refuge with no development (wilderness).

Don't want to see drilling rigs from river. What about seeing outhouse in the uplands?

Monument Proclamation states the Monument should be protected. If a group wants a use that is contrary to Proclamation, t shouldn't be allowed in the Monument.

How to allow for poor/local use of resources.

Manage to the benefit of wildlife preferentially over commercial uses that compete for essential range and habitat resources.

Shouldn't try to preclude existing uses unless Proclamation precludes it.

Severely limit the impact of humans and their animals to retain a rustic recreational opportunity and valid wildlife habitat.

BLM has a responsibility to control all activities that jeopardize wildlife and habitat integrity. (p.s. limit roads/cattle grazing)

Do not limit future use - accommodate future use.

I would include timber resourcing, mineral resourcing, agriculture and recreation. All activities should be monitored to the late and best environmental standards.

Limit use of the river and surrounding land.

Lean towards protecting the area from further impact by our thoughtless use.

Do not allow new development.

Manage to the benefit of wildlife preferentially over commercial uses that compete for essential range and habitat resources.

Fences should be used only when necessary to protect Monument resources and be consistent with VRM principles. All fenc should be built to wildlife compatible standards.

BLM should look at careful development on all lands.

To allow any kind of commercial interests, vehicular, powered water craft, etc. into the 377,000 acre Monument area would be intolerable encroachment upon the Monument.

Keep development to a minimum to preserve the primitive quality of the Monument.

Do everything possible to curtail and restrict any kind of development within the monument (roads, structures, utility corridors energy facilities).

Private outfitting and public hunting and fishing need to be in balance with each other and same importance placed on public property (resources) rights as private property rights.

2050

The RAC concluded that timber sale sin the Monument should be discontinued, and we agree. Post and pole cutting should prohibited because it is similar to commercial harvesting and encourages illegal, off-road vehicle use. Non-commercial firewo and Christmas tree cutting that does not adversely impact the management of the Monument resources may be allowed by permit in designated areas where the firewood gatherer or Christmas tree harvester can obtain trees without driving off of designated routes.

If logging is required for forest health the roads should be locked to ATVs and reclaimed at the end of the project.

Prohibit timber sales including post and pole cutting.

BLM should discontinue timber sales in the National Monument, and allow for noncommercial firewood and Christmas Tree cutting by permit in designated areas.

No commercial harvesting of wood products, including Christmas tree cutting and timber harvesting.

No harvesting of wood products such as timber, Christmas trees.

Prohibit all timber sales.

Cut some wood.

Does “no harvest” of timber include collection of firewood? Personal use for campfire in same category? Can haul own firewood. What about reduction of fuels, not commercial, but to reduce fire effects?

What are alternatives to cutting down trees?

No timber logging.

MWF believes that any commercial timber harvesting in the Monument shall require an approved 'permit' only after a comple landscape analysis is conducted and it can be proven that the integrity of the Monument will be enhanced by the harvest. Non commercial firewood and Christmas tree cutting that does not adversely impact the management of the Monument resources may be allowed by permit in designated areas.

The RAC concluded that timber sales in the Monument should be discontinued, and I agree. Post and pole cutting should be prohibited because it is similar to commercial harvesting and encourages illegal, off road vehicle use. Non-commercial firewo and Christmas tree cutting that does not adversely impact the management of the Monument resources may be allowed by permit in designated areas.

How do we manage fires/wood gathering in uplands?

Commercial timber harvests, fuel wood harvesting, and post-cutting are unnecessary activities that would result in damage to monument resources.

No logging.

Prohibit post and pole cutting. Prohibit firewood cutting.

"Education and Scientific" terms should not be used, as it was in California and Oregon, for logging.

2100

The BLM must analyze, document and determine existing, legal rights of way for access to private land or State land. All existing documents pertaining to rights of ways should be kept on file in the Monument headquarters. Informal rights of ways must be formalized with full public participation.

MWF supports the trade-out of state lands within the Monument for lands of equal or greater value outside the Monument boundaries.

Utility or communication rights of way that existed prior to the designation of the Monument should be identified, mapped and validated. Development of valid, existing rights of way should not interfere with the proper care and management of the Monument and should be planned and constructed to avoid impacts on the visual aesthetics of the Monument.

Conservation easements with landowners must be actively pursued and sufficient funds made available.

The BLM should review the list of private lands within the Wild and Scenic River corridor and prioritize its list of properties tha would like to acquire if the opportunity arises.

Explore opportunities to acquire through trade, easement or purchase from willing landowners and the State, property that wi enhance the Monument’s resources and protect those resources from degradation. The BLM should prepare and prioritize a of possible opportunities where willing landowners may sell, exchange or provide protective easements.

Utility or communication rights of way that existed prior to the designation of the Monument should be identified, mapped and validated.

Development of valid, existing rights of way should be planned and constructed to avoid impacts on the objects, including the viewshed, of the Monument.

No new utility rights-of-way and communication sites should be granted or constructed in the Monument.

The BLM should review the list of private lands within the Wild and Scenic River corridor and prioritize its list of properties tha would like to acquire if the opportunity arises.

The BLM should prohibit official and unofficial target practice ranges or facilities in the Monument.

Special uses such as filming and large events should be highly restricted to prevent conflicts with other users. Such activities require monitoring to insure conformance to regulations and prevention of land misuse.

We encourage land acquisition by the BLM within the Monument. These acquisitions should be fee and scenic easement purchases from willing sellers using Land and Water Conservation Funds or land exchange. Land exchange should use pub

land outside the Monument for "exchange lands." Highest priority should be given to bottomlands with historic and cultural sites. Bottomlands that have riparian habitat potential should also receive high priority for acquisition.

I believe that before BLM disregards the potential RS2477 designation of roads, Secretary Norton's office should be consulte

Buy out private lands if there are opportunities to do so.

If BLM makes land trades, or acquisition-disposal type transactions, I feel that it should all be done within the same school district. We have lost taxable value in our school district in recent years and can't afford to lose anymore.

School districts should be considered in land trades so the same values can be retained in the affected district. Also should sales occur and the BLM purchases offsetting parcels they should be in the same district.

There is little doubt that land acquisition will continue to take place. If the Bureau of Land Management acquires land in the Winifred area it is imperative that they dispose of property of equal value within the Winifred Public School District. A substantial net loss will be sustained by the school district if this practice is not implemented and enforced.

Private rights of way are to be maintained by the private landowner served by the road.

Buy as much as possible of these lands and protect them.

Analyze, document and determine existing legal rights of way for access to private land or state land. The BLM must also identify, map and validate utility or communication rights of way that existed prior to the designation of the Monument.

The BLM should develop a prioritized list of all possible opportunities where willing landowners may sell, exchange or provide protective easements.

Review the list of private lands within the Wild and Scenic corridor and prioritize a list of properties for acquisition.

Acquire all inholdings.

The BLM should develop a prioritized list of all possible opportunities where willing landowners may sell, exchange, or provid protective easements.

The BLM should identify property owners interested in selling land or easements and prioritize those acquisitions that would b protect the resources of the Monument.

Provide the stakeholder process with maps of all legal rights-of-way for access to private or state land.

The BLM must analyze, document and determine existing, legal rights of way across the public lands within the Monument.

All existing and future documents pertaining to rights of ways should be kept on file in the Monument headquarters.

Informal rights of ways must be formalized with full public participation.

Review the list of private lands within the Wild and Scenic corridor and prioritize its list of properties that it would like to acquir

2101

Explain "acquire easements in areas of limited public access."

Restrict general public access to specified areas following all rules for action.

Keep public access as it exists today.

Allow public access as it exists today.

A large block of public land, how did you get into the area (ATV, vehicle)?

There should be no guaranteed right of way for a private landowner who does not permit the public to cross the private land in order to access public land. Fair use requires that the public be permitted access to public land just as the private landowner has access to his land.

Limit the number of access points to the river for cars and boat launches.

It's very easy to get lost and/or stuck in this area. Maybe private land crossing to public land access could be addressed.

I would also like to see limited recreational access as a method to prevent weeds and weed management plan be implemente along the river.

Access to the Monument should not restrict the public from enjoying the special beauty of the area.

There is enough access for you to take care of.

Under "Reroute Roads" all three management ideas seem acceptable.

Maintain or improve public access within the monument.

Maintain public access as it exists today.

We hope that national monument status will provide a potential source of funding to purchase additional access sites.

Keep public access as it exists today.

Acquire easements in areas of limited access.

Maintain only BLM public access.

The management plan should allow for access to hunting opportunities, but provide for adequate big game security.

Maintain public access where it is there now.

Get legal reroute roads.

Various access locations should be established for public access to park, then walk or bike.

As an elementary teacher I would like to see provisions made for groups of students and teachers to access areas of the Monument for field trips.

More access sites are needed so that the public can enjoy this stretch of the Missouri River. At the very least, the names and phone numbers of ranchers willing to "sell" access should be published, so those with their own canoes and rafts can enjoy short float trips.

Any legally designated public access routes must be provided on an equal opportunity basis.

Allowing more access makes it easier for violators and drug labs (airstrips).

Support public access, and no special access for the commercial interests.

2102

Leave access to State lands that have access now consistent to State lands recreational use permits.

Acquire easements or purchase property for access. Include access agreements with BLM leases or increase the lease fee t match the private land market lease values if access is not allowed. Do not allow the leaseholder access to Monument land f outfitting, hunting, hiking or any recreation use if they don't allow equitable access except for ranching functions.

Limit land access to the river.

Make sure there is fair and comparable access.

Access for private property and cattle leases for respective parties should be allowed.

Handicapped access needs to be addressed in all areas. Water and land.

I believe it is important to provide access to the Monument for people who have disabilities, especially those who are unable walk.

Is it access to what they use now? What is the type of access?

Need fair and equitable access.

Allow no private land owners within the Monument to improve by building, rebuilding any existing access across Monument la

Private access to private lands should be determined, formalized and designated with 'use specific' prescriptions. Each approved designated road must include a long-term maintenance plan.

Consider limiting access to the river where and when excessive use may damage the environment and the special attributes the corridor.

Current trails need to be preserved and open to public use (negotiate access from private landowners).

Access to private property must remain open to all types of vehicles including farm machinery to keep the current land use.

Do not limit access to children, elderly and handicapped.

Access to all areas of the public land needs to be maintained in its present historic role.

Access for disabled and elderly would be limited to already existing public areas.

There should also be equal access opportunities for the public and no privileged access.

Equal access.

Landowners with landlocked public land should not be allowed use of the public lands (lease) unless they allow reasonable access to the public to those lands.

Legal rights-of-way to state lands must be maintained.

2103

No new communication sites on Monument land.

There should be no new utility rights-of-way routes to communication facilities constructed in the Monument.

2150

I recommend cattle grazing end completely in the vicinity of the river. A buffer zone of no cows at least a mile from the river a its tributaries would go a long way to protecting the grasslands, cottonwood forest, and prevent pollution of the water.

Grazing is the other principal historic use of the area and is also integral for both healthy land conditions and supporting the wildlife component.

Grazing allotments should be determined by individual yearly conditions and not "by the acre" with rewards to the permittee w is providing good management practices. Good livestock management is critical to game habitat and FWP needs to do a bet job managing "their livestock" jointly with domestic livestock which will actually improve range conditions.

I suggest that eventually livestock be allowed only limited access to the riparian vegetation.

The BLM should closely monitor grazing practices to prevent overgrazing that damages vegetation and the restoration and recruitment of cottonwoods.

Remove abandoned fences in Bullwhacker and Squaw Creek.

There should be more water developments in the Monument area. This would increase the wildlife and also more and better utilization of the grass for grazing livestock. In dry years there is often grass but no water for miles.

To help keep erosion at a minimum I believe grazing along hillsides and water be restricted. No abolished but definitely managed so that the impact on the environment is minimized. Possibly limiting water access to certain sites, etc.

There should be no range improvements authorized within the monument. No fences.

BLM Standards and Guidelines for grazing leases should be monitored and enforced.

Range improvements are good, help wildlife and livestock. Define reclamation of "disturbed" areas.

I urge that cattle grazing be managed to protect wildlife habitat. I support limitation of grazing during the summer time during hot season, especially in riparian areas.

Let BLM range management control all livestock grazing.

Grazing facilities should be monitored to make sure they meet guidelines and standards.

The grazing of livestock should continue as it is right now. There are enough rules in place now to do a sufficient job in management of grazing livestock.

Develop off-site water for livestock.

The BLM should actively monitor, evaluate, and enforce grazing laws, regulations and the standards for rangeland health on

regular basis. There should be no new improvements or reconstruction of existing grazing facilities on Monument land withou analysis of the impacts to the Monument. The BLM should limit activities by livestock permittees if such activities adversely impact the integrity of the Monument. Grazing is recognized in the Proclamation as a permitted traditional use of the land; bu grazing on the Monument must be strictly supervised to prevent damage to other values recognized in the Proclamation.

Pump water from the river up to the cattle grazing. Keep cows off the river.

Monitoring and proper management of grazing leases is also important in order to protect the integrity of the Monument. Plea establish enforceable guidelines and monitor for compliance. If livestock are found to be destructive to the wild character and natural resources within the Monument, they should be limited.

Retain watershed plans.

Rangeland improvements in general and stock water systems in particular must be regulated within the Monument area to av creating conflicts between livestock and wildlife in critical habitats. A particular concern is the areas used by elk, sheep and antelope for birthing in spring and summer.

Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines should be well monitored and enforced.

Ranching and grazing are traditional activities in the area and should continue, but good range management practices must manage grazing so as to protect soil, water and wildlife resources as the top priority. Ranchers know that good range land is basis of their livelihood and they can be great land stewards.

Livestock are critical for any progressive land management and because of the 81,000 acres of private land and integration o BLM grazing this needs to be maintained for the local economy.

Development of range improvements and water improvements should be allowable if a plan can be developed between allotm owner/lessee and BLM.

In cases where redistribution of cattle is deemed absolutely necessary to meet riparian standards, impacts to wildlife could be reduced if at least a third of each allotment were to receive a full year of rest from livestock grazing each year, with rested are rotated within each allotment from year to year.

We are concerned about the ramifications of increased livestock use on some upland habitats. The amount of residual vegetation present on BLM allotments at the end of the grazing season affects the capacity of these lands to support winterin deer and elk and is also important to ground-nesting bird populations (including sharp-tailed grouse and sage grouse) the following spring. In some areas, increased cattle use of upland habitats has been accompanied by considerable reductions in the amount of residual cover available to wildlife. Redistribution of cattle to upland habitats may have also increased compet between cattle and mule deer for forbs and browse during the growing season.

No grazing fees on public land.

I encourage restriction of grazing within the riparian zone to allow restoration of cottonwoods and other riparian zone growth.

AUMs should be modified on permit areas to ensure adequate forage for elk and deer cows and does in birthing areas.

Please prevent grazing cattle from degrading vegetation and river banks. This could be done by limiting the number allowed, extensive fencing to keep them away from the river and providing water a distance from the Missouri for those that are allowe

As for grazing in the Monument, I believe that the watershed agreements made between ranchers and BLM should be a part the RMP for the Monument.

Monitor livestock grazing to ensure ecological integrity standards are met.

The riparian standards and guidelines should reflect the fact that the Missouri River is not a free flowing river.

Grazing should be prohibited in riparian and campground areas. Stock tanks for cattle should be developed in upland areas.

Grazing should be prohibited seasonally in special wildlife habitats.

Eliminate fences, use herders, move cattle around and there would be less damage to the land.

Strictly monitor livestock grazing within the federal and BLM standards and guidelines. The BLM should not rely on self-polic methods by permittees. Those permit holders who violate their permits should be given notice that the permit will terminate unless the holder brings the operation into compliance. There should be no hesitation to hold permittees accountable under t terms of their contracts. Identify areas where diverse camping will take place which may come into conflict with cattle and modify the grazing permit accordingly. Strictly monitor rangeland health.

Renew grazing permits only if permittee has been a good steward and then at near market rates.

Limit activities of livestock permittees if such activities adversely impact the integrity of the Monument.

Regarding grazing management, I feel that the watershed agreements entered into, between BLM and leaseholders, should b incorporated into the RMP.

Monitor leasing dates and ensure dates are followed in management of stray cattle.

Manage range lands with a primary goal of restoring and protecting the natural wildlife habitat values. BLM should carefully monitor range condition and make any necessary adjustments in grazing activities to bring back the natural vegetative condit

I recommend that the BLM increase staff and hours to properly monitor and enforce grazing standards and guidelines. The BLM should limit any livestock activity that causes significant damage to the integrity of the Monument. Cows in the Cottonwoods for example.

Livestock grazing must be controlled, so that it doesn't result in overgrazing and loss of habitat for wildlife.

For watershed systems now in place you might consider some kind of rest-rotation practice among allotments to draw increas elk numbers off adjacent private property. Manipulating water availability might get us to a better balance of riparian and grassland values -- both are important.

I would like to see restrictions on the access of cattle to the lands. They eat young trees and foul the water. Then the cottonwoods, willows and other plants would have a better chance to regenerate.

Grazing allotments should be determined by the year and not the acre. By this, I mean, on wet productive years allow more cows and on dry years less cows - simple. Abusers of this policy should be fined severely or lose grazing privileges.

Limit activities of livestock permittees if such activities adversely impact the integrity of the Monument.

Monitor and enforce grazing standards and guidelines and limit livestock activities if such activities cause serious damage to integrity of the Monument.

This ecosystem was developed under heavy grazing pressure from bison and other ungulates. Under present management t grazing has been reduced to the point that native forage is dying out or unhealthy. Invaders come in and fuel buildup is such are often treated to heavy smoke (air pollution) and big uncontained fires. Grazing is important to this ecosystem.

Eliminate all livestock from the Monument to improve wildlife habitats, wildlands environments. Specifically preclude any new livestock welfare subsidies such as fencing, roads, trails, well, pipelines, water tanks, destruction of native wildlands and conversion to livestock feed, etc.

Manage grazing with existing Standards and Guidelines. Range improvements help livestock and wildlife.

Whenever permittees can be bought out, it should happen.

Use of the watershed planning process to review grazing permits should continue. This process allows an overview of each particular watershed and its unique characteristics. This also incorporates involvement and cooperation from the people mos affected in the area. The watershed planning process should identify what criteria to evaluate the condition of the resource a at the same time allow permittees flexibility in how the conditions are met. The RAC should only be involved in general terms and not specific grazing plans. The RAC's current management of general guidelines, which are incorporated into the watershed planning process, is a reasonable approach. Monitoring of the area should be based on shared responsibility of th agency and the permittee. Before monitoring is to occur, a clear set of guidelines should be followed. These guidelines shou include: Discussion on areas to be monitored; Ideology of methods of monitoring; Designation of how data collection will occ Communication by both parties when actual monitoring will occur and the results.

Implement "Standards of Rangeland Health" into all management decisions for livestock grazing.

Monitor, evaluate, and enforce current livestock grazing laws, regulations, and the standards for Rangeland Health in every management decision.

Allow grazing (not excessive grazing).

Limit or cancel livestock usage if not meeting permit requirements.

Limit activities of livestock permittees if such activities adversely impact the integrity of the Monument.

Watershed-based planning means current management is good and time tested. Range improvements - as needed and continue maintenance. Evaluate each allotment and permittee as needed per se in historical agreement of multiple use concept. Livestock management - current management. Monitoring - all areas need to be considered. Weeds - current

management.

There should be no established limits on the number of reservoirs developed in the monument. Decisions to develop reservo should be between the allotment owner and the resource manager.

Allotment owners should be allowed vehicle access along existing roads or trails to make range improvements or maintain fences, reservoirs or springs.

Allow vehicle travel 300 feet from existing roads to establish a campsite.

The RMP should include a review of current grazing practices and make land use level decisions about whether grazing is suitable in all areas. This is appropriately done at the land use level stage and is based on FLPMA's multiple use standards, which requires the BLM to balance competing resource values to ensure that public lands are managed in a manner "that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people." [National Wildlife Federation v. BLM, 140 IBLA 85, 101 (August 21, 1997)].

Standards and Guidelines should include a schedule for assessing allotments and implementing changes where necessary a must include a collection of sufficient quantitative and supplemental qualitative information adequate to initiate monitoring.

Standards and Guidelines must include a commitment to assess springs and riparian areas for PFC, incorporating biotic and abiotic indicators, upland assessments, including evaluation of cryptobiotic soil crusts and commitments to reassess where d is not current.

The BLM must enforce the grazing Standards and Guidelines in a timely, effective manner.

Range control should not be in management plan. It should be controlled by BLM.

Limit livestock use where it conflicts with the objectives of the Monument.

Monitor and enforce grazing standards, limiting grazing if necessary to maintain the integrity of the Monument.

BLM should control (manage).

Grazing permits dictate what can and cannot be done.

Livestock grazing in the Monument should not be addressed in the RMP.

Not a wilderness area, bottoms are not like 200 years ago; be fair across the board, grazing along river (need a balance).

Watershed plans should be followed for grazing.

You as a leaseholder on certain rights (spell this out). Be careful of what is written; may not include everything.

Cattle grazing should be controlled by BLM management plans and should not in any way be subject to the Monument plan.

I believe grazing should be allowed and managed well.

It is the private landowners' financial and physical burden to fence out BLM. Who should be responsible for fencing?

Livestock grazing must be managed to not detract from the visitor experience. Efforts should be made to keep livestock off o the river banks as much as possible. This will probably require fencing and water development. The Lewis and Clark campsites, where known, should be protected. Campsites for river travelers need to be better protected to prohibit livestock entry. As many as possible of the cottonwood stands should also be protected.

Control of grazing to reduce the removal of too much of the annual growth, giving first priority to the native wildlife, will be a h priority for a wonderful future for this unique Monument.

Reduce grazing where cows are doing damage.

Please reduce the amount of cattle grazing in the Monument and insure that what grazing is allowed to occur is managed so to do the least impact on natural resources.

Grazing standards need to be set, monitored, and enforced to sustain the grassland.

In order to protect wildlife and habitat, we recommend that you eliminate hot-weather grazing along the river; ban grazing from sensitive areas, including sage grouse habitat; and restrict the development of reservoirs.

Livestock grazing should be closely managed. Those grazing activities that adversely impact the integrity of the Monument's resources, especially riparian areas, should be limited or eliminated. The draft EIS must specify what the carrying capacity of the land is, the grazing on/off dates, and where water facilities would be allowed. Moreover, the draft EIS should describe the current range condition, what the desired future condition is, and how the BLM will achieve that desired future condition.

Livestock grazing must be carefully regulated and overgrazing prohibited to avoid loss of plant life that results in less forage e year for both livestock and wildlife, as well as causes erosion to the land.

Monitor, evaluate and enforce current livestock grazing laws, regulations and the standards for Rangeland Health in every management decision.

Carefully restricted and controlled grazing.

Allow grazing but limit to reduce wear and growth on dancing grounds and wildlife areas.

Limit grazing to the present ratio.

[No more permits allowed] for livestock activities.

The Montana Stockgrowers have developed a program called Uncommon Stewardship. Uncommon Stewardship should be encouraged if it is focused on the improvement of grazing of poorly managed allotments, historical preservation and restoratio

MWF believes that the BLM should actively monitor, evaluate, and enforce grazing laws, regulations and the standards and guidelines for rangeland health on a regular basis. There should be no new developments or reconstruction of existing grazin facilities on Monument land without analysis of the impacts to all objects of the Monument. The BLM should limit activities by livestock permittees if such activities adversely impact the integrity of the Monument and its resources. MWF believes any grazing regime or infrastructure allowed within the Proclamation does not establish a vested interest in the public land or resources of the Monument.

Remove abandoned fences that could be hazardous to visitors, wildlife and livestock.

I urge BLM in its management alternative to scrutinize its allotment management to ensure that range health in the area is healthy or on an improving trend.

Having just canoed the upper Missouri through the wild and scenic stretch (the White Cliffs and the Missouri Breaks), I was appalled at the number of cattle along the river that left droppings in every campsite and churned the riverbank into a quagmi It seems to me that you might consider reducing the cattle in the popular recreational stretch of the upper Missouri.

Allow traditional agriculture to continue, but limit degradation that comes from overuse.

No arbitrary limits should be set for reservoir developments. Decisions to develop water or to make range improvements sho be based on sound management principles shared by the BLM and allotment owner.

One of the prohibitions would be grazing.

Continue to allow grazing as per existing AUM capacity.

BLM has the expertise to identify where cattle grazing has caused wildlife habitat to deteriorate. This information should be discussed in the management plan, together with measures that will reverse that trend and move the habitat into a recovery.

Livestock grazing must be carefully monitored and managed.

Grazing leases and practices need to be looked into similarly, and where they are inconsistent with the primary management goals and purposes for which Monument was established, corrective action needs to take place.

The BLM should actively monitor, evaluate, and enforce grazing laws, regulations and the standards for rangeland health on regular basis. There should be no new improvements or reconstruction of existing grazing facilities on Monument land withou public involvement analysis of the impacts to the Monument. The BLM should limit activities by livestock permittees if such activities adversely impact the integrity of the Monument.

Fence or protect riparian areas from livestock grazing.

Monitoring plans must be developed for the existing watershed plans to ensure that the plans are followed and that corrective action is taken before damage to Monument resources.

Domestic grazing programs for ranchers should be closely monitored and scrutinized as to any negative impact on wildlife an the ecosystem.

Restrict livestock activities that adversely impact the Monument integrity.

Restrict grazing in sensitive areas to promote the health of the land.

Range improvements should be controlled by BLM management not monuments.

Livestock could be managed via horseback. Some livestock administration (building fence) requires motorized vehicles.

Livestock grazing after native seedlings are established should be prohibited to ensure the survival of the native plants. Site evaluation should be required to determine when the native seedlings should be grazed again and the effectiveness of the current or new grazing system on the persistence of native plants.

I would like to recommend that grazing be phased out of the riparian zones whenever possible. At the least I would fence off o restrict cows access to the river banks.

Grazing should be managed at a level that takes drought, and its subsequent effect on wildlife species, into consideration.

Examine closely the effect of livestock grazing, and phase it out as needed to protect the integrity of the site.

To enforce critical wildlife habitat and to foster the health of native trees and plants, BLM Standards and Guidelines for grazin leases should be monitored and enforced.

BLM should implement the Standards and Guidelines of Rangeland Health into management decisions regarding livestock grazing.

The BLM should closely monitor grazing practices and prevent overgrazing that damages vegetation and damages restoratio species such as cottonwoods.

Grazing allotments must be maintained.

2200

Oil and gas development and mining with their attendant road development and habitat degradation should not be permitted within the Monument.

The BLM must clearly and completely close all lands within the Monument boundaries to all forms of energy resources exploration or development.

2210

Require all new structures be placed and painted in a manner that helps blend into the natural environment.

Allow existing oil and gas development only restrict surface damage.

While existing leases are supposed to be honored, the range of management ideas appears to be designed to preclude natur gas drilling altogether. Limiting road miles and adding regulations concerning wildlife (i.e. winter ranges, sage grouse leks, et will only serve to exacerbate this dampening effect.

If you were to make a series of overlays for limiting surface use for raptors, sage grouse habitat, big game wintering areas, sensitive species, slope of ground, etc. the portion left for surface use would be nonexistent or small. For example, under som interpretations big game wintering areas could be considered to be the whole monument.

With new technology many things can be done to limit disturbances such as remote sensing equipment, low impact drilling, computer enhanced seismic, directional drilling, etc. These should be encouraged but not required as they don't work in ever case.

Water disposal should be left as is. In most cases the water can be put in a pit where both cattle and big game will use it.

Road miles for new wells should not be limited.

Require the lessee-builder or the current lease holder to finance elimination and restoration to pre-construction condition all o gas exploration/ development trails, roads, troads, ways, routes with the Monument.

Gas and oil exploration should be allowable as well as roads for maintenance.

More enforcement from BLM on wells being developed or completed to check conditions of access roads, control weeds, archaeological studies of possible Native American sites (e.g. tepee rings, cairns, possible burial sites). Maybe Fort Belknap should be involved with archaeological studies.

Follow the same rules as general public and any restricted areas off limits to general public for recreation also restricted to re use by owners/employees of gas wells.

Needless to say developing the area for oil and gas extraction are out of the question as well as other mining activities.

Let's use our own resources first, then if we have a shortage we can purchase less later.

When gas wells have completed their production and are ready to be abandoned, BLM must provide for complete restoration the land, including removal of roads and pipelines.

Provide the public with annual maps showing leases and activities on leases. Strictly monitor gas production from each well affecting leases within the Monument and give proper 60 day notice of leases where production has fallen off. Require opera to prove that they have paying quantities of gas. Require gas pipelines to be buried and to follow existing roads.

Allow exploration only along existing roads.

Require immediate (within 2 months) reclamation of disturbed areas.

Roads accessing natural gas wells -- no more than absolutely necessary.

Eliminate all oil and gas exploration/development trails, roads, troads, ways, routes within the Monument illegally created or modified within the Monument, and/or resultant of terminated or out-of-date oil-gas leases.

Strictly limit natural gas exploration and development to only that for which valid leases already exist. Require the highest lev restoration and reclamation.

Terminate gas leases in the Monument that don't adhere to BLM requirements.

Require explorers for gas to travel already established routes when possible and prevent off-road vehicle travel, monitor drillin and production each year and give the public information as to development.

For valid leases impose regulations which will enhance all wildlife species, reduce impacts of invasive plant species and limit amount of roads servicing those leases. We strongly encourage rehabilitation of roads and other infrastructure when comple

Require site rehabilitation with native plants.

Most importantly, please require oil and gas developers to use existing roads only and closely monitor all oil and gas development to make sure developers are obeying our Montana laws and federal laws. Please terminate all wells that do not comply with our laws.

Be careful with language – be too restrictive.

Don’t overstipulate and keep industry from their lease rights.

Way to increase natural gas production - should take advantage and still protect resources.

Timing stips and conditions of drilling.

Wildlife use areas change over time, so there could be danger of not being able to drill since they can move and everything c be considered important wildlife habitat.

Does BLM have authority to limit the miles of roads to access wells?

Build a minimal access road to well site until resource is proven. If possible minimize road size through well life.

Will waivers be significantly not issued because it is within the Monument? (Waivers should be reviewed more strictly in Monument.)

Noxious weeds, new trails, problem of accessibility. Any new disturbance (blade), weeds.

Gist Road, not a lot of access in that area. Existing road is already a limiting factor.

Blend gas operations into natural environment by painting house, blend into landscape, work with operators in laying out road into sites.

Limit exploration to existing routes. Determine closes route. Work with company to reduce travel.

Concern about enforcing mitigation.

Can you locate facilities outside the Monument boundary? Directional drilling, for example.

If get shows of gas in “new” areas, can BLM restrict further development?

Any problems enforcing the regulations (funding or manpower)?

What would be the possibility of restricting surface occupancy? The structure or equipment must be beyond the Monument to preserve the character of the Monument (directional drilling).

County roads have to be maintained. Instances where trucks have torn up the roads, litter along the roads. Seems it isn’t be looked at. There should be improvements if the BLM does allow drilling. How much of the revenue will be used for improving roads?

Authority to put stipulations on a lease; limit the miles of roads.

Study further on any new roads to well sites.

BLM has existing restrictions for roads.

Who is going to reclaim the roads to dry wells?

Reclaim roads not used.

Why go into an area that has already been drilled (dry well sites)?

If they get gas, they will need a pipeline (not just one site).

Close access roads, except for the company.

With existing leases with production, when no longer producing will they be required to reclaim the area (roads, pipelines)?

Has the area had seismic?

How long does it take to drill? (2-3 days)

Chouteau County – drilling not allowed within 3 miles from the river.

If a well is drilled on a lease within the Monument, how will you access a producing well (pipeline) 10 miles across the Monument?

Use bi-directional drilling (under) when tiering wells in.

Could drilling rigs (company) be charged a fee for road maintenance?

Problem of pipelines sunken in (fenced), who monitors/maintains?

Let the landowner/permittee know when leased activities are occurring.

Drill wells based on lease stips issued at the time.

What about pipelines; any restrictions?

Amount of gas is subjective; area is a gas-prone area.

Gas production in the Monument – does any money come back to the Monument?

How much money is generated from the wells in the Monument?

Is it correct that reclamation occurs in three years?

Is there drilling going on for other reasons than producing gas? Very little gas seems to be produced.

Not everyone needs to have access on the road to a well site.

Plowing and seeding does not always result in reclamation; what is the success rate for reclamation?

Some leases old; have any roads been reclaimed?

What about pipelines and well location (reclamation)?

No further exploration in "no-show of gas" areas, and critical concern areas.

Ban oil and gas development.

Please try and keep gas and oil development to a minimum so as to not scar the area permanently.

No oil and gas development.

Ensure that well houses are constructed and maintained in such a way that they are not altering the pristine viewshed.

Require that any existing gas and oil lease holders in the Monument stay on existing roads. Seismic trucks should stay on existing roads. Once roads and drill sites are not used anymore, they should be reclaimed as soon as possible. An effort should be made to acquire or terminate the existing leases.

Make gas developers comply with rules, no off-road travel by trucks, annual monitoring and reporting of developments for pub review.

Keep access and lease activity as minimal and low impact as possible on existing leases. Offer no new leases in the Monument. Maintain close inspection and high standards for all existing wells and pipelines (notably old pipelines). Use stric high standards (minimal impact to the land) for access to new leases on Montana State lands within the Monument.

No drilling in Cow Creek ACEC and Bullwhacker area. No drilling in "no show areas" where numerous dry wells exist with no producing wells.

I do not know the estimated reserves under the Monument (do you?), but I do know that, compared to age and (expected) lifespan of the land, any energy benefit will be very short-term indeed.

If sound science does deem it worthwhile to remove the fuels from under the Monument, I expect that the BLM will contractua bind the developers to full environmental responsibility. To do otherwise could rob future generations of the promised benefits Specifically, beyond the minimal impact during construction and operation, the companies must commit to complete removal the pumping facilities, once the pumping is over. By "complete removal", I mean that nothing should be left on or in the soil which inhibits the retaking of the site by the native flora and fauna.

I believe with current management practices and no drilling within sight of the Missouri River, that gas leases should continue

Absolute 100% restoration is a must and operator reclamation bonds must be held at adequate levels. The track records of operators should be looked at as they apply for permits (permission) to develop on public lands. If an operator's reputation is spotless, we should not take a chance.

Monitor and restrict exploration activities to established, existing routes in order to prevent damage to vegetation and soil.

Use no surface occupancy.

Use restoration and reclamation stipulations to properly care for and manage the objects protected by the Proclamation.

There should be no more permits allowed for oil and gas development.

Require pipelines to remain within the access road and/or road right-of-way.

No drilling in "no-show areas."

Raptors including Bald Eagle - Surface uses may be controlled or excluded within a 1/4 miles zone of identified essential hab (some leases). Current management but take out the three mile zone.

Any oil and gas development must e managed to protect the resources and the impact kept to a minimum. The official road

system should be used and new roads developed only as absolutely necessary. Abandoned roads should be blocked and restored by the developers.

Natural gas development and exploration should be allowed on all of the land in question as long as it is out of sight of the riv and back far enough to prevent much erosion, say 1 to 2 miles away from river.

Drilling for natural gas should only be allowed if it was under lease when the Monument was established, and then carefully controlled by the Bureau of Land Management, in order that disturbance of the landscape is kept at a minimum.

Minimize gas development; keep use to existing roads. Monitor exploration activities and gas production.

Use restoration and reclamation stipulations to properly care for and manage the objects protected by the Proclamation.

Given the lack of a good single source of gas/oil within the Monument boundaries, new roads should be prohibited, or limited drastically (e.g. <10 miles new roads in Monument).

Continue to develop natural gas in the area.

I have to assume the exploration and development of existing oil and gas leases sill be adequately monitored.

Use existing state oil and gas rules for spacing of oil and gas wells.

Strict restrictions should be in place to prevent gas developers from going off road in search of well sites.

If you are going to require vehicles to be washed, then they all should be.

Oil and Gas: Follow through with minimizing impact to the area by demanding the best environmental practices of lessees. Demand thorough inspections of existing (old) pipelines, and demand safe practices.

New roads accessing natural gas wells - no more than 5 miles.

Terminate all gas and oil exploration permits which don't meet requirements.

There should be no arbitrary limits on the number of gas wells drilled in the monument. Virtually all gas development is outsid the river corridor and represents little impact on monument visitors.

Existing development must adhere to wildlife stipulations so as to not impact breeding grounds, migration corridors or sensitiv habitat; riparian watersheds. NSO stipulations enforced as necessary.

Development limited severely.

New roads for well access should be as short as possible without falling within sight or sound of the river. Access to these roads by the general public should be denied.

All vehicles should be cleaned of invasive plant species before entering the Monument.

Reclamation of disturbed areas should be completed within a few months after the end of construction.

All surface uses should be controlled to avoid conflict with wildlife habitat and activity.

Well drilling activity should be controlled spatially and in time to reduce impact on visitor visual and sound values. Structures should be placed and colored to reduce visual impact on visitors.

Waste products should be disposed of outside the Monument.

The best grass in the Monument is where the pipelines are run. I do not believe that natural gas exploration and developmen should be stopped if the same reseeding practices are followed.

Invasive plant species - require operators and contractors to self-certify, etc.

When well is no longer productive road is destroyed, plowed and planted with native species, vegetation.

Allow for development of current leases, under existing regulations.

Natural gas should be developed, restrict general public to access all areas. No wide-open drilling, but one well every 4 miles too restrictive.

Water disposal into pits or dams for wildlife and livestock is a reasonable approach that would cost much less than re-injectio or disposing off site, provide for better distribution of livestock, and be beneficial for various types of wildlife. Due to possible

treatment costs, developers should not be required to dispose of water by this means, but by one of the options available to t

Monitor and enforce the proper restoration of sites containing dry holes or nonproducing wells.

Seek to rehabilitate gas sites, roads, and impacts from exploration activities to natural conditions after exploration and after th gas wells are decommissioned.

Allow for the construction of proposed gas pipelines only within established road right-of-ways.

Require all operators and contractors to self-certify vehicles and equipment weed free.

Monitor and enforce the proper restoration of sites containing dry holes or nonproducing wells.

Seek to rehabilitate gas sites, roads and impacts from exploration activities to natural conditions after exploration and after th gas wells are decommissioned.

Allow for the construction of proposed gas pipelines only within established road right of ways.

Gas contractors should be held to no higher standards for weed control than any other monument user. If contractors have to wash their vehicles before entering the monument then all users should have to do the same and that is a none starter. To p this requirement on a contractor is discriminatory and should be given no further consideration.

Gas producing wells should be inspected every third year just like they are done everywhere else in the state.

Low impact drilling - implement current management. There should be no requirement for low impact drilling for wells less tha 5000 feet. Requirements for low impact drilling for wells over 5000 feet should be assessed by the BLM resource manager a not be based on some pre-established rules.

Potential natural gas reserves - implement current State management governing gas well spacing requirements. Why should standards be any different in the Monument?

Production Operations - Current management practices regarding view sheds, travel, pipelines, and water disposal should be implemented. To establish some arbitrary new standards for the Monument is discriminatory and unnecessary.

Existing gas leases should be honored and the regulations concerning drilling should not make it so difficult if not impossible drill.

New roads should be permitted to enable development of new gas wells on existing leases.

No oil and gas development.

All oil and gas access roads should be reclaimed as soon as leases expire.

Proof of restoration funds must be presented to the BLM by the leaseholders before any new development can occur.

NEPA analysis should be used to determine onsite impacts of proposed development; new developments cannot commence until an analysis verifies validity examination.

BLM must implement clear guidelines as to how reclamation would be implemented, monitored, and enforced. Relying on leaseholders to oversee themselves is not a viable option.

Full reclamation with native vegetation of all old well pads, roads, and pipelines, and other surface disturbance should be undertaken.

Reclamation with native vegetation of all wells, pipelines, and roads created for oil and gas development should be undertake and financed by the leaseholder as soon as the extractive activity ceases.

Removal of pressure stations and other buildings should be undertaken as soon as the extractive activity ceases.

All lease-related roads should be closed to motorized and mechanized public access.

Wells and pipelines should link to existing roads, with routes based on impact to Monument resources rather than shortest distance.

Remote checking should be encouraged to minimize road use by the leaseholder.

All construction and facilities should be in conformance with Visual Resource Management requirements.

Paleontological and archeological field checks by BLM personnel or other authorized personnel should occur prior to disturba

All equipment involved in the gas development and extraction process should be thoroughly cleaned, washed and inspected BLM personnel prior to use, and after any trips outside the area, to minimize the spread of noxious weeds.

Lease operators should be responsible for eliminating noxious weeds on well pads and pipeline corridors through the life of th wells and for five years post abandonment.

We suggest that the management plan should include basic principles as to how BLM will handle activities on "valid existing rights" leases so as not to create any new impacts that would interfere with the proper care and management (the key words the proclamation). This could include a preference for no surface occupancy, such as using directional drilling. It could includ a standard set of requirements for restoration and reclamation where surface disturbance is found necessary to honor valid existing rights.

Open up more areas for drilling.

Try for non-surface access on those now in effect.

Use restoration and reclamation stipulations to properly care for and manage the objects protected by the Proclamation.

Require that gas developers use existing roads for exploration to prevent off-road travel by seismic trucks. Close motor vehic routes to dry hole gas well sites. Monitor drilling and gas production annually and provide the public with a report of both the status and location of development activities.

Resource extraction within the monument, particularly for oil, gas, and coalbed methane should cease.

Oil and gas drilling in adjacent roadless areas should be permanently banned.

Recommend no gas drilling/exploration/access within view of the river.

Close roads leading to wells to public use. Clarify "low impact." No drilling in "no-show" areas, or areas of critical concern.

New drilling should be allowed on all Monument land as long as the drilling cannot be seen from the river.

All exploration must be environmentally sacred. Sites must be managed as to be returned as close as possible to natural setting. Fee to Monument management - % of production.

Set no limits on roads to new gas wells. Doing so would compromise the ability of the contractor to further develop an existin lease.

Proposed projects should include an assessment of erosion impacts. Gas leasing development should follow a no-net loss o topsoil policy.

New roads should be permitted to enable development of new gas wells on existing leases.

Location of pipelines should be up to the resource manager, not some phony rules about erodable soils.

There should be no limits on the number of gas wells drilled in the monument at a given time. The BLM resource manager ca control this based on common sense.

No oil and gas activities.

The RMP alternatives should vary only to the degrees of strictness that BLM uses to limit energy development to existing leas while protecting the monument resource, its objects and natural values, as dictated by the Proclamation.

Roads to existing valid leases should remain open to leasees and BLM staff only.

New roads should be permitted to enable development of new gas wells on existing leases.

New roads should be permitted to enable development of new gas wells on existing leases.

Any roads used to access gas should not become public roads. They should only be for management and the lessee. Road should be constructed and sited to minimize visual impact, and for ease of restoration at the end of the lease or depletion of

resource. Prove resource before constructing road. Access roads should be restored and not allowed to enter the public domain.

Do not restrict existing leases for gas production.

Current rules for drilling are adequate. Follow rules as they change within industry (per regulating natural gas agencies).

Roads should be adequate for leaseholders to access their lease/property.

Oil and gas operations in the Monument should avoid big sagebrush habitat, both in the construction of wells and roads and pipelines.

Set no limits on roads to new gas wells. Doing so would compromise the ability of the contractor to further develop an existin lease.

Location of pipelines in the monument should be carefully considered and should be based on wise planning by the resource manager not some arbitrary rules dreamed up by environmentalists.

All roads to wells to be removed when wells abandoned unless a bona fide recreational use will exist.

Stay with current management policies used by the State to govern gas well spacing. There is no compelling need to establis different standards for the monument except where some object of antiquity may be impacted.

No limit or at least 20 miles more roads as needed. No restriction on access for gas development. Require reclamation withi months of completion. Only need to inspect properties every 3 years. No requirements on drilling.

Any natural gas exploration should not disturb the overall environment (land, air, quiet spaces, or water) of the Monument. Should not disturb birds, fish, big game, small animal species or their habitat. Any natural gas exploration should be required pay a significant bond that of cleanup or mitigation.

Wide open to all exploration.

Be careful with how existing natural gas leases are monitored and managed.

The BLM should require that any gas exploration occur with low impact seismic equipment using existing routes.

Motor vehicle routes that were used to develop gas leases that are now dry holes should be closed to motor vehicles and qui reclaimed.

Require gas developers to use existing routes when exploring for gas so that there is no off-road travel by seismic trucks. Clo motor vehicle routes to dry hole gas well sites. Monitor drilling and gas production annually and provide the public with a repo showing the status and location of development activities.

As specified in the Proclamation, the BLM must monitor and enforce the proper restoration of sites containing dry holes or no producing wells. Gas sites, roads and impacts from exploration activities must be rehabilitated and reseeded to natural conditions after exploration and after the gas wells are decommissioned. Proposed gas pipelines must be constructed within established road right of ways and trench excavations reseeded with native plants.

Against any kind of gas development that would subject the Monument's area to any kind of additional road building or land disturbance that could not be made whole or closed after use.

None should be permitted.

Wildlife stipulations must be issued with any development on leases (existing).

Although the establishment of the National Monument is subject to valid existing rights, promoting oil exploration and development as a goal is not within the purview of the Proclamation.

Contractors should not be forced to shoulder additional responsibilities for weed control beyond what is required of other monument users. To require everyone to spray wash their vehicles before entering the monument is nonsense.

Location of pipelines should pose minimum impact on the environment but placement of the pipeline should be agreed upon the contractor and the BLM resource manager.

Roads, old or new, should be allowed to gas wells.

Pipelines and wells drilled for gas should be allowed outside the river corridor.

There should be no established requirement for low impact drilling. Rather, drilling requirements should be developed betwee

the contractor and the BLM resource manager for each proposed drilling site.

Any leases developed in the Monument should have no surface occupancy standards to protect the natural quiet and wild of Monument.

There should be no arbitrary limit on new roads to gas wells. Without road access there can be no new gas development.

Low impact drilling - low impact drilling on locations with slopes <10%.

Inspection and enforcement - inspect producing properties annually.

Reclamation of disturbed areas - require reclamation to be completed by Nov. 15.

Implement current management regarding view sheds, travel, pipelines and water disposal. The Proclamation provides for continued development of existing gas leases. To establish overly restrictive new rules that causes gas development to beco more expensive and more difficult violates the spirit and intent of the Proclamation.

Regarding natural gas exploration, the draft EIS should describe how restoration and reclamation would take place. Addition there must be restoration and reclamation stipulations in place to properly restore areas where any resource extraction may occur. Natural resource development companies must be required to post bonds to pay for reclamation activities.

In order to preserve the Monument's ecological and aesthetic integrity, industrialization and development must be curtailed. A maze of roads in the Monument would destroy the very essence of what the original Proclamation sought to preserve. There no gentle way for gas exploration. It's invasive and destructive. It does not belong in the Monument.

This is the lowest profile energy development which is compatible with other uses of public lands.

Natural gas exploration in the Monument should be restricted 100%. Despite advances in exploration technology the threat to the balance of the natural environment is too strong.

Permits should include reclamation and restoration stipulations, to protect Monument objectives. No surface occupancy for leases. All leases to be strictly managed.

Roads only where absolutely necessary and reclaim/close after use. Roads only to valid existing leases.

No drilling in Cow Creek ACEC and Bullwhacker area.

Gas drilling should be allowed. Some of the areas are so remote, drilling would have no impact on canoeing or wildlife or monument visitors.

Do annual checks of well/lease validity, especially re paying quantities requirements.

We strongly recommend that BLM not only remove goal five, but also take additional steps to inform the public that promoting and gas exploration and development is not part of the RMP or of BLM's overall management responsibilities for the Monume Instead, BLM should reiterate to the public that the National Monument is closed to new energy development, other than valid existing leases.

Mitigation measures that minimize the impact of extraction activities have been effective in some instances and gas compani should be commended for these efforts.

2212

Existing leases that were legally authorized after EIS can remain. No extensions to leases. 10 years and they are gone.

Try to end gas leases on the Monument.

Minimize the impact of such activities by banning any new leases/well drilling/lease renewal/gas exploration.

If any oil and gas leases are within Wilderness Study Areas, they may contain terms and conditions more restrictive than thos in the proclamation.

Actively seek to terminate gas leases in the Monument that fail to meet BLM requirements.

It is my humble opinion that the BLM should terminate any gas leases in the Monument which fail to meet BLM requirements and that your agency should monitor drilling and gas production annually.

To protect the Monument every effort should be made to trade existing valid gas leases for other sites outside of the Monume

The BLM should provide the public with maps of the location of existing gas leases and show whether the lease is producing being held by production.

The BLM should produce a map locating the valid leases for the public.

Oil and gas leases should not be allowed because they compromise the conservation aspects of the Monument.

Do the leases have an end point?

Lease at the end of Gist Road.

Are there leases held up by appeal? During appeal, is 10-year term put in suspension (does clock stop)?

BLM needs to figure out the validity of the leases. Would like to see an examination of each lease. How do you determine validity? That is the only way to avoid some sort of legal challenge. Must include shut-in wells.

Are there any leases where drilling is held up by administrative or legal action? (one) If the drilling permittee wins his point, does he get an extension on his drilling time to make up for the lost time? Does his lease become re-effective as of the date can go ahead and drill?

15% leased.

Allow for development based on current leases.

Has an EIS been done for the existing leases?

Did BLM gain a lot of money from the leases?

Should look at new opportunities for gas leasing.

Monitor production and enforce regulations for determining whether gas leases are meeting the requirements of the law and send out proper and timely notices regarding non-producing wells.

Seek to terminate leases that are no longer meeting the requirements of production in paying quantities or leases that otherw violate the law.

Provide the public, on an annual basis, with accurate monitoring information for those existing leases in the Monument and leases outside the Monument whose production is maintaining leases within the Monument.

The BLM should provide an estimate of how long the valid gas lease in the Monument will remain subject to possible explora and development. The BLM must monitor production and enforce regulations for determining whether gas leases are meetin the requirements of the law and send out proper and timely notices regarding non-producing wells. The BLM must seek to terminate leases that are no longer meeting the requirements of production in paying quantities or leases that otherwise viola the law. The BLM must, on an annual basis, provide the public with accurate monitoring information for those existing leases the Monument and leases outside the Monument whose production is maintaining leases within the Monument.

Monitor production and enforce regulations for determining whether gas leases are meeting the requirements of the law and send out proper and timely notices regarding non-producing wells.

Seek to terminate leases that are no longer meeting the requirements of production in paying quantities or leases that otherw violate the law.

Provide the public, on an annual basis, with accurate monitoring information for those existing leases in the Monument and leases outside the Monument whose production is maintaining leases within the Monument.

All mineral leases need to be reviewed to determine if they are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Monument and th final mgmt. goal and objectives for the monument. Where the leases are inconsistent they should either be bought back or canceled, identified for not being
reissued, or stipulation added to mitigate potential impacts that might occur from lease development.

Void all leases in Monument not issued pursuant to an oil/gas leasing EIS. That would be all leases in the Monument.

2213

All O/G leases should be examined to determine whether a valid existing right exists, and whether that right is limited by term and conditions in the lease.

There should be no exploration of or development on existing leases in the Monument until those leases are determined to be valid. In the draft RMP, the BLM must identify the existing leases and the procedures it will use to validate those leases.

MWF believes that legal discussion outside the narrow policy envelope limiting energy developments to existing leases is precluded by the Proclamation.

BLM needs to review whether VERs are present by reviewing files to ensure that required actions, filings, and fees are in full compliance with the BLM Oil and Gas Handbook H3107-1.

A detailed public record to document how leases were/are kept valid should be made available.

There should be no exploration or development on existing leases until the leases are determined to be valid by ensuring tha leases beyond primary term are held by actual production in paying quantities.

Validate existing leases, place reasonable stipulations, and have no surface occupancy within Monument.

Do not allow exploration of, or development on, existing leases in the Monument until those leases are determined to be valid

Identify existing leases and the procedure it will use to validate those leases and to enforce the laws and regulations, includin notice requirements it will follow to ensure that leases on producing or non-producing sites are properly monitored.

Provide an estimate of how long the valid gas leases in the Monument will remain subject to possible exploration and development.

With respect to Goal 5, and any management agenda that attempts to promote “social and economic benefits,” we recommen BLM not allow exploration of or development on existing leases in the Monument until those leases are determined to be valid

The Montana Wilderness Association has challenged the validity of the post-1970 (NEPA) leases in a portion of the Monume If that challenge is successful, the management plan should provide for the immediate revocation of all other leases in the Monument that are based on the same leasing document.

Determine the validity of existing natural gas leases and monitor and manage all leases as required under the law.

Until an EIS is completed on each lease, all leases should be terminated. Following EIS and the law is most important within Monument boundaries.

The draft EIS must determine the validity of existing natural gas leases and identify those leases. Furthermore, the BLM mus recognize those leases and should manage these leases as required under law.

When determining the validity of existing gas leases in the Monument, the BLM should use 3 categories: valid, not valid and valid pending determination of validity. This will allow BLM to verify production in paying quantities and time to issue notices noncompliance with regulations.

Leases should not be presumed valid. Validity should be established for each lease by checking for compliance with all regulations including a determination of paying quantities.

Actively seek to terminate gas leases in the Monument that fail to meet BLM requirements.

Identify existing leases and the procedure it will use to validate those leases and to enforce the laws and regulations, includin notice requirements it will follow to ensure that leases on producing or non-producing sites are properly monitored.

Provide an estimate of how long the valid gas leases in the Monument will remain subject to possible exploration and development.

Validation of leases is issue. Proclamation recognizes existing rights, but does not establish validity. Must look at well’s capability.

Proclamation discusses valid existing rights (does not discuss exploration).

What is checked for the validity of the leases (background check)?

Determine the validity of existing natural gas leases and monitor and manage all leases as required under the law.

BLM should evaluate the validity of existing gas leases. It should specify the procedures it will use to validate those leases a to enforce all regulations. BLM must terminate leases that are no longer meeting the requirements of production in paying quantities or leases that otherwise violate the law. Annually, the BLM should (sic) the public with accurate monitoring information for those existing leases in the Monument and leases outside the Monument whose production is maintaining lea within the Monument.

Determine the validity of existing natural gas leases.

Verify the validity of existing leases.

Verify validity of leases.

2215

Development of existing leases should not impair security habitat and calving-fawning areas of bighorn sheep, elk or antelope

Open up to all gas production with as little damage to environment.

What historical item well impacts?

With computer-enhanced drilling, have higher success in reading target which minimizes impacts because they know where t drill.
Low-impact drilling looks good at site, but traffic tears up county roads, results in litter, etc. Can revenue go to improving road

Concerned about activities impacting cultural properties.

Challenge that they can make a low impact gas field (Pincher Creek).

Gas migration (Canada) has affected livestock.

2250

I have been floating the upper Missouri River in canoes for 38 years. It is so much nicer with the new campgrounds and the n wake speed limit. I also believe it is cleaner with the pack in-pack out policy.

Primitive recreation should be allowed.

I believe our public lands should be managed for quiet recreational pursuits such as hunting, fishing, camping, hiking and qui water sports.

Prohibit sport shooting of prairie dogs and other nongame animals.

I think it is critical to have motorless, as well as motorized, areas of use.

The BLM should restrict visitor activities in areas where damage to sensitive geomorphologic features would occur.

Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and other remote and rugged landscapes such as the Bullwhacker, should be managed as undeveloped.

Recreational sites would be limited and monitored for overuse and noxious weed invasion.

The BLM should limit group size in the river corridor and in the uplands in order to protect Monument resources.

We suggest that the BLM indicate that recreational opportunities and other visitor experiences, which threaten or have the reasonably foreseeable potential to damage the Proclamation's protected objects, cannot be approved within the RMP. For instance, the BLM should not permit, or promote, ORV use if it has the potential to damage scientific or historic objects.

It would seem to make more sense to simply supply visitors with a good map and some identifying information on the wildlife let them find out the rest for themselves.

The only shooting on the Monument should be with cameras (even though I believe in the right to bear arms, there is a time a place for everything. This is no place for firearms or bows and arrows.)

Encourage muscle-powered physical activity that promote physical fitness, such as hiking, canoeing, kayaking, and horsebac riding in the Monument.

No shooting of prairie dogs and coyotes.

Manage wilderness study areas, the Bullwhacker area, and the entire Monument as undeveloped and for primitive recreation preserve special values, including naturalness and solitude.

No limit on recreation. This is public land.

Recognize hunting and fishing as important recreational opportunities in the National Monument and as appropriate

management tools for sustaining viable populations, reconstitute damaged habitat, and provide healthy range for the many na species.

No permit should be given for competitive, special events like motorcycle racing or 4x4 rallies or fixed wing races. Special events which do not create noxious fumes, noise pollution and soil erosion may be examined on a case-by-case basis and m be permitted after allowing comment by the public.

Encourage the practice of 'leave no trace' for visitor use.

Encourage unmotorized rec. opportunities by creating brochures describing such opportunities.

Yes to canoeing and other downriver, people-powered activities.

Encourage "leave no trace" use by visitors.

Registration should be mandatory. Permits for visiting, camping, hunting should become the way that the public gets in to us the area.

Why not permit all those types of recreational access that do not impair the desired goal. Monitoring of all uses over time can a tool to address any concerns as they arrive.

We suggest that BLM indicate that recreation opportunities and other visitor experiences which threaten or have the reasonab foreseeable potential to damage the Proclamation's protected objects cannot be approved within the RMP. For instance, BLM should not permit, or promote, "off-road vehicle" ("ORV") use if it has the potential to damage scientific or historic objects.

Allow non-motorized uses such as air balloons or gliders to be used inside the Monument. Permits should be required and landings and takeoffs should be monitored.

Yes to hiking.

All of the public should be able to hunt, fish and recreate without restriction.

Recognize hunting and fishing as important recreational opportunities in the National Monument, and as appropriate management tools for sustaining viable populations, reconstitute damaged habitat and provide healthy range for the many na species.

Visitors should be informed that the Monument provides a "primitive" recreational experience in order to preserve Monument values for future generations.

A quantifiable index of the overall impact of all human activities on the Monument must be created as a regulatory standard o measurement for "protection" as defined in the Proclamation.

Undeveloped recreation to be highest priority.

Visitor management and visitor services regulations are to be founded on people being personally responsible for a "leave no trace" and "Pack it in, Pack it out" visit to the monument.

Visitors will be encouraged to enjoy the Monument through "undeveloped recreation."

Ban sports shooting of non-game animals, including prairie dogs.

All river floaters, as well as overnight campers at road heads, should be required to register at convenient locations. It is important to obtain accurate information on the amount of use that the Monument is getting. It will be necessary, at some futu time, to restrict the number of floaters on the river. Having accurate recreation use information will be essential.

Encourage low impact recreation.

Recreational stock use. The BLM should regulate the number of animals per group. If feed is brought in, it must be certified weed free.

The concept of Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) and sustainability should be implemented. Here again the goal of management should be restoration in some areas and prevention of damage to others. Management goals should be established and defined that protect the basic resources. Monitoring should be focused on assessing change and arresting u that is site impacting and not sustainable.

Baseline data on visitor use in uplands, how will it be measured? Use of entrance gates.

Do not alienate groups of recreationists.

Does Monument have an idea of number of people and how long people will stay?

How will Monument be portrayed when out-of-staters bring 40' RVs into Monument? Primitive and should be left that way.

Like block management have people sign in.

More undeveloped sites at an area where you can get off river.

Educate public about pack it in/pack it out.

Limits of acceptable change a good tool to define/manage future use.

Don't see an increase in people using uplands.

Permit (registration) people that use the Monument.

Some people want primitive experience and some people would like some "services."

Knows of no place in Montana where hikers are limited – would not limit.

Look at issuing permits to upland users, i.e. hikers.

Is an overlook simply a turn-out or something more (information station)? An overlook with information about geology could b beneficial.

Manage the wilderness study areas, the Bullwhacker Area, and the rest of the Monument for primitive recreation.

Look at prohibiting any kind of "varmint" shooting, especially prairie dogs, within the Monument.

Limiting development and recreation enhancements to a minimum for the purpose of resource protection and visitor safety.

Recreation needs equal consideration with commerce to insure quality outdoor activities and wildlife habitat.

Well we are not totally disabled just old. How about some rights for us and won't cost the government a penny?

It all depends on how many people are actually using the area. Don't fix it if it is not broken but if use is rising better be prepa for it.

Manage this section of the river as pack in-pack out area.

Limited number of hikers (backcountry) and on river.

No newly developed recreational areas should be developed. Existing areas can be improved but not expanded.

Please educate visitors in "leave no trace" usage, and keep all motorized vehicles on established roads.

Leave No Trace ethics.

We need to know what BLM is working on – ROS.

Make it easy for public to use monument for quiet recreation but not abuse the vegetation or wildlife.

Manage people on the monument in a "Responsible User" system. This means that visitors are held individually accountable not impacting the resource with their activities, the Monument itself will offer very few and very basic (primitive) visitor service

We recommend that the principles of Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) be considered for the entire Lewis and Clark Trail, keeping in mind that the Monument should be at the most primitive end of the scale when considering all aspects of management and development.

Limit recreational uses to "undeveloped" and "primitive" types.

Adequate waste management.

An alternative to the private property and recreation activity management idea should include an aggressive education progra for visitors. The education program should include kiosks and brochures detailing the diverse ownership of land and camping stipulations within the boundaries.

Visitors should be encouraged to enjoy the Monument through "undeveloped recreation." Require "leave no trace" camping i the river corridor.

As far as the recreation activities that have jeopardized the health of the land I believe that the various levels of use should continue, but instead of completely closing areas due to overuse, include the public in the restoration activities. Perhaps rest use but endeavor to keep sites open.

Visitors must be required that anything carried in should be carried out.

2251

Minimal impact (pack it in, pack it out) campsites.

Alternative camping and grazing sites should be provided when primary sites become overused and in need of recovery.

We practice no trace camping and would hope that over the years others would adhere to the "leave no trace" camping ethic.

Minimally designated campsites.

Campsites on the river should remain primitive and be located at a reasonable distance from the river's edge. Inlets should b developed for boat tie-ups off of the beaches.

The number of campers at each campground should be limited and monitored.

Require "leave no trace" camping in the river corridor.

Allowing campsites 300 feet from road will lead to a lot of 300-foot roads that will turn to ruts at the first rain. Limiting campsit to 50 feet of roads will make them easier to maintain, and vehicles can park next to the road. Do not allow any old campsite t used until the land is restored and grass is growing again.

Require "leave no trace" camping in the river corridor.

Any campgrounds should be primitive, i.e. water, fire pots, outhouses.

Designate campsites that are minimally developed and encourage the practice of "leave no trace" visitor use.

Recreational sites should be kept primitive except for a few hardened sites. Remember "Wild and Scenic."

Establish campsites that are minimally developed.

Any developed service such as camping, parking or viewing areas installed for visitor use should be of primitive character wit the minimum of actual human alteration to the land or objects. Dispersed camping where a motor vehicle is present should b confined to within 100 feet of a designated system road with vehicles parked no more than 50 feet from the edge of the road.

Visitors should be encouraged to leave no trace with minimal new campsite development.

A minimum of development for the campsites would be best and emphasis on "leave no trace" use will help preserve the scenery.

Developed upland campsites should be limited in number and be separated by a distance of not less than 5 miles. These campsites should not be visible from the river and river campsites.

Campsite Classification System for Upland Areas Based on Four Levels of Development: Need another level -- Level 5: Undeveloped Public Land.

Identify zones or areas in the Monument suitable for primitive, river, and nonprimitive camping opportunities.

Encourage and educate the public about “leave-no-trace” camping ethics.

Camping and upland use should be restricted spatially and seasonally to protect endangered and threatened species during critical periods.

Establish "hardened" recreational sites. Manage regularly and intensively. Rotate to allow recovery when overused.

Require "leave no trace" camping in the river corridor.

Allowing campers to drive off established roads to set up camps is inconsistent with the requirements of the Proclamation.

Designate minimally developed camp sights and encourage campers to leave no trace.

Camping areas should not interfere with wildlife/essential habitat.

Prohibit campers from driving off designated routes to set up camp. Campers should park vehicles by designated routes and walk to campsites. There should be no cross country vehicle use for the purpose of camping. Identify areas where camping not permitted because of fragile soils, archaeological sites, private land or historic features. Create adequate maps which identify camping areas. Developed campsites should be accessible from the river corridor and segregated from cattle.

Every effort should be made to keep the area's naturalness as undisturbed as possible. While improvements to some campsites are undoubtedly necessary, what makes this place so special is its lack of development, which should be kept at th absolute minimum.

Designate campsites that are less developed to "pack in and pack out."

Prohibit open fires at campsites. Campers should use gas stoves.

Motorized vehicles should be allowed to pull a reasonable distance (150 to 300 ft.) off designated routes for camping.

Please keep the campsites minimally developed.

Campers should practice "leave no trace."

Campsites need to be designated that are minimally developed and encourage the practice of "leave no trace" visitor use.

Before rules for camping on river islands are developed, ownership of the islands must be established; i.e. state, private, CM or BLM. Camping is often done to enjoy wildlife and should not be restricted unless a compelling impact on wildlife has been documented by credible scientific study.

Keep campsites primitive. Vault toilets are okay but that's all that's necessary.

Designate campsites that are minimally developed; encourage the practice of 'leave no trace' visitor use.

Prohibit camping in areas where it adversely affects the riparian areas.

Please don't overdevelop the river campsites or add too many.

Develop additional Level 3 camping opportunities on private land via easement. Maintain consistent image and quality at campsites.

Camping limited to campsites within 300' from roads.

Plans for additional campsites in uplands? There should be some someplace. Right now three(?) campgrounds.

Any campsite needs to have some toilet facility.

No developed campsites in uplands.

3-State OHV plan – 300 feet from road, walk to find a site, then drive to it. Can we change that in Monument plan?

People also need the option to pull off of designated roads to camp.

Only "no-trace" camping should be allowed in the Missouri River corridor and visitors should be encouraged to enjoy the Monument through undeveloped recreation. The draft EIS should address current primitive camping levels and how the BLM would manage all types of camping within the Monument.

Restrict road campers to 50-150 feet from main roads. Leave remote camping for hikers, horse riders, etc.

Maintain the existing campgrounds. Perhaps volunteers could be stationed at each site to manage the area and police the tr

I don't believe camping on islands is safe at all and should be discouraged at all times.

The BLM should establish a maximum fourteen-day campsite time restriction.

Develop more campsites.

Require all users to camp in designated camps. These should have only modest improvements with vented pit toilets. There should be no collecting of wood in the monument for fires. This may require all fires to be propane.

Designation of rustic campsites with "leave no trace" signage.

Identify zones or areas in the Monument suitable for primitive, river, and no-primitive camping opportunities. The BLM should prohibit open campfires in favor of using campstoves, BBQ grills or fire-pans in all ones. The BLM should encourage leave-n trace camping and prohibit the cutting of live or dead trees for the construction of camp chairs, tables, etc.

The BLM should prohibit driving vehicles off of designated roads to set up campsites. Motor vehicles should be parked within feet of a designated road and campers would walk to their campsites.

Allow primitive camping throughout Monument along authorized roads and river.

Smith River idea to keep the place pristine - Specific campsites.

In the Monument all designated camping and parking facilities should be "primitive" and designed for minimum impact on the landscape.

The BLM should ensure that campground facilities require minimal water resources.

Please do not develop campsites off river corridor.

Allow camping as stated in OHV.

Emphasis on hiking, horseback riding and canoeing to maintain primitive and natural values.

Identify zones or areas in the Monument suitable for primitive, river, and nonprimitive camping opportunities.

Discourage or ban open campfires in favor of camp stove use in all zones.

Encourage and educate the public about “leave-no-trace” camping ethics and prohibit the construction of camp chairs, tables etc. from existing trees.

Designated primitive camps with camping only in designated camps. There should be vented pit toilets.

No collecting of living or dead material within the Monument. People should use propane burners at camp sites.

I would like to see "leave no trace" policies when it comes to designated camping areas, as well as all other areas.

Improve the campsites and other things, river points of interest.

I think there should be developed areas to give users facilities/accommodations. I think that as use increases, designated campsites similar to the Smith River will be necessary.

Prohibit open campfires in favor of using campstoves, bbq grills or fire pans.

I think that there are enough developed sites on the river.

Designate campsites that are minimally developed and encourage the practice of "leave no trace" visitor use.

Camping along the Missouri in the breaks can be disgusting with all the cow ____ in the best camp spots. Fencing the camp areas is a short sited approach, but I would support more rigid rules for recreationists. Either put outhouses in the designated campgrounds or require porta potties.

Prohibit driving vehicles off of a designated road to set up a campsite. Motor vehicles should park within 6 feet of a designate road and campers can walk to their campsites.

Developed campsites should be located outside the Monument. Inside the Monument only primitive camping should be allow

Designate campsites that are minimally developed and encourage 'no-trace' camping.

The BLM should educate visitors about the importance of “leave-no-trace” camping through interpretation.

The BLM should manage camping with the main priority being to protect Monument resources. BLM should delineate what le and type of camping is in accordance with this priority.

Maps and discreet signs in accordance with VRM principles should be available for visitors to locate designated campsites.

The BLM should prohibit open campfires in favor of using campstoves, BBQ grills or fire-pans.

Prohibit the cutting of live or dead trees for campfires, the construction of camp chairs, tables, etc.

Allow camping under existing guidelines.

Recreation Activities have Jeopardized Health of the Land at Some Locations: All items listed could be combined.

Develop or designate camping.

Designate campsites that are minimally developed and a policy that designates user cleanup after use and their own packing of their garbage.

Provide additional camping opportunities along river, probably more primitive type.

Upland campsites should continue with partnership development. Limited level 3/4 public access sites no more than 1 site to miles.

2252

Maximum group size of 21 people.

Limit group size.

I think a maximum group of 50 people would be fine. I don't think that there should be any limit on the amount of people leav Coal Banks in one day.

A user allocation system should not be implemented nor should it be further studied.

Limit group size for camping to 15 people.

Maximum group size 15 people. Larger groups need permit.

Allow groups of up to 50 people.

If numbers of visitors are to be limited (and they will be) give priority to individuals over outfitters.

If allocation becomes necessary, no commercialization of the public resource.

The RMP should include provision for resolving future user conflicts (such as allocation of float trips) through a public process in cooperation with Montana FWP. The RMP should specify that allocation of user opportunity will be made directly to the en user and cannot be acquired or controlled by any commercial operator.

A user allocation system should not be developed or further considered.

Group sizes should be limited to 15 without a special permit. Any larger group has too much impact on the land/vegetation/sanitation/wildlife.

I would hope the day never comes when floaters will have to be limited and regulated as is the case with the Smith River.

A user allocation system should not be considered or implemented at this time.

Accommodate future use as much as possible. If that means permitting do it on Smith River model.

There is no need for a user allocation system and this issue should not be further pursued.

Develop measures to take care of increase in use.

Group sizes on the river should be firm - not vary because of "special groups" or circumstances.

Maximum group size of 25 people, with a special permit required for more.

Recommend no implementation of a user allocation system in any form.

Under no circumstance should a user allocation system be developed, studied or implemented.

There should also be guidelines in place relative to traditional uses. Large groups in particular should be encouraged to show sensitivity in terms of numbers, campsite selection, and overall impacts.

Group size: 15 except for special permit.

No allocation system.

Develop a permit system so the river is not overpopulated.

A user allocation system should not be implemented nor should it be further studied.

River use needs to be actively managed, including instituting a permit system.

Permits should be required for all boaters and a fee should be charged for all visitors. The permit should carry with it a pamp containing all the restrictions placed on the use of the riparian and upland areas of the monument. Signboards with these restrictions should be placed at all entry points.

The number of private and commercial boaters should be allocated throughout the year and boating groups larger than 15 people should require special use permits.

Limit party size and impact to shorelines (camping, etc.) when use becomes popular.

If a limit to the number of visitors becomes required the first limitation should be placed upon commercial traffic.

Don't want to be restricted like the Smith River.

People need to be educated so they know what to expect on the river.

Written test before floaters launch.

You may have to initiate a limit on the numbers of people plying this river at any given time.

No permit system.

Limit boating group size to 16 people because of campsite impacts.

Smith River idea to keep the place pristine - limit on groups.

If a permit system is developed - no set asides for commercial ventures at the expense of the general public.

A user allocation system should not be implemented nor should it be further studied.

As numbers of users increase, damage is inevitable unless there are restrictions on user numbers.

FWP strongly endorses limiting public access to the Missouri River within the boundaries of the Monument. FWP agrees with the Central Montana Resource Advisory Council's December 1999 recommendation that the public access (launch) sites sho be at: Fort Benton; Loma (Wood Bottom); Coal Banks Landing; Judith Landing; Kipp Recreation Area.

Under no circumstance should a user allocation system be developed, studied or implemented.

The maximum size of groups boating the river should be restricted to 15 persons.

A user allocation system should not be considered or implemented at this time.

2253

You can power boat and fly your plane anywhere. But only on this stretch of river can you quietly paddle in peaceful serenity

Motorized watercraft must be prohibited on the 149 miles of wild and scenic river to protect the purposes served by the designation.

Non-motorized boats except for emergency.

Ban jet skis, jet boats and other motorized crafts to preserve the quiet, high quality enjoyment and fishing experiences.

It is important to identify that motorized boats are not for recreation only. Landowners utilize boats to check livestock, mainta fences and access private lands. Possible no-wake zones are realistic; however, complete elimination of watercraft use is no realistic alternative.

Smith River idea to keep the place pristine - No wake motorized boat use.

No jet skis. No jet boats.

No motors on the water or in the air. That is no motorboats, jet skis, etc.

Manage this section of the river as non-motorized.

Forbid motorized boating on the Wild and Scenic River portion of approximately 150 miles.

I'd like to have noise restrictions imposed on watercraft as well as the no-wake rule.

Boaters are taxpayers too and should have equal use of the river throughout the year. Make floaters share some of the responsibility for user conflicts if there are any. Seasonal boating restrictions should be established from June 15 to Septemb 15. The current downstream travel restriction should be dropped. Allow both up and down stream travel in the wild and scen segments at no wake speeds during the restricted season.

Leave the motorized/no wake restriction as it is now.

Do not permit motorized recreation on the 150 mile stretch of river.

Keep the 149 miles river quiet. No motorized watercraft except for emergency use by govt. employees.

The 148 mile stretch of the Missouri River that flows through the Monument should be managed as non-motorized to provide solitude, a quiet recreational experience for floaters and anglers, and to protect birds and other wildlife.

The use of motorboats to hunt, fish, and travel the river is definitely one of the traditional uses within the monument and I reca BLM stating on several occasions that traditional uses would be allowed to continue.

I support the use of motorboats on the Upper Missouri within the monument boundaries. If any changes are made to the curr restrictions I would like to see the dates changed from the weekend before Memorial Day to June 15th and the weekend after Labor Day to September 15th.

Motorized boats restricted to no-wake speed from June 15 to September 15 each season.

Allocate boaters all year - No-wake up and down.

It is critical to prohibit all motorized watercraft completely on the entire wild stretch of the wild Missouri River within the Monument.

Allow power boating in all river segments. Establish new seasonal boating restriction dates from June 15 to September 15 an allow both up and down stream travel at no wake in the wild and scenic river segments during the restricted season. Boaters should not be forced to bear all the responsibility for user conflicts. The current no upstream travel restriction essentially ban boating during the restricted season and is patently discriminatory. Floaters are entitled to their views on river travel but so a boaters.

The current system for regulating motorized boating on the river should be continued.

Is there a provision for emergency use of motor boats?

Please close the entire Missouri River within the Monument to motorboats.

Preclude motorized watercraft.

The river itself should be off limits to all motorized craft, except in an emergency situation, just to maintain the peace and quie one can find on a slow-moving body of water.

It makes sense to have no motorized vehicles/watercraft in this section.

Ban all motorized watercraft.

Save this stretch of river for non-motorized vessels.

No motorboats, jet skis, etc.

Provide for a peaceful, non-motorized, back-to-nature experience when boating on the approximately 150 miles of the Missou River through the Monument.

Absolutely restrict motorized traffic on both land and water.

Balance the river use on the 149 miles of the Wild and Scenic river. Keep it quiet as has been the tradition.

No motorized boats within the 149 miles of wild and scenic Missouri.

Motorized watercraft should be prohibited.

Revised seasonal boating restrictions should be established from June 15 to September 15. The current downstream travel restriction should be dropped. Allow both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments at no wake speeds dur the restricted season.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the 148 remaining miles of the Wild Missouri.

Motorized watercraft should be prohibited.

Power boating should be permitted in all river segments. Recommend new seasonal boating restrictions be established from June 15 to September 15 with both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments permitted at no wake speeds during the restricted season.

I don't agree on banning all motorized craft on the river. Last year we took a motorboat tour from Ft. Benton to Judith Landing The no wake rule was in effect and there was very little noise from the boat. My wife and I are older people not capable of paddling a canoe or raft.

Prohibition on the river of any personal motorboat craft of a character similar to a jet ski should be enforced. Any transport of terrestrial motor vehicle on a boat on the river should be regulated as a violation of the Proclamation ban on off-road vehicle travel and appropriately punished.

I believe motorboat use should have the same restrictions that are in place now with the exception of some date changes. Change the dates from the weekend before Memorial Day to June 15th and the weekend after Labor Day to Sept. 15.

Non-motorized corridor.

I support motorboat use on the Upper Missouri River within the Monument boundaries. I believe motorboat use should have same restrictions that are in place now with the exception of some date changes. Change the dates from the weekend before Memorial Day to June 15th and the weekend after Labor Day to Sept. 15.

Allowing motorized traffic on this stretch of the river would completely destroy the wonderful solitude that is so hard to find wh on the water.

Nonmotorized watercraft should be the rule.

Keep power boats on the river. Recommend seasonal boating restrictions be established from June 15 to September 15 with both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments permitted at no wake speeds during the restricted season.

Keep motorized boats off that stretch of 150 miles of river.

Motorized boats should not be allowed at all in the Monument. The drone of motorboats has spoiled the peacefulness of our floats for hours at a time. If a complete ban is impractical, personal watercraft should at least be prohibited. All other boats should be required to observe a no wake speed all year long.

Revised seasonal boating restrictions should be established from June 15 to September 15. The current downstream travel restriction should be dropped. Allow both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments at no wake speeds dur the restricted season.

Motorized boats restricted to no wake all year - entire river.

Establish a "quiet water zone" to reflect the beauty and quiet that was once enjoyed by the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Please continue allowing motorized craft on the Wild & Scenic Missouri River.

No motorized transport on or near the river.

I would prefer no river motorized use. If motorized use is to be allowed it should be limited to no-wake use, preferably horsepower limits.

No motorized craft (except in emergencies).

The BLM should protect the natural quiet on the river by managing the stretch of the Missouri River that runs through the Monument as non-motorized.

Motorized watercraft should be prohibited on the river within the Monument.

The entire stretch of the Missouri River through the Monument should be non-motorized.

Let's keep this particular stretch of the Missouri off limits to power watercraft of whatever kind, in keeping with the character o the Monument.

Motorized recreation on the majority of the river within the park should be banned or severely limited.

Non-motor areas on the river.

Keeping motor boats to a minimum would also be a concern.

It is my hope that this critical stretch of the Missouri be managed as non-motorized.

Prohibit motorized watercraft.

No motorized boats.

I'm very concerned about the possibility of motors being banned on a portion of the Missouri River.

No motor boats should be allowed on the Missouri River segment traversing the monument, except for law enforcement and public safety emergencies.

The BLM should designate the entire 149 miles of the Wild and Scenic Missouri as non-motorized.

Keep the Missouri River breaks open to motorized boat use.

Protect the natural quiet on the river and in the sky by managing ht stretch of the Missouri Rive that runs through the Monume as non-motorized.

I urge you to prohibit jet skis and jet boats.

BLM has the rare opportunity to protect the natural experience for visitors floating the river, by phasing out motorized boating

Ban private motors.

Prohibit jet skis on the river and the use of landing craft to deposit any motorized vehicle from the river corridor onto public lan

Regulate noise and establish no wake zones, recognizing the value of natural soundscapes and primitive travel modes to the recreational experience of the river. Establish regulations providing users with uncompromised opportunities for such experience, especially during peak use seasons when recreational floating dominates river use.

Do not allow any private motors.

Prohibit jet skis and watercraft of a similar characteristic on the entire length of "Wild and Scenic River".

Motorized watercraft are restricted to 15mph within the Recreational and Scenic sections.

Prohibit the use of landing crafts.

Prohibit the transport of a terrestrial motor vehicle on a watercraft on the river. The use of such a vehicle, where off loaded, would be a violation of the Proclamation ban on off-road vehicle travel.

Prohibit motorized watercraft competition (s).

The Monument Interagency Wildlife Management Council (see III, A., (1)) should evaluate and implement appropriate emergency and administrative agency services motorized watercraft use that does not compromise habitat, fish, wildlife, and public recreational experiences. In emergency situations only, agencies are exempt them from "no wake" and up or downstre use restrictions. Administrative or law enforcement purposes must take into consideration river users and resources when considering use, minimizing such travel as much as possible.

From mile 0, Fort Benton, MT to mile 52 (Ebersol Bottom), all motorized watercraft use shall be "no wake" from the Saturday before Memorial Day to the Sunday after Labor day. During the remainder of the year, motorized watercraft is allowed, up and downstream within this river segment without a wake restriction.

From mile 52 (Ebersol Bottom) to mile 85 (Deadman Rapids), motorized watercraft allowed year-round downstream with the " wake" restriction.

From mile 85 (Deadman Rapids) to mile 92 (Holmes Rapids), all motorized watercraft use shall be "no wake" from the Saturd

before Memorial Day to the Sunday after Labor day. During the remainder of the year, motorized watercraft is allowed, up and downstream within this river segment without a wake restriction but they shall have a speed limit restriction of 15mph.

From mile 92 (Holmes Rapids) to mile 99 (Leslie Point), motorized watercraft allowed year-round downstream with the "no wa restriction.

From mile 99 (Leslie Point) to mile 104 (Magdall Homestead), motorized watercraft is allowed up and downstream year-round within this river segment without a wake restriction. Speed limited to 15mph.

From mile 104 (Magdall Homestead) to mile 128 (Cow Island), motorized watercraft allowed year-round downstream with the wake" restriction.

From mile 128 (Cow Island) to mile 149 (Fred Robinson Bridge), motorized watercraft is allowed up and downstream year-rou within this river segment without a wake restriction. Speed limited to 15mph.

Protect the natural quiet on the river and in the sky by managing the stretch of the Missouri River that runs through the Monument as non-motorized.

The river should be closed to personal water craft and to high speed jet boats.

Manage the 149-mile stretch of the Missouri River in the Monument as non-motorized. Do not allow jet skis, jet boats, and ot motorized watercraft.

No motorized traffic (jet boats, jet skis, etc.) allowed on the river.

Non-motorized travel along this section of the Missouri.

Allow the motor boats you have licensed to continue to operate the day trips on the Upper Missouri. Allow those of us who ca paddle access to this beautiful river landscape.

Do not allow motorized boat travel on the Missouri in the Wild and Scenic area.

By prohibiting motorized water travel on the river within the Monument, high quality hunting and floating opportunities will continue.

I strongly support current regulations for motorized boat use within the Monument.

Manage the stretch of the Missouri River that runs through the Monument as non-motorized.

We recommend that you designate the 149-miles stretch of the river within the Monument boundaries as non-motorized. Opportunities for mechanized travel abound in Montana; opportunities to experience the remote and undeveloped landscape that Lewis and Clark witnessed are rapidly diminishing. The purpose of the management plan is to protect this remote and undeveloped landscape.

Non-motorized forms of water travel should be the required form of recreation.

There should be responsible motorboat access to the Breaks area.

The Coal Banks to Fred Robinson stretch should be free of all motors - land, water and air.

River use should e balanced. IT should provide for seasonally controlled motorized watercraft use. Wild sections of the river should have more restrictive motorized watercraft use due to habitat impacts. Jet ski use within the monument is inappropria

The entire river should be accessible to all boating traffic, powered or unpowered. National monuments are not the private preserve of any particular special interest and as such regulations should promote respectful mutual use by all groups, not th exclusive use by a group.

Power boating should be permitted in all river segments. Recommend new seasonal boating restrictions be established from June 15 to September 15 with both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments permitted at no wake speeds during the restricted season.

Stretch of the Missouri River (Monument area) should be off limits to jet skis and large motorized boats.

I would hope that the Missouri River is not closed to motor boats.

Establish new seasonal boating restrictions as follows: June 15 to September 15. Both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments should be permitted at no wake speeds during the restricted season.

We do not want motor boats and jet skis on the Missouri River either.

Eliminate additional motorized water craft use of all descriptions and phase out this usage in a reasonable time.

Public use of jet boats on the river should be halted because of their noise and interference with the original kinds of travel an recreation.

No motorboats on the entire 148 miles of the river within the Monument.

Prohibit motors on the river.

In other resource management debates, people have been quick to demand motorized access for the use and privilege of pe with disabilities. We have taken many people with mobility impairments onto the Missouri, and we've never had need for mot

Prohibit jet skis/speed boats.

Management of this particular portion of the Missouri River as non-motorized.

Keep power boats on the river. Recommend seasonal boating restrictions be established from June 15 to September 15. Th current downstream travel restriction should be dropped. This represents a virtual ban on boating to local residents during th summer and is patently discriminatory. Permit both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments at no wake speeds during the restricted season.

I would like to see year round usage of motor boats on the Missouri River on all sections of the river. These boats should be allowed to travel both up river and down as long as no wake is created during the summer floating months.

Safeguard the natural setting along the river by phasing out motorized boats.

Close existing airstrips in the monument and restore natural conditions on those sites.

Motor boats should be allowed in the river within reason.

Allow power boating on all river segments throughout the year. Revise seasonal boating restriction dates to be from June 15 September 15 and permit both up and down stream travel in the wild and scenic segments during the restricted season.

Jet skiing is not something that should be allowed.

The 149-mile stretch of river through the Monument should be kept free of all motorized recreation.

No motors on the river. Floats, paddles, canoes only.

Restrict inappropriate motorized watercraft/jet skis (preferably none) especially in wild sections (habitat).

Manage the Missouri River through the national monument to be free of motorized watercraft.

I support motorboat use on the Upper Missouri River within the Monument boundaries. I believe motorboat use should have same restrictions that are in place now with the exception of some date changes. Change the dates from the weekend before Memorial Day to June 15th and the weekend after Labor Day to Sept. 15.

The Monument Proclamation by Sec. Babbitt preserved historic use and includes the words "valid existing rights must be recognized." The first motorized use in the White Cliffs took place in 1859 when the steamboat "Chippewa" traveled to the sit of old Fort McKenzie. In 1860 the "Chippewa" and "Key West" both made it to Fort Benton. There has been motorized boat traffic in the area every year since that time. This certainly constitutes "historic use" by any reasonable definition.

No motorized watercraft.

The BLM should prohibit jet skis on the river and the use of landing craft to deposit a motorized vehicle from the river corrido onto public land.

Prohibit motorized watercrafts.

I strongly support current regulations for motorized boat use within the Monument. These regulations have been in place sinc 1976 and have proven to be an excellent compromise for multi-use on the Missouri River.

Power boats should be allowed on the river, with no wake and/or speed limits.

The 149 mile stretch of the river that flows through the Monument, the last 6% deserves to remain free.

Keep the river open to reasonable motor trips.

The river use must be balanced, can offer both a quiet experience and allow for seasonal controlled motorized watercraft use some reaches of the river (wild sections) should have greater motorized watercraft restrictions due to habitat impact. MWF believes jet-ski use within the Monument is inappropriate.

As far as the river corridor is concerned, the 149-miles stretch should be managed as non-motorized. This stretch of the rive should never allow motorized traffic such as jet skis, jet boats and other motorized watercraft.

The entire 149 mile wild and scenic stretch of the Missouri should be completely closed to all motorized watercraft.

Prohibit motorized craft on the adjacent portion of the river.

I would like to see a ban on motorized watercraft through the 149 miles stretch of the Monument waterway.

Prohibit the use of motorized water craft on the 148 miles within the Monument.

We support continuance of BLM's allowance of commercial motorized traffic on the Wild and Scenic portion of the Upper Missouri River in Montana. Any concerns that the public may have about the continuance of motorized traffic could be partia alleviated by the BLM setting a baseline for acceptable behavior for those offering such services. After this, the BLM should design a policy of withholding or rejecting permits to those operators who fail to meet the baseline requirements.

Maintain current policies and seasons of use for no wake zones. Utilize the stakeholder process to identify when use levels would trigger a review of river use policies and seasons.

We would like to see the tranquility and historic character of the Monument preserved by prohibiting motorized watercraft from the 148 miles of Missouri between Fort Benton and Kipp Bridge.

We support motorboat use on the Upper Missouri River within the Monument boundaries. I believe motorboat use should hav the same restrictions that are in place now with the exception of some date changes. Change the dates from the weekend before Memorial Day to June 15th and the weekend after Labor Day to Sept. 15.

Motorized use of the Missouri River through the Monument should be restricted to administrative use only.

Declare the Missouri River nonmotorized.

Limit the number of boats. A few would be ok, but not a lot.

15 mph on river where motors are allowed to provide for "quiet experience."

No increase in motorized traffic on the land or the river.

Motorized use of the Missouri River in the 148 miles of the monument should be limited to emergency use only.

Develop a less restrictive, less discriminating approach to allowing motorized boats the chance to share the waterway with th traditional river floaters. This means establishing a less restrictive set of seasonal motorized boating restrictions. During the time between June 15 to September 15 allow both up and down stream travel with motorized boats, yet limit them to the size the wake they create, or the speed at which they can travel upstream. Some logical rules of courtesy and right of way can be written also.

When you consider making restrictions concerning the waterway in the Monument also consider that Article IX of the Montana Constitution provides that all water in Montana is the property of the State for the use of its people.

I would like to see motorized watercraft, jet skis, water skiing, etc. restricted or hopefully prohibited on the stretch of the river within the Monument. I would like to see the Monument in 20 years continue to be primitive and undeveloped.

I strongly support current regulations for motorized boat use within the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument.

The Monument proclamation by Secretary of Interior Babbitt preserved historic use and includes the words "valid existing righ must be recognized." The first motorized use in the White Cliffs took place in 1859 when the steamboat Chippewa traveled to the site of old Fort MacKenzie. In 1860 the Chippewa and Key West both made it to Fort Benton. There has been motorized boat traffic in the area every year since that time. This certainly constitutes "historic use" by any reasonable definition.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on all 148 miles of the river within the Monument.

In order for the Monument visitor to have anywhere like that same experience, we must not have motorized water craft along stretch of the river.

No motorboats on the river.

Limit all motorized boats except for emergency and administrative uses.

Seasonal usage by power boats must be regulated.

Motorized watercraft should be prohibited on the Wild and Scenic River designated portion of the Missouri River.

No motors except for administration.

Designate the section of river running through the Monument for nonmotorized boating only.

Preserve the tranquility of the river by disallowing motorized vehicles.

I would like to keep this small section of the river non-motorized on both the water and the non-developed land.

Designate the 149-mile stretch of the river going through the breaks Monument as nonmotorized.

Designate and manage the portion of the Missouri River that runs through the National Monument as non-motorized.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the 148 miles of river within the monument.

Particularly important is the banning of motorized watercraft.

Motorized boat traffic allows all people, including the elderly and the handicapped, to travel the river who could not have thes experiences without the help of motorized watercraft.

FWP endorses the present motor boat rule.

Prohibit motorized watercraft from Great Falls east to Fort Peck Dam headwaters.

Motorized boat access to allotments that don't otherwise have roaded access for the rancher to be able to check their fences livestock.

I support the present management that allows motorized craft on the Upper Missouri River Monument. They provide a servic the general public and in some cases to people who would not be able to see this unique area.

No motorboats.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the 149 mi. of wild and scenic river.

Don't allow motors to be the rule such as boats, ATVs, and other OHVs.

Motor boats, jet boats and jet skis on the Missouri River threaten the Monument's natural quiet.

All two-track ways should be closed to motorized vehicles unless designated open. Restore to a natural condition or convert foot trails appropriate user-created roads.

Keep the 148 miles of the river to non-motorized quiet water travel.

No motorized watercraft on the river.

Motorized watercraft (especially personal watercraft - jet skis, etc.), airplanes and ATVs in, on, around and above that particu stretch of river are particularly annoying.

On the river, 149 miles of nonmotorized use.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the Wild and Scenic River.

There are certain recreation activities that should not be allowed. Such activities including motorized water craft.

Make river travel primitive only (no motor use) in the Monument.

Limit motor boats on the Missouri River to preserve the natural quiet and wilderness experience.

Ban all motorized travel in this 148 mile section.

Enforce the no-wake rule with closure to motorized use on the river if repeated violations occur.

No motor use on the river within the Monument to minimize impact and preserve natural solitude of this area.

Motorboats should not be allowed on the Missouri (except for rescue and patrol by the BLM) year round to ensure solitude an Monument character.

Do not allow any motor boat activity.

Limit the use of motorized vessels exclusively to emergency and administrative us by BLM and affiliated agencies yearlong.

Reserve the solitude and quiet on the river by designating it as non-motorized.

Follow the Monument Proclamation to a fault: "…prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road" except for limite emergencies and administrative purposes. That should include not only large vehicles and ATVs but motor boats on the wate as well.

The river section through the Monument is unique in its wild nature. Maintain that wild nature by prohibiting motorized waterc

The use of motorized vehicles on the river should be restricted, or even (ideally) prohibited from a segment of the river excep emergency situations. This would be a better balance of the interests of motorized transport and the experience of backcoun solitude.

I urge the BLM to protect and preserve the 149 miles of Missouri River in the monument lands. Please, no noisy jet skis or ot motors except for emergency services.

Close all 148 miles of river within the Monument to motorized boat travel.

Motorized boat use should not be allowed.

Limit the number of boats operating in the area may be wiser.

Regarding motorized watercraft, I favor the present regs allowing motorized boats during specified dates.

Please protect the natural quiet on the river by managing the stretch of the Missouri River that runs through the Monument as non-motorized.

Wide open to motorboats.

No motorized boats on the river that is within the Monument.

Certainly most, if not all, of the Missouri River within the National Monument should be closed to motorized boat traffic.

Motor boats are a horrible intrusion into scene.

Let's keep the river open to motor boats so all people may enjoy the benefits of seeing the White Cliffs, regardless of their ag physical ability.

Current management time restrictions - speed limit 15 mph. If management decisions become more restrictive then no wake

Motorized activity on the river itself should be limited and I would prefer none.

It would be great if you can recognize the peacefulness of the river and area by managing the stretch of the Missouri River th [flows] through the Monument as non-motorized.

It is vitally important that all citizens be allowed aces to this national treasure. As American citizens and certainly as Montana residents my parents are entitled to enjoy the White Cliffs region of the Missouri River just as much as the able bodied person who can camp for three days on the river.

Please keep the river open to motor boats so that people of all ages will be able to enjoy the beautiful scenery.

Since the drastic evolution of motorized traffic in recent years it is imperative for the control of motorized usage. Jet skis, jet barges or high powered motorboats must be denied accessibility and use on the river so that fish and wildlife can be protecte To use multi passenger boats powered by engines should be stopped. This includes outfitters carrying cargo for their parties

I believe motorized watercraft should be prohibited, except for Fish and Wildlife and emergency personnel.

As a Montana native who grew up on the Missouri River near the Breaks, please accept this letter as a strong objection to closing the river to motorized travel.

Please keep this stretch of river non-motorized.

Prohibit all motorized watercraft completely on the entire wild stretch of the wild Missouri River within the Monument.

On the water, use of motorized boats, jet boats, and jet skis by a minority create an inordinate impact for the enjoyment of a majority of Monument visitors. The Monument offers quiet boating, hiking, fishing, and hunting opportunities like nowhere els

but they will only be possible if BLM has the foresight to restrict motorized usage now.

Boat sales up, problems are looming.

Motorized boats may make sense for fire control; would there be administrative exception?

Motorized boats not allowed; only for emergencies.

Open to motors all year long with respect and courtesy to those in non-motorized craft.

Solitude can mean idling on pontoon boat.

Without an access corridor during the hunting season, there are only two short months to gain access to the river. There sho be a time for hunters and recreationists to use the river. River floaters have quiet during the summer. Hunters should have access also.

It was nice to see that there were many different methods of travel available to the public for experiencing the White Cliffs, fro canoes to kayaks to horseback trips to boating. Continue to allow motorized boats in the Monument.

I am against motors such as boats and jet skis on the river.

Motorized use of the river should also be strictly controlled. No motorized boats should be allowed in the portion of the river t was designated "Wild and Scenic" in 1977. I am not against motorized boating, per se, but I am opposed to speeding, noisy craft buzzing up and down the river. Consequently, I believe that a no-wake policy should be enforced throughout the remain river areas year-round.

Manage the stretch of the Missouri River in the Missouri River Breaks Monument as non-motorized.

Motorized boats restricted to no wake 6/15-9/15.

I personally have never supported motor boats on the river for a number of reasons including noise, wakes, pollution, etc.

Limit motor boats on the Missouri River to preserve the natural quiet and wilderness experience.

I would also like to see the river closed to motorized water craft except in the case of an emergency. BLM personnel servicin camp sites should look at alternatives to getting into these places.

Close the 148 miles of river within the Monument to motorized use.

With the increased sales of powerboats, jet skis, and landing craft there is a need to create a nonmotorized segment of the riv to protect the quiet and solitude for which the Monument was created.

I urge you to adopt management of the monument that provides for non-motorized recreation, including boating.

Protect the natural quiet on the river and in sky by managing the stretch of the Missouri River that runs through the Monumen non-motorized.

Missouri River use should be balanced and should offer both motorized and non-motorized opportunities. Some sections of t river should be motor free to protect habitat. Finally jet ski/wet jets should be prohibited with the monument.

There are presently restrictions on the river motorcraft. These restrictions should not be increased or expanded. The use of motorcraft should be studied and monitored and restrictions reviewed which may establish a new baseline.

Access to the river should allow for motorized watercraft such as motorboats including jet boats. Not everyone has the good health to paddle a canoe. A no wake policy in the presence of nonmotorized craft makes sense. Jet skies are a thrill toy and n for traveling along the river so should be prohibited.

Two years ago my sister and I were able to realize the dream of following in the footsteps of Lewis and Clark as they traveled past the incredible landscapes of the White Cliff area on the Missouri River. We are too old to paddle a canoe and traveling b launch was our only option. Please don't take this privilege away from older and handicapped visitors to this beautiful area.

These purists will stop at nothing to prevent handicapped and the disabled to enjoy what every American has the right to enjo Leave the motors.

Set up a no motorized policy on the short stretch of the river(s) within the Monument area, approximately 149 miles of the Missouri River, I understand.

No motors on the river.

We urge BLM to designate the river in the monument as a non-motorized segment.

Limit human impacts by not allowing any motorized traffic (except emergency rescue operations) on the river's 148 miles with the Monument.

No restrictions on boaters. This is a public river and land.

Do not limit the river to a few people who can only float the river. It needs to be open in ways for people who cannot and do n want to be in a canoe for three days.

Especially please do not allow jet boats of any kind on the Missouri here.

Allow boats all year.

Ban jet skis and other motorized boats from the river.

No motorized use from Memorial Day to Labor Day.

We would like to see motorized watercraft prohibited on the 149 miles of the Wild and Scenic portion of the Missouri River.

Sensitive, ecologically based, and adequate planning and zoning must be undertaken before the area is dominated by mechanized toys and their noise and destruction so the monument would then become a roaded, noisy, and disturbed area o river lands with nothing to offer to the public who really want a Missouri float trip.

One of the alternatives should be for an essentially motor-free Monument; especially in the wild and scenic segments of the river. Motors on the river during hunting season are becoming a more serious problem and user conflicts with each passing year.

Seasonal timing restrictions preferred.

Another comment that elderly should not get preferential treatment re access via motorized watercraft.

Elderly people need access on river.

Should allow motorized watercraft for administrative and emergency purposes.

Some outfitters abusing “no wake” rule. Need speed limit. Disturb nesting birds.

Some people expressed opposition to all motors.

Large power boats should also be prohibited on the river within the Monument. The same is true of jet skis and other high sp vehicles known as personal watercraft.

No motorized watercraft on entire length of river (148 miles) through Monument.

The segment of the Missouri River running through the Monument should be designated as nonmotorized. Sound, even from relatively quiet engines, carries on the river and destroys the possibility of experiencing the river as Lewis and Clark did. Also motors are allowed, crowding will occur because people can travel more of the river in a shorter period of time.

Prohibit motorized watercraft.

I don't like the time schedule system as it is set up at this time for motorboat use. I would like to see the Missouri River open year-around use by motorboats to travel up and down the river. I feel that there could be a scheduled time and place for jet s and water skiing as they are also users.

There can be speed limits in areas for motor boats; wake-free areas and special regulations when meeting floaters coming do the river; treating them with consideration.

One of the main issues needing to be emphasized is consideration for other people on the river. Treat other users the way yo would want to be treated. I have seen the time when people in a canoe had a problem and were very happy to be towed to s by us in our motorboat. There needs to be a time limit on the loading dock or another place provided for floaters to use rathe than tie up the dock for hours.

Motors on the river within the Monument should be for emergency and ranger use only.

Keep this stretch of the Missouri as non-motorized.

Please do not allow motorized watercraft on this stretch of river.

Allow motorized watercrafts except exempt jet ski use.

The way it is done now is fair and should be continued.

The 150 miles of Wild and Scenic River in the Monument should be free of motorized watercraft.

Keep the river quiet and serene. Allow small fishing boat motors to help craft navigate without noise and wakes. Police it.

Motorized transportation on the river should be prohibited except for emergencies and management needs.

Motor boats used all year with no wake in heavy traffic. No restriction on numbers.

No motorized boats. The no-wake rule isn't enforced. BLM violates it all the time. I've witnessed BLM boats roaring upriver no-wake season.

Use of motorized boats on the Upper Missouri - what is the consideration on whether or not a rancher can travel the river in a motorized boat to put in his river fences? Many times a boat is the only feasible way to get to these river fences. May specia permits be issued with certain limitations or what?

Eliminate all motorized craft from the entire corridor year long immediately, except for legal, bona fide emergency actions.

Support the current use of motorboats to remain the same on the Upper Missouri River and also to change the dates from the weekend before Memorial Day to June 15th and the weekend after Labor Day to September 15th.

There is only one remaining stretch of non-motorized, quiet water travel on the Missouri.

I don't agree on banning all motorized craft on the river.

The wild and scenic river should only be open to non-motorized craft.

Prohibit use of jet skis and jet boats on the Missouri River in the Monument.

Retain current management or dates could be slid either way a few days.

Allow motor boats at certain times for access to hunting grounds.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the 149 miles of Wild and Scenic River.

The RAC recommended all watercraft observe the no-wake rule from Memorial Day to Labor Day with the exception of a seve mile area at Judith Landing. The BLM should push for the eventual banning of all motorized watercraft in the 149 miles stretc of the Monument which represents only about 6% of the length of the Missouri River.

One "feasible" recommendation from the RAC was to keep boating restrictions as they exist today.

Prevent motored boats on the Wild & Scenic River.

Preserve this 148 mile stretch of the Missouri for activities such as hunting, fishing, birdwatching, hiking and camping via non motorized crafts.

I'd like to see local boaters have more use of the river during summer holidays. Like some upstream travel from Fred Robins Bridge during paddlefish season (thru 15 June). Giving primary use of the river to floaters is discriminatory and should be fixe

Motorized recreation on the Missouri River should be limited to help preserve the natural quiet and wilderness experience. T draft EIS should specifically detail those areas where motorized recreation will be allowed and where restricted. Furthermore the draft EIS should indicate what the current level of motorized recreation is on the river and what the desired future conditio will be.

Use of motorized watercraft except for official purposes should be strictly prohibited. Motorized watercraft would very quickly destroy the very attributes that make this river section important.

All motorized watercraft should be barred from those reaches of the Missouri that were classified by Congress in 1977 as Wil or Scenic. Where the river is classified as Recreational, motorized watercraft should be required to limit the speed to the no-wake rule year long, in order to minimize disturbing recreationists and wildlife.

Prohibit motorized use on the portion that is a Wild and Scenic River.

Ban motors of any sort from the Wild and Scenic portion of the river.

Wake controls and designated canoe only days could be implemented, but canoe use should not dominate the river use.

The river below Coal Banks should be reserved for non-motorized craft. This should also apply to the BLM except for emergency uses, such as law enforcement, search and rescue, etc.

Seasonal restrictions on motorized use - as current management of wild and scenic river management.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the 149 miles of Wild and Scenic River.

Canoe use on the river within Monument boundaries.

Motor boats should be allowed on the river just as canoes with respect to others on the river.

Absolutely prohibit jet skis (personal water craft) and require other motorized boats to observe no-wake speed all year long.

Leave this 148 mile section of the river unmotorized.

Manage this stretch of the Missouri River as non-motorized.

The river is a very historic navigable river. It is unreasonable to stop the use of motor boats. It would discriminate against old people and people that can't take the time to float it.

The use of power boats between Memorial and Labor Day would bring too many conflicts. Keep it as it now stands.

Use of motorized boats limited to no-wake. No jet skis or ATVs allowed in Monument area period.

Please do not allow motorized watercraft.

Prohibit motor boats on the Missouri in this area.

There are options to control motorized use, such as expanding the no-wake zone, permitting some use, placing limits on the t of boats or motors, or creating some non-motorized sections.

With the exception of emergencies, the BLM should manage the river without allowing motorized craft, as is done on other wi and scenic rivers.

We believe that a carefully planned system of time zoning should be continued and refined in consultation with your RAC. Th will provide some times of the year when users would not have to hear motor boats, the noise of which can have huge impact the experience of other floaters. Some part of the floating and hunting season should be devoted to non-motorized boats. Motorized boats should be the first use restricted as use increases and restrictions become more necessary.

Another is the use of motorized river craft in the river corridor, which should be strictly prohibited.

Do not encourage motorized river travel.

Keeping motorized craft such as jet skis off of this river is vital.

Alternative motors could include electric motors for BLM river administration.

BLM administrative use of motorized boats should be limited. Patrol/administer the way the public uses the river.

Jet skis restricted on river.

River speed limit along with wake restriction – 30 mph. Does not include search and rescue.

2700 miles of Missouri River motorized, why not 149 miles with no motorized use?

Already giving up with the current restrictions; need access corridor during hunting season to huge blocks of public land.

During hunting season no motorboats on the river (maybe a period of time).

Is motorized use on the river being monitored/enforced?

Leave restrictions as is for motorized use on the river; provides access (hunting).

Look at speed limits. Should be places where can’t hear motors.

On the river: restrictions on motorboats, ATVs used on public land (ranching).

Motorboats to use river any time, maybe with speed restrictions.

Motorized boating – less restrictive on either end.

Open up couple days/week to power boats.

Restricting motorboats off the river is wrong.

Any real problem(s) with current season boating restrictions?

Have we considered allowing upstream motorized travel from Kipp to 6/15 to facilitate paddlefishing?

Which segments are closed to motorized watercraft?

No motorized watercraft.

Off limits to motorized water travel.

Strictly limit the amount of motorized traffic, and keep the crafts on the water to a no-wake speed. Outfitters are starting to us motorized crafts to haul people in to the Monument, and the number needs to be kept to a minimum. I mean one a day is enough. And the occupants should be restricted to disabled or elderly.

Since almost all of the rest of the Missouri River allows motor boats, we'd love to see the Monument non-motorized. If this is possible because of traditional usage, maybe quiet, no-wake battery operated motors can be used in limited areas for fishing There definitely should not be any jet boats, jet skis, or fast, loud motorboats.

I enjoy canoeing and feel it is less harmful to the shoreline of the river. Noisy boats can go to other places.

I believe that the Wild and Scenic regulations are adequate and represent a good compromise, as they pertain to motor boati Motor boat use should be allowed on a year around basis, for the purpose of maintaining water gap fences, and other administrative purposes.

Limit motorboats and jet skis.

Prohibit motorized boats.

Eliminate motorized boat use within the Monument.

The stretch of river between Fort Benton and the Robinson Bridge (the Kipp area) needs to be for non-motorized craft only. I have been on the river in that stretch when others were using motors even modestly -- they are not only an intrusion on quiet us humans without motors but for the critters as well.

Disallow motorized traffic on this section of the river.

With the ever increasing sales and use of motorized watercraft I feel that the 149 miles of river in the Monument should be ke free of motorized watercraft except for legitimate emergency use.

It is time to designate a section of the Missouri River as a no motor area to preserve the quiet and primitive nature of the river corridor.

Limit motor boats on the Missouri River to preserve the natural quiet and wilderness experience.

Reformat the seasonal restriction on motor use to observed Memorial Day through observed Labor Day. Much simpler than current plan.

Eliminate the no-wake speed from Slaughter River campground to Judith Landing. This offers more opportunities for motor u and opens the river to more fishing opportunities.

I urge prohibition of motorized watercraft on the river.

Current restrictions under the Wild and Scenic concerning motorized travel on the river are a good compromise. They coincid with the best times for hunting and fishing on the Missouri. Year round travel should be allowed for administrative purposes a maintenance of allotment fences.

Alternative #1.
Rescind current boating restrictions. Implement new procedures as follows:

a. Boating restrictions will be implemented from June 15 through August 31 each season from Ft. Benton to the Robinson

Bridge. During this period up/down stream powerboat travel will be allowed but speed will not exceed 15 miles per hour, exce when passing other watercraft at which time speeds will be reduced to no wake. Speeds will also be reduced to no wake whe passing established boat launch facilities and developed campsites.
b. Throughout the boating year, all river users will operate watercraft in a safe and courteous manner, thereby ensuring the safety of all river users.

Alternative #2.
Rescind current boating restrictions. Implement new procedures as follows:
a. From Ft. Benton to Coal Banks Landing and from the PN Bridge to the Robinson Bridge, power boating will be permitted both up and down stream travel as follows:
(1) During the boating year, speed limit will be 25 miles per hour except when passing other watercraft at which time speed be reduced to no wake.
(2) Speeds will also be reduced to no wake when passing established boat launch facilities and developed campsites.
b. From Coal Banks Landing to the PN Bridge power boating will be permitted but restricted to no wake, for up/down stream travel, from the weekend before Memorial Day to the weekend after Labor Day.
c. Throughout the boating year, all river users will operate watercraft in a safe and courteous manner, thereby ensuring the safety of all river users.

Alternative #3.
Rescind current boating restrictions. Implement new procedures as follows:
a. From Coal Banks Landing to the PN Bridge, up/down stream power boating will be permitted throughout the boating yea but speed will be reduced to no wake at all times.
b. From Ft. Benton to Coal Banks and from PN Bridge to Robinson Bridge up/down stream power boating will be permitted within these reaches throughout the boating year subject to the following restrictions:
(1) Speed limit will be 25 miles per hour.
(2) Speeds will be reduced to no wake when passing other watercraft, established boat launch facilities and developed campsites.
(3) Throughout the boating year, all river users will operate watercraft in a safe and courteous manner, thereby ensuring the safety of all river users.

Alternative #4.
Revise current power boating restrictions as follows:
a. Change the seasonal boating restriction dates from June 15 to August 31.
b. Permit up/down stream travel in the Wild and Scenic River segments but limit speeds not to exceed 10 mph.
c. Throughout the entire river reach, speeds will be reduced to no wake when passing other watercraft, established boat launch facilities and developed campsites.
d. Throughout the boating year, all river users will operate watercraft in a safe and courteous manner, thereby ensuring the safety of all river users.

Prohibit motorized boats.

Prohibit motorized watercraft on the 149 miles of the Wild and Scenic River. The survey work conducted last year on the rive showed that 92% of the people using this 149-mile stretch of the river, at least during the summer months, use canoes or oth non-motorized watercraft.

Motorized craft of any sort be prohibited along this stretch of the river as well as motorized vehicle usage along the banks.

All motorized traffic should be prohibited on the 148 mile portion of the river.

Keep the no wake speed law for motorized boats in case of head wind.

When floating the river one of the many pleasures was the distance and the silence. Allowing motorized craft on that section river would not only detract from the unique pleasure of the breaks, but rob the visitor of its sense of history.

Please prohibit motorized watercraft on the 148 miles of river within the Monument.

No motorized craft in the Wild & Scenic portion of the river.

Designate the 149-mile stretch of the Missouri River running through the Monument as non-motorized.

Motorized boat travel should be allowable even if speed limits need be placed upon when encountering non-motorized travel.

2254

Fairness requires that the BLM not provide permits to outfitters who have exclusive access to, and use of, public lands within Monument. Exclusive use results when private landowners refuse to allow the public to access public lands that are only accessible by crossing private lands. By denying the public access, the landowner gains exclusive access to adjacent public land.

Immediately effect commercial outfitters licenses limits, specifically eliminate the current privileged reservations processes an user limits to outfitters. Everybody throws their application in annual pot, specifically including outfitters (one person, one application), and whoever draws a float permit can make their own arrangements.

Do not establish an arbitrary number for outfitters. Rather, incorporate the outfitter issue into the total monument manageme concept and adjust upward or downward based on resource impacts or other considerations. Consider outfitter restrictions o when a clear and compelling need arises.

As far as guided hunts are concerned, no guiding should be allowed from private land onto public land that is blocked from public use. We believe it is improper to create incentive to close access to the public land.

No special use permits.

This area should not be catered to outfitters.

Tour groups on top of ridge are not appropriate (Hole in the Wall).

Restrict and limit commercial outfitter operations. Limit, and perhaps allocate by pre-season lottery, the number of commerci outfitter trips that are permitted on the river, and restrict such commercial operations to specific campsites, leaving the greate number of such sites (especially at Eagle Creek and Slaughter River) for use by private parties.

Do not permit any outfitters access or special use permits anywhere within the Monument where the general public does not have access.

Please do not allow motorized access to outfitters in areas where the general public does not have motorized access.

Provide equal access opportunities for the public; no privileged or guaranteed access for commercial interests.

In areas of restricted access no favoritism to guides/outfitters.

Restrict permits from outfitters who have access to public land which is inaccessible to the public at large.

No outfitting permits should be issued for any public land that is not equally accessible to the public.

No special treatment or privileged access for commercial interests.

All lands not accessible by the general public should not be leased for outfitting. This access needs to be determined by road access not just water.

The number of commercial boating permits should continue to be limited, and the management plan should insure that non-commercial users will not have to wait lengthy periods of time to access the river.

No permits should be issued to outfitters that have exclusive access to public lands via granted rights-of-way over private lan

I don't feel there should be any limit on user numbers of either individuals or outfitters.

Do not provide permits to outfitters who have access to public land which is inaccessible to the public at large.

No outfitting without the public having equitable access to any area within the Monument.

Allow no outfitting on public land where public access has been prohibited or controlled by private landowners.

Conflicts arise when someone has an advantage over someone else, e.g. outfitters gaining exclusive access to and use of pu land.

If outfitter/private landowner has access to public land then the public should have access to the public land that's been block off (wouldn't issue a Special Recreation Permit if outfitter/landowner blocks access).

Outfitters shouldn't be given preference and should be restricted.

Allocation (Smith River system), x no. for public, x no. for outfitters, can lead to a fee. Use a model that allows the public to determine if they use an outfitter or not (applies to hunting also).

You would exclude outfitter permits when the public does not have access.

Commercial operators should not receive special consideration regarding access.

Outfitters pay 3% of operation income into a fund that stays in Lewistown Field Office.

RMP should include any format that may be necessary to allocate use between outfitted and non-outfitted users.

Guiding is an important option for recreation and hunting visitors. The primary need for guided trips is education, interpretatio and facilitation of visitors who do not have the skill or equipment to float the river or hunt on their own. We believe that there be a time in the near future when recreation-floating use will need to be restricted. With that in mind, the BLM should be very careful not to create any priority, or use right, to guides. At the time use restriction becomes necessary, guides should not ha nay first opportunities or priority over citizen permits. We believe that it is critical that recreation floating opportunities on publ rivers and wildlife hunting opportunities not be privatized. Any permits should be issued to the public, not guides. It is appropriate that the BLM assist the public, those who have permits, to find guides who have authorization to guide on the rive A fair system that assists guides in connecting with potential permitted guests should be worked out.

Limit no. of commercial boating permits to 20 controlling their density to spread them out on river.

Any allocation system should incorporate historical use patterns by outfitters, and the number of outfitting permits should be k at a number which will ensure the viability of well-run businesses.

No permits to outfitters where the public has restricted access.

No privileged or guaranteed access for commercial interests.

No outfitter permits issued for areas without equivalent public access.

Regulate outfitters. Make sure they are educated re: proper use of the area, able to handle emergencies, not damaging the l fulfilling their agreement with their customers.

Monitor and enforce regulations regarding outfitters and use greater efforts to prevent illegal outfitting in the Monument.

[No more permits allowed] to outfitters who are allowed exclusive access to areas the public at large are not allowed the sam access.

Make operators go through training before getting a SRP.

No use of roads or access to outfitting or special interests - to include ranching where there is no equal access for the public.

Clients of commercial service providers such as hunting outfitters and float-fishing outfitters should receive no access opportunities not also available to the general public.

One pressing concern that I have with the recent influx of users (used to see no one) is that outfitters with groups of floaters, with their every need catered to, create a risk of destroying the ambiance. If they get to "own" the river I will never want to se again. Last year I noticed especially that an outfitter can motor ahead of the floaters and pick the best spots for camping, the get set up to greet his floaters.

River use must be fair equitable with no preference to special interest or outfitter floats.

No outfitting permits where public doesn't have "equivalent" access. This in essence becomes a private hunting preserve on public land.

Fairness requires that the BLM not provide permits to outfitters who have exclusive access to and use of public lands within t Monument. Exclusive use results when private landowners refuse to allow the public to access public lands that are only accessible by crossing private lands. By denying the public access, the landowner gains exclusive access to adjacent public land.

Do not provide permits to outfitters who have access to public land that is inaccessible to the public at large.

Monitor and enforce regulations regarding outfitters and make a greater effort to prevent illegal outfitting in the Monument.

We oppose any advantage in access or special means of access to any commercial interest.

There should be no commercialized outfitting on the public lands within the Monument.

Guides should be offered to public if unsure of area, info pullouts.

Limit the number of commercial boating outfitters. Predominant number of boater allocations should go to private recreationa users.

Public should be offered guide services into remote areas and aware of what they are getting into.

Outfitting should be banned unless the public is given equitable access.

Apparently the current permitting process discourages short scenic trips along this section of the river. I can't blame an outfit for wanting to cater to the more lucrative trips of several days duration. However, it should be possible for the BLM to arrange the process to take into consideration short trips for those whose infirmities, budget, or work schedules do not permit several days commitment.

Commercial operators should attend a training course prior to receiving a special use permit.

When visitor opportunity to use the monument becomes so popular that a rationing system must be installed, that system mu never allocate such opportunity directly to a commercial vendor. Allocation of user opportunity must always be made fairly an directly to the individual citizen. No "set-asides" or reserves of user opportunity can ever be made to any commercial vendor

The BLM should provide equitable access for hunting and other purposes. Fairness requires that the BLM not provide permit to outfitters who have exclusive access to and use of public lands within the Monument. Exclusive use results when private landowners refuse to allow the public to access public lands that are only accessible by crossing private lands. By denying th public access, the landowner gains exclusive access to adjacent public land.

The BLM should monitor and enforce regulations regarding outfitters and use greater efforts to prevent illegal outfitting in the Monument.

The privilege of outfitting in the Monument should be tied to the public having equitable access. This is in no way an infringement on private property rights because that rancher is not required to allow the public to either cross or hunt his land What I am stressing is that the privilege of outfitting in the Monument be tied to equitable access for all.

No air hunting over the Monument and no air transport of hunting or other clients into the Monument.

Outfitting, both hunting and canoe, should be supported and encouraged. These activities bring business to our small communities and provide a good sideline income for some of our residents. Efforts to force equal access through private land should be resisted.

Provide equal access opportunities for the public with no privileged or guaranteed access for commercial users.

Do not establish an arbitrary number to limit outfitters. The BLM resource manager can make that decision as a practical ma based on common sense.

Limit outfitters only when a valid reason exists to do so.

Do not provide permits to outfitters in areas not open to the public.

Hunting outfitters cannot receive a permit to operate on the Monument land in any area where equitable public hunting acces does not exist.

I have heard that it is being considered again that the general public should have the same access that an outfitter has. As a outfitter I feel this is extremely unfair. On our family ranch, to access the roads on BLM or the Monument you have to drive through (in most cases) several miles of deeded property. The deeded property is where we do most of our hunting.

The BLM should monitor and enforce regulations regarding outfitters and use greater efforts to prevent illegal outfitting in the Monument. Fairness requires that the BLM not provide permits to outfitters who have exclusive access to and use of public lands within the Monument. Exclusive use results when private landowners refuse to allow the public to access public lands are only accessible by crossing private lands. By denying the public access, the landowner gains exclusive access to adjace public land.

Outfitting (hunting and canoe) should continue, as it benefits our local communities and residents. Trying to force equal acce through private land should not be allowed.

I would suggest that you eliminate outfitting on all public land where the public has less than comparable access.

Commercial SRP user days should be managed in coordination with FWP to prevent crowding and overhunting.

There must be no "set asides" or other special opportunities for clients of commercial outfitters. When user opportunity must rationed, the citizen should be the recipient of the opportunity and not the commercial vendor.

Citizens should have exactly the same hunting and fishing access that guides and outfitters have.

No guaranteed access should be carved out for commercial interests.

When visitor opportunity to use the Monument becomes so popular that any rationing system must be instituted, that system must never allocate such opportunity directly to a commercial vendor (including outfitter services, etc.). Allocation of user opportunity must always be made fairly and directly to the individual citizen. No "set-asides" or reserves of user opportunity ca ever be made to any commercial vendor.

Outfitters cannot receive a BLM permit to operate on the Monument land in any area where equitable public hunting access d not exist.

The BLM that we lease is in the Monument. We are trying to start up a business of guiding horseback riders into that area an sleeping in teepees.

No commercial outfitting (private control of public lands).

Provide equal access to these designated areas for the entire public, deny any privileged or guaranteed access for private or commercial interests.

Outfitted tours both on the river and upland should have a limit as to their number. When there are too many the impact on t land and quality of the recreational experience is affected, and the clients are spread thinly among many outfitters making it h to make it profitable.

Boater restrictions in peak season only. Limit commercial float trip outfitters and require them to attend training. Too many campgrounds are taken over by the commercial float trips who send employees ahead to get the best spots.

Outfitting not be permitted where the public does not enjoy equitable access.

The BLM should monitor and enforce regulations regarding outfitters and use greater efforts to prevent illegal outfitting in the Monument. Fairness requires that the BLM not provide permits to outfitters who have exclusive access to and use of public lands within the Monument. Exclusive use results when private landowners refuse to allow the public to access public lands are only accessible by crossing private lands. By denying the public access, the landowner gains exclusive access to adjace public land.

Outfitting not be permitted where the public does not enjoy equitable access. This kind of commercial use would amount to a private control of public opportunities to enjoy our public lands and public wildlife.

Private outfitters should not have any preference in a launch allocation system. The dramatic increase in outfitters the last ye definitely changed the flavor of the float.

Since trapping is by definition a commercial pursuit, special use permits should be considered.

2255

Being able to enforce rules during hunting season. Off-road use, fire danger, open gates, chasing livestock.

More quality hunting of sheep, mule deer and elk.

Hunting goes back to antiquity and is not only a historic use of the area, but is also an important economic base for the entire region and is the principle economic component of tourism. All game management programs must contain a predator contro component and these programs should recognize that hunting is the traditional as well as the most effective method of game management.

All hunting opportunities within the Monument should be non-motorized. In other words foot, stock or non-motorized water cr only.

Reintroduce nature fauna and hunting can be considered.

Opinion evenly split between leaving status quo and restricting access numbers during big game season by immediate adopt of permit only hunting there.

Use OHV guidelines for Monument. Allow game retrieval.

Yes to fishing and hunting.

Did they drop the game retrieval off-road in the final OHV document?

Game retrieval must be balanced with the possibility of ruined game.

Most hunters want equitable access and don't mind walking in.

Problem with hunting (illegal).

MWF believes the tradition and heritage of public hunting and fishing must be recognized as a legitimate and valuable public opportunity within the Monument.

2002 had most hunters in the area because additional tags were available. Coordinate between BLM/FWP on tags in area.

Is there an opportunity to outfit only to help hunters retrieve big game animals?

Work jointly with Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks to develop sound game management, establish wildlife and hunting seasons.

Fishing and hunting should be managed under state laws in cooperation with the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife :& Pa

One other though might be if you want to control the "amount" of hunters in an area you might consider making it a special permit area.

The Monument should be kept open to hunting. Most of these lands are currently hunted and need to maintain these tradition uses.

Provide for off-road game retrieval access.

In 1998 the State of Montana convened a Hunter Behavior Advisory Council to address hunter ethics. The "Final Recommendations" of that group are available from the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (444-4038). Their relevance is that Montana citizens responding to the council, identified motorized and off road vehicle uses as the primary causes of unethical behavior.

Wildlife opportunities such as hunting should promote fair and equitable access as well as ethics and fair chase - nobody eve said game retrieval should be easy.

Coordinate efforts with Fish and Game to re-establish trophy muley bucks in areas like Cow Creek, Bull Creek and Bullwhack

2256

Access fee to all lands.

Small annual fee to recreate within the Monument.

Except for commercial outfitters and full service camp sites (which should be very few), absolutely no fees.

Public land should be open to the public without fees.

No general user access fee should be charged to the public for use of the Monument.

Smith River idea to keep the place pristine - Small fee.

The monument should be a no fee area to visit.

Have Denny Rehberg introduce a bill waiving fees for Monument use for all of us in central Montana.

The monument should be a no fee area except at full service campgrounds.

With towns like Fort Benton and Loma right on the edge of the Monument a fee for boat use won't go over well with local fishermen or recreationists. I'd prefer a fee for overnight use (camping at developed sites).

Annual fee - good idea.

Charge higher fees. Limit the numbers.

Do not implement user fees beyond what is currently in place.

Public land should be open to the public without fees.

We recommend a go-slow approach to fees. Problems of distortion of use patterns, collection costs, visitor acceptance and other potential problems are a reality that BLM should weigh carefully sometime in the distant future before use fees are

considered.

There should be no fees for the public to use public land.

The public commons belong to the people without having to pay additional fees. Keep allocation responsibility in the Congres and prevent starting a fee schedule which will only increase with time.

Do not charge a public land recreation user fee.

Eliminate immediately all fees, charges, etc. to the general public for recreational uses of our public land and resources. Not included in my recommendation are fees charged for administration, safety, etc. to commercial outfitters and similar for profit individual, group, or organization uses of our public land and resources. The fees so effected on these for profit entities shou be at 110% of true, accurate costs to we the federal taxpayer.

No public user fees should be charged to members of the recreating public using or accessing the Monument.

There should be no general user access fee for the Monument. That is - no fee simply to access the land or the river. Fees f specific personal services may be charged: i.e. a solid waste disposal fee to use the bulk waste system as described in (AD1075-5152). Only specific fees for specific services should be charged - not to include such general government obligatio as road system maintenance and law enforcement. Such duties should be funded by general appropriations.

As far as the fees are concerned, I believe there should be a minimal fee that includes all possible uses. If we increase fees much it will not be possible for all persons to use these facilities equally.

I believe that if user fees are instituted, a portion of the proceeds should go to local fire, rescue and ambulance services.

No user fees.

Recreation users should not be fee assessed.

Public land recreation should be open to the public without fees.

I think thee is a place for charging user fees, especially to fund strict enforcement of any rules on road and river access that t BLM determines in the Monument management plan.

As far as user fees, I do not believe the US taxpayer should pay a fee for use of our public lands unless we are paying for enhanced services; I don't see where any enhanced services are existing nor needed in the Monument as designed.

Public land recreation should be open to the public without fees.

I would like to see a nominal fee added to the floater permit system to be utilized for weed prevention and control along the Missouri River and the Monument.

Public land recreation should be open to the public without fees.

Reduce or eliminate fees for camping in prepared campsites.

Charge annual fee for boat, recreation and camping.

No fees except commercial users.

Patrol areas like rangers in Yellowstone.

Public land should be opened to the recreating public without fees.

No fees.

Could oil/gas equipment be charged a special use fee with money going to county for road maintenance?

Fees (user fee) can keep the users from the resource.

Recreation User Fees: Combine 3 [Range of Management Ideas] as options that people can choose.

Access should be free.

Access fees are appropriate.

Rec user fees - at the necessary level to maintain campgrounds, etc.

I am not in favor of a user fee because of the regulations that will come with it.

No user fees.

As funding levels shrink, fees become more important.

How long will experimental fee demonstration program last?

Any fees collected within the Monument should be returned to the Monument.

Fees should only be charged at established sites. Congress should allocate budget to manage Monument instead of collecti fees.

If there is a voluntary fee, don't worry if people pay or not. At lease get some dollars and if you tried to enforce will cost more

Is it possible for some type of voluntary donation fee to access the Monument?

Public shouldn't have to pay extra to use lands.

Don't mind a fee if it goes back to the area.

Fee demo system not part of the Proclamation.

Fees handled properly, money for management of the Monument.

Hate user fees; I pay taxes, my land is no longer free. Congress sees $6 million made, cuts the budget.

If there is a user fee charged, can the money be kept in the area?

No such thing as a free lunch; more people, need solution.

Poll tax effect (fee limits). Tiering a fee to an enhanced service. Low cost (no fee).

Reasonable fee that will allow everybody to enjoy.

Said in first place would not have user fees. This was a change.

The type of management we want requires a cost for management (reasonable fees).

Users already pay fees (about half the users). Consider user fees.

Fee system may be justified at some sites, i.e. high maintenance areas.

Fees may help counties with search and rescue costs (local services).

No fees at boat ramps.

No fees should be charged.

Not sure we can get by without fees; door should remain open for "dock" or campground fees.

Pay for it to use it.

Recreation users should not be assessed.

There should be a fee.

When we charge fees, not long before it becomes privatized.

Would support a fee for recreation floating on river.

Do Kipp fees stay in this area?

Fees are not a new idea on public land – USFS campgrounds, national parks

If fees are charged, money should stay in this administrative area – don't send funds to general fund.

Public land should remain available with no fees.

Subgroup of RAC also wrestling with fee issue.

Overnight fee only.

Open public land without fees.

If user fees are implemented, a portion should go to the local communities for fire, ambulance and rescue services of which most are volunteer services.

Have a fee per head each trip to boat the Upper Missouri River. Keep the $6.00/night fee at Kipp campground and Coal Ban campground.

The BLM should not impose fees on visitors. Public land should be open to the public without fees.

Charge a public user fee to cover the expense of search and rescue, fire protection, ambulance, etc.

User fees should be charged to float the river.

Recommend a user fee for noxious weed control, prevention, and education for people who purchase a permit to float the Missouri River within the Monument boundary. If predictions of increased recreational participants over the next three years a accurate, a $2.00 fee earmarked specifically for noxious weed use could be significant. The BLM could transfer noxious wee revenues to counties along the Missouri float section or use the monies directly through their budget for noxious weed activiti

2257

Converting roads to mountain bike trails would be good, but no ATVs please. Provide parking at trail heads and use signs an natural barriers to keep vehicles out of the trail area.

Create a trail system for hikers and horseback riders.

Create a good foot-trail system that offers some opportunities for loops and transits of the Monument.

Forest Service standard for width of a trail's tread vary according to the type of recreational use. Hiking 12"-24". Mountain bi and pack saddle 18"-24". ORV have 48"-60".

The main use of the Monument will come from use of the Missouri River traffic, and there will need to be some control of foot traffic along the river. This is a highly-erodable environment and over use of foot traffic will soon have its effect on erosion. I not saying that foot travel should be eliminated but it should be watched, and after a time might need some control in a few places.

I believe a double loop trail should be designated/developed for hikers and horses (goats, etc.) with water available to water t livestock at the trailhead. [See comment for drawing of 6-mile and 12-mile loops.]

No construction of new trails due to possibility of erosion and spread of weeds.

Need trails for mountain bikes.

Open some trails for mountain bikes.

Should a portion of Monument be managed for mountain bike use? If so, such an area should be outside Monument.

Some existing trails (Eye of Needle/Hole in the Wall) are washing badly. Public then pioneers new route around.

Some trails may require some type of preparation in order to avoid erosion.

Walking along the river, connect Lewis and Clark Trail with other trails, consider loop.

Hiking and horse trails (the traditional uses) should prevail.

Foot trails should be considered as an appropriate means of access to sites where birds and mammals can be observed with placing impact on them or on their habitat.

Some trails from the roads and a few more primitive campsites would be nice.

I would like to see trails available to horse and foot traffic only.

Create a non-motorized trail system for foot and horse travel by converting some of the two-track ways to non-motorized trails and close all others.

Establish a trail system for hikers, horses and nonmotorized bikes.

Create hiking and biking trails. Encourage float use. Create specific access sites to river.

A trail system for foot, mountain bike and horse travel should be developed.

Maintain or develop existing trails for new horse, hike, and pedal use.

We recommend the creation of a non-motorized trail system. Some of the old motorized trail can be converted to non-motorized. The Nez Perce Trail would be worthy of consideration for development of a non-motorized trail.

Would love to see a walk trail (Lewis and Clark walking trail on all or some of the Monument).

No new or developed trails because of erosion and weed dispersal.

No construction of trails for bicycles, hiking, horseback riding that could lead to erosion or spread of weeds.

Mountain bike trails -- maybe at least one trail on north, one on south.

Horseback riding and hiking trails might be okay.

Being an avid mountain biker I could see where this activity would thrive with this site. This activity has exploded in recent years. I have peddled many miles in the Little Rockies and along the river. I have read articles in national magazines of bike trips in the CMR. Kellogg, Idaho is a prime example (Hiawatha Trail). If some trails were designated bikes only, there should people "traveling" to the Monument to ride knowing that they won't have to compete with motorized units. (I have taken ATV trails and do not mind sharing.) If rules and regulations were laid out with caution signs and rest areas (shaded tables?) and loops were mapped you'd do just fine. Pick up a copy of Mountain Bike Action and look at some of the rides they print.

2300

I want to urge you to protect the Missouri River Breaks Monument as a pristine wilderness area with as few roads as possible and no motorized vehicles whatsoever.

Curtail and restrict any kind of motorized use (motor boat, PWC, ATV, hovercraft, aircraft, etc.) within the Monument.

Our few remaining wild lands, especially those designated as monuments, should be kept free of noisy motorized vehicles.

Maintain the quiet, unroaded, nonmotorized status that it enjoyed a century ago.

There should be no sightseeing flights, no roads, no trails.

Let's not try to modernize the Missouri River Breaks Monument. Allowing motorized watercraft and opening air strips will chie benefit a few affluent people.

We are completely opposed to the presence of motorized vehicles in this Monument; more specifically, jet skis, jet boats, tou aircraft overflights, and use of off-road vehicles.

Protect the unique serenity and wild nature of the river corridor by prohibiting motorized travel on the water and within river corridor. I realize there may be exceptions for emergencies and other official travel.

Access and transportation should be the same - no change.

Preserving the Monument, free from motorized boats, helicopters, airplanes, and off-road recreation vehicles will be a pricele and precious gift to future generations of Americans.

Minimize, and to the greatest extent possible, eliminate the use of motorized vehicles within the area. In this regard, I would prohibition of any motor-driven boats on the river, the restriction of motor-driven land vehicles to official vehicles, and then on the extent necessary to perform maintenance of developed campsites.

Most visitation up to this point has been by river, not overland -- which has not only been in keeping with the Monument's hist but has also contributed to its preservation. Any management plan should encourage this pattern to continue and especially guard against unnecessary roads and off-road traffic.

Any Wilderness Study Areas or remote area should stay undeveloped with vehicles prohibited including motorized boat traffic that part of the Missouri River.

Maintain its non-motorized character.

It is imperative to "freeze" expansion of motorized access. Make a baseline survey of routes, designate the established, planned, high use roads, and close, obliterate, and rehabilitate the many new two and single track routes.

Allow motorized vehicles only on existing roads in order to prevent further deterioration of the land in that area.

Prohibit motorized vehicles including aircraft and boats, jet skis, etc. on this section to maintain the serenity that is naturally th

As you plan for the future of the Missouri River breaks National Monument, please give careful consideration to the amount o motorized travel that will be permitted in the Monument.

This last stretch of the most scenic and wild character of the Missouri River needs full protection from man and his machines. The greatest threat to removing the wild character are ATVs and 4-wheel drives, motors on boats over 5 HP, and aircraft.

Protect the quiet of the Missouri River Breaks. Keep it non-motorized.

We do not believe that land or water vehicles typified by noise and high speed are consistent with the atmosphere and management theme of the Monument. There are plenty of other areas where this type of vehicle can be used.

The habitats of the wildlife must be preserved, and the wildlife must not be disturbed by off-road motor vehicles nor by motorboats on the Missouri.

Establish the Monument as a refuge from motorized use, or to limit motorized use to relatively small areas, thus allowing extensive zones free from boat and ORV noise.

No roads, motorized land or water crafts, or airstrips.

Draft a plan that keeps motorboats, jet skis, off-road vehicles and heavy commercial use off of and away from the river and o of the skies overhead.

Regarding a management plan for the Monument, I want to go on record as favoring minimal motorized use and access in tha area.

The strongest possible protections to the Monument in regard to limiting motorized recreation.

The Monument's quiet and views won't be offended by any motorized watercraft, I implore; nor aircraft; nor ORVs.

I would like to maintain or improve the wilderness character of the area as much as possible by limiting access by motorized boats, vehicles and aircraft.

Keep any motorized travel - boats, planes, ATVs, trucks, etc. to an absolute minimum in the new Missouri Breaks Monument

Snowmobile use near the river corridor should be strictly forbidden.

I urge further that the management plan ban from the Monument all other motors, from boats on the river to airplanes using existing landing strips.

Keep the planes, boats, and land vehicles out of the Monument.

Prohibit motorized intrusion into this special place - air, land, and water.

We do not need any motorized recreation on water, air or land in the Missouri breaks.

Please manage as much as possible to be non-motorized.

Motorized recreation and access has no place and should be excluded within the boundary.

Jet boats, skis, aircraft, endless roads have no place there.

Limit roads, two-tracks, motorized watercraft, aircraft and other noise makers.

Establish a reasonable balance with respect to the use of motorized vehicles/boats, etc.

Keep any mechanical device that makes loud noise, pollutes the water or stinks out of most of the area.

I believe that the entire Monument should be designated non-motorized except for the roads and trails (minimal) needed for minimal access, ranching, maintenance, etc. These motorized roads should be marked with signs. Also hire a full-time signmaker to be replacing these signs as they are vandalized and stolen.

Please do not allow any motorized vehicles (on land or water) or development in this rugged landscape.

Motorized vehicles, specifically off-road vehicles, are causing problems not only with noise but with disruption of the terrain.

Develop an alternative for managing the Monument that prohibits motorized use - on the water, in the air, and on the land.

Please use your influence to see that the Monument is managed as non-motorized.

What I recall there to be a shortage of are areas that preserve the natural habitat and wildlife for people to enjoy without the damaging effects of recreational motorized vehicles. When developing strategies for management of an area such as this, I f you need to consider what is already available to people before trying to accommodate everyone's wishes.

Please do not allow increased motorized land or river traffic or new aircraft strips.

We are particularly concerned about the possible increased use of motorized vehicles on the unroaded areas and unrestricte use of motors within the Monument. In our view, this can easily degrade the wilderness characteristics of the Monument. Wi the increased publicity surrounding the Lewis and Clark activities, we can see the possibility of much damage by uncontrolled use of dirt bikes and other types of off-road vehicles. The ultimate adverse impacts of such activities on the wildlife populatio plant communities and archeological sites is a foregone conclusion.

These lands and waters must be a sanctuary from the noise, destruction, and pollution caused by off-road vehicles such as ATV's and snowmobiles and PWC's or other motorized watercrafts.

I like the idea of being able to get out into a contiguous area of river and surroundings with no roads or motor vehicle disturbance. Please consider keeping this area off limits to anything with a motor.

No outboard motors or mechanized vehicles, no motorcycles, jet skis, four wheelers or three-wheel vehicles of any kind; and mechanized trails, no snowmobiles and no motorbikes of any kind.

The Missouri River national monument segment should be a non-motorized area. This includes boats and airplanes.

Please don't give in to pressure from off-road enthusiasts, boaters and joy-riding pilots.

Let's nix the motors. They have no place in a national monument. By land, by air, by sea, they are invading everywhere.

Allow mountain bikes, game carts, no ATVs.

Are bikes considered a mechanized vehicle?

Changing technologies and increased sales can change character of the area, place with no motorized use.

Concern about ATV use (damage); area outside river pretty much controlled by private (access roads across private to public

Disallow all motorized vehicle use on the land and in the river.

The natural sounds of the Monument must be preserved by limiting Monument overflights and motorized recreation on the Missouri River. The draft EIS should describe how the BLM plans to address overflights and motorized recreation on the Missouri River. Additionally, the draft EIS should identify what the desired condition is for natural sounds and solitude within t Monument.

I am a wilderness fan, canoer and kayaker that would appreciate not having any air traffic, additional roads or motorized wate traffic on this wondrous place. And please close the unauthorized, user-created two-tracks that are already there in order to save the wildlife and halt the spread of noxious weeds.

There should be no sightseeing flights, no roads, no trails.

Let's eliminate all motorized vehicles, planes, ATVs, boats from the whole area.

Please limit to a minimum the impact of motorized vehicles, noise and the like. Please allow hiking, canoeing, and low impac activities.

I urge you to take active measures to prohibit motorized recreation within the territory of the Monument, including personal watercraft on the river, off-road vehicles of all kinds, and the re-opening of airfields within the Monument.

Remove all motorized users from the entire Monument including the 148 miles of the river within the Monument.

I ask that your management plan include features to prevent fragmentation of the wilderness with roads, exclude ATV use, clo unauthorized airstrips to allow them to revert to their natural state and keep the Monument's portion of the Missouri River free from motorized travel.

Aren't bicycles a mechanized vehicle? Concern about game carts being precluded.

I would prefer complete solitude in the monument and that would also mean limiting snowmobile use during the winter month

The area also needs to be open to both motorized and non-motorized usage--both on the land and the river. Canoe users sh not be granted special privileges. Access should be open to al people and should also include airplane use (you will not be restricting military low level exercises which has gone on for sixty years or commercial over flights). This area is too interwov with private ranching operations which historically and regularly use airplanes in their normal business practices.

We would like to see the back country stay non-motorized so we can have places to hike that are still serene and quiet.

It is not a place for scenic overflights, more roads, jet skis or jet boats.

Motorized users cry "Multiple Use" but the truth is that their use prevails when areas are left open to all uses. The only way to have real multiple use is to designate certain areas for motorized recreation and other areas off limits.

Manage this section as non-motorized to preserve the solitude.

Set limits on vehicles of all kinds and small/large aircraft.

2310

Allow long unused airstrips to go back to natural state.

The aviation community desires that the long-existing airstrips on BLM within the Monument be kept open for public use for th purposes of recreation, search and rescue, emergency landings and other uses for the public's benefit. The continued use of these airstrips will result in minimal disturbance to the land and wildlife, no cost to the BLM, and provide dispersed access to lands in the Monument.

All the airstrips should remain open. They provide good access for search and rescue for aircraft emergency landings and perhaps wildfire control. Access roads are not wanted nor needed to these strips. The MPA will maintain them and I believe have a pretty good record of showing our respect for these airstrips.

Airstrips should not be in Monument, should be in gateway communities.

Quiet skies.

I think the need for airstrips on BLM public land is only for a very small portion of the public and is inconsistent with the conce of the Monument as a primitive place that should be preserved.

Do not allow airstrips in the Monument.

No private or commercial airstrips should be constructed or permitted in the Monument.

Recreational and commercial aircraft usage should be prohibited.

Close the airstrips in the Monument.

Limit motorized aircraft to airstrips outside the Monument.

Quiet skies should be the rule. Direct aircraft to the many developed airstrips in communities near the Monument. Complete work on the once closed back country airstrips.

No airstrips.

We would encourage managers to prohibit the opening of recreational airstrips within the Monument.

The long-closed back country air strip should remain closed and should be allowed to be reclaimed by a natural process.

Close airstrips, both active ones and "informal" ones.

The BLM should close the airstrips at the Monument.

The same can be said of low flying aircraft and airstrips (should be banned).

Support our established local communities and their airstrips and close the breaks airports and overflights.

Prohibit use of any back country airstrips.

Do not re-open or construct airstrips within the national Monument. The Monument was designated to protect historical and natural values, and it represents a small fraction of eastern Montana where visitors can experience quiet skies. There are several available airstrips in the communities around the Monument.

Since land disturbance has already been created when these airstrips were first established, no new disturbances will be needed for the continued use of these small acreages. There are no previously recorded historic or archeological sites within the present airstrips. (See the attached document from the State Historic and Preservation Office, pages 34-36). Furthermor there are no known plants or animal species of special concern in the vicinity of the airstrips. (See the attached document fro the Montana Natural Heritage Program, pages 37 and 38). There are no known leks within five miles of an airstrip. There are no prairie dog towns in this area of the Monument. There are no bald eagle nests anywhere near the airstrips.

Direct air traffic to developed air strips.

All of the airstrips, if maintained in a casual manner using only hand tools, are usable by the average pilot with a suitable aircraft. They all have clear approaches and are aligned with the prevailing wind. Their surfaces are fairly smooth and even, with no stones or rocks on the runway surface. The gentle gradients are acceptable for safe landing and takeoff. The airstrip are not readily visible from the ground unless you are standing on the runway. Thus, there is virtually no visual degradation o the surrounding natural rangelands.

Airstrips in the monument--I think not.

Other uses of the Airstrips: (1) Emergency landing sites near the Missouri River, which is an existing and natural corridor for pilots flying across Montana; (2) Law enforcement officials and federal, state and local agencies can find these airstrips usefu for fire management efforts, support of ground personnel in crime investigation, Border Patrol activities, and search and rescu (3) These airstrips can prove useful to the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks during their ongoing management the wildlife in the Monument, as directed by the Monument proclamation; (4) The use of aircraft to access this area can provid for a unique experience for people with physical handicaps.

Assure the ten (10) existing unimproved airstrips sited on BLM land within the Monument be included in the RMP for the Monument, designated 1/17/01.

Code the airstrips with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) designators for listing in/on all FAA aviation charts, aeronautica information publications and databases.

Insure continued pilot accessibility for both general and emergency use.

(1) Airstrips are a compatible use in the Monument under the BLM's multiple use mandate. Interior Secretary Gale Norton stresses their importance by saying: "… ensure that legitimate uses of backcountry airstrips are protected;" (2) Continued use the airstrips is of a public benefit; (3) Continued use of the airstrips will not cause environmental degradation; (4) There would no cost to the BLM for maintenance; (5) There would be no liability concerns.

Support of continued public use of the ten airstrips located on BLM land within the Monument.

Close all airstrips on the Monument.

Agreements can be reached between the aviation community and the BLM to perform the needed casual maintenance work o the airstrips using only hand tools.

I agree on the "Quiet Skies" concept.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument. Instead, encourage aircraft to land in existing airstrips at gateway communities, which will economically benefit local airports and communities.

Airstrips have no business there.

In managing the breaks, it would be helpful to establish an aviation policy similar to the Frank Church Wilderness Area in Idah With a lot of the area roadless, it would provide access via aircraft.

Ban recreational airstrips.

Airstrips should be prohibited as well as low flying planes and helicopters.

Allow existing airstrips to remain with minimal maintenance, except as provided by the pilot community and Montana Departm of Aeronautics.

Limit airstrips to currently designated primitive strips.

Any airstrip activity should be directed to the surrounding communities rather than allowing airstrips within the Monument.

There is no need to allow aircraft landing in the Monument; no old airstrips need be reopened. The character of the Monume will certainly be ruined by individuals being allowed to joy ride into the Monument, at the exclusion of others who enjoy the solitude of the area.

Prohibit the use of airstrips within the Monument because commercial fixed wing and helicopter scenic overflights over the Monument would intrude on the primitive character of the region or compromise the natural soundscape and recreational experience of Monument visitors.

No airstrips.

Do away with unauthorized airstrips that can only be used by those who have access to an aircraft.

Any landing strips within the Monument should be closed.

[The Montana Pilots Association] would like to see 6 of these [airstrips] left available for recreational flying purposes. The association is willing to keep up these airstrips at no expense to the public.

I think to maintain the quiet and unspoiled nature of the monument the airstrips should be closed. People can fly into the surrounding communities if they like or maybe an airstrip established out side the monument but I don't believe the integrity o unspoiled, undeveloped and natural environment can be maintained if the airstrips are allowed.

Close the airstrips in the monument and allow nature to complete its work in reclaiming those sites.

Prohibit landing strips in the Monument.

The long-closed backcountry airstrips must remain closed.

Keep airstrips open. Road access not needed or desired. Maintenance done by pilot organizations volunteers. If hunting violations by air are valid, close subject airstrip(s) during hunting season. Note: It is unlawful to fly and hunt the same day. I also unlawful to use aircraft radios for hunting.

Allow access to existing airstrips.

The existing airstrips provide firefighting access to the Monument and should remain open for single engine air-tanker aircraft Since the airstrips are accessible by road support services for the tankers, such as fuel, can be trucked to the sites.

Allow natural restoration processes to complete their work on long-closed backcountry airstrips in the monument. Protect the Missouri Breaks as a rare place where quiet skies are the rule. Direct aircraft to the many developed airstrips in communities near the monument.

Don't open airstrips in the Monument; keep the skies quiet.

Prohibit the use of airstrips in the Monument.

Airstrips are not needed. They endanger the wildlife and impact noxious weed growth. Also, very dangerous area for aircraft it is a low flying zone for the armed forces.

Allow aircraft access to the airstrips in the Monument to provide for opportunities for those persons with disabilities or those unable to withstand a long vehicle journey to experience the remote locations of the Monument.

Do restrict airstrips in the Monument.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument.

If there is an airstrip keep it useable.

Close and restore any existing airstrips and prohibit future development of airstrips within the Monument boundaries. Direct a air traffic, commercial and private, to existing or new airstrips in surrounding gateway communities where their existence can contribute to local economic development.

Maintain existing airstrips within the Monument for diverse recreation opportunities, emergency services. Not all airstrips nee road access. Limit road densities. Aircraft provide effective and efficient way to manage natural resources, livestock, wildlife

etc. Aircraft cause minimum impact on the landscape, therefore an effective alternative to access the Monument.

No recreational airstrips in backcountry.

Maintain all the existing airstrips for public use.

The BLM must keep closed all backcountry airstrips within the Monument.

Prohibit all aircraft.

Disallow aircraft landings in the Monument, allowing any places where aircraft have used before to naturally return to the nativ state.

I caught word of some nearby airstrips in this area. I support closing these.

The preservation of the natural stillness, serenity and quiet, so that the songs of birds and the calls of beasts may be heard b the visitor - not drowned out by the roar of aircraft motors.

Airstrips should be kept out of the Monument. Opening them will only put more pressure on a very limited resource, introduci more motors, more noise, and more development, to the detriment of the Monument and a majority of people who use it and enjoy it for its current natural values.

I know I would prefer to have no noise pollution from the sky and I think the best way to accomplish this would be to establish no fly zone or a minimum flight height along the river in the area of the monument.

The BLM should not allow private or commercial airstrips in the Monument and should immediately close those for which ther has been no prior BLM approval. BLM should fine those responsible for any development or improvement of areas that have been so used.

Close all airstrips on Monument land.

I urge you and your Bureau to support the continued and maintained existence of current airstrips and the creation of new on where the need for such landing areas is presented.

Limit human impacts by not allowing any airstrips within the Monument's borders.

Close all airstrips on the Monument.

The airstrips can stay closed.

One other issue I became aware of was the proposal to open airstrips in the Monument. I am opposed to this idea.

No airstrips within the Monument. They can use local airstrips from nearby towns, which will help their economy.

BLM should also close the airstrips in the Monument and allow nature to complete its work in reclaiming those sites.

A single airport with least potential impact should be selected for best management with least impact. I don't believe pilots ne broad access to recreate in all areas of the monument.

We oppose the creation of any airstrip within the Monument. Such a facility is contrary to the purpose and values of the Monument and is unnecessary. Air traffic can use already existing facilities to the benefit of those local communities.

Primitive airstrips should be allowed.

2500 registered aircraft in Montana and 4000 registered pilots.

Add the airstrips to the transportation map (inventoried).

Airplanes should not be landing in the Monument; military planes use area.

Airstrips – what about emergency services?

Airstrips being used/maintained not open to the public.

Airstrips maintained by someone with liability insurance; only used by the few/most public limited. Airstrips are only for specia interest.

Airstrips no different than user-created roads. Should allow existing ones.

Airstrips should be located at gateway communities.

Airstrips should be maintained for emergency use.

All airfields on public land should be part of travel plan.

BLM's regulations and guidelines call for designation of which roads are open and closed. This would follow for airstrips. Th airstrips seem to be very similar because they are there and have been used for a very long time. BLM must make a decision about whether the use should continue.

Disagree, no basis to close area to airplanes. Permittees use plans for livestock monitoring.

Do not keep the airstrips open if they are not authorized. The few individuals now using the airstrips could turn into hundreds like in the Grand Canyon.

Does any road built in the Monument have authorization? The airstrips have historical use (for sixty years) and should remai open and in use.

Don't want airstrips upgraded. Military noise greater than private pilot use. Airstrips can provide emergency aid to injured people. Aircraft noise not continuous. Only loud for short time at takeoff.

Eliminate all airstrips.

Flying aircraft in and out of the Monument is no more of a historical use than driving on a ridge. The NEPA process should b followed. Request that prior to August 30 BLM visit and document each landing strip to determine whether it is or is not in continuous use.

Flying is no more a "recognized" use as many other existing uses. Needs to be subjected to NEPA. Inventory strips so know which ones are used.

How many airstrips in Monument?

Is there current authorization for the airstrips? If someone is putting an improvement on public lands, they should have a per to do so.

Issue of airstrips being authorized. Have been there since 1950s.

Issue of authorization not really important, as many roads also exist that are not authorized.

Landing in the Monument is dangerous at the runways.

Liability issue – all pilots have lots of training (medical and in the air); they carry insurance.

Maybe pilots should get a permit to land at these strips.

Most airstrips primitive and not used. - Documentation for authorization reviewed. - If not used for a significant time start the NEPA process.

Need airstrips for emergency purposes.

Not all airfields are needed.

Now is the time to inventory the airstrips, set a formal process to insure that the next President doesn't change something. Once the airstrips are documented and authorized, it will protect their future use. It would be good to have a user permit to regulate the number of pilots using the strips each year. Put the procedures in this document so it can't get out of control.

Only 15-20 seconds of noise when taking off.

Pilot Association work with BLM and maintains these airstrips.

Pilots could maintain the airstrips; State Aeronautics funds maintenance.

Planning process should decide if airstrips are maintained.

Private organization should not maintain. Specific changes should be conducted by federal agency.

Re liability associated with airstrips: Is it any more libelous to be driving on a road in the Monument and run off the road beca there was no guardrail? Liability is not an issue. Drivers are issued license for several years with one test, no physical. Stric requirements for pilots.

Reason for airstrips – emergency services.

Should be no airstrips unless authorized.

Should have airstrips outside Monument, like gateway communities. Also concern about flights in and out of airstrips.

Strips should be authorized – liability issue.

The airstrips are no different than any other roads you drive on in the Monument. These are primitive strips and would not wo for jets. Not for run-of-the-mill aircraft.

The airstrips must be under special use permits. There are some serious liability issues if they are not authorized.

The biggest noise issue is from military flights. Use of the airstrips is an existing use and are important for emergency service Must be able to get seriously injured people out of the area.

There are 6 airstrips that average 1400-2000 feet in length. The six runways that have been there but have minimal use shou be allowed to continue.

There is a strip within the Monument that doesn't have public access but has been well used and maintained for private use.

There should be no airstrips unless it is a product of a formal authorization process which is subject to the NEPA process.

These strips are grandfathered. Add up the total feet of airstrips and compare to the miles of roads.

What is liability of cow/wildlife being struck by airplane?

Do not allow airstrips within Monument boundaries (can develop outside boundaries on BLM property).

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument. I'm visualizing the future landscape and realize that aircraft landing in the Monument (othe than true emergency landings) would disrupt the solitude, beauty and wildlife in the Monument. Hunting has been popular in Monument for years and airplanes are not necessary for this sport. There is plenty of access for hunters, hikers and firefighters. Landing aircraft at surrounding local airports supports those communities and is close enough for access.

Airplanes can land at the maintained airstrips in the gateway communities. There should be no landing strips maintained in th Monument.

Do not allow planes to build or open landing strips.

All airstrips (10) in Monument are currently being maintained by private pilots. They must be kept open for the following reasons: 1. access by people with zero impact; 2. airstrips cost BLM $0.00 to maintain; 3. gives a forward fire base. Each airstrip should also have vehicle access to aid in maintenance.

No airstrip use (any old airstrips can be allowed to revegetate).

Limit motor boats on the Missouri River and the use of airstrips in the Monument to preserve the natural quiet and wilderness experience.

Air strips cannot be allowed in the back country.

Inventory existing air strips and their frequency of use. Phase out this intrusion over a reasonable length of time.

There are several abandoned and/or unauthorized airstrips on BLM lands in the Monument. These should be restored to the

natural condition. They are inconsistent with the purposes of the Monument. Aircraft users should be encouraged to use airstrips at the gateway communities.

No airstrips in the Monument, there are plenty of existing airports in the region. Quiet skies are rare these days.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument. There are plenty of airstrips in "gateway" communities (which would benefit from such traf anyway). Restoring old airstrips within the Monument violates the purpose for creating the Monument in the first place. Thes airstrips are not needed by recreational users (they were originally created for oil and gas development, not recreation, anywa Air travel is not necessary for reaching the Monument. Small planes zooming overhead will not contribute to a "wilderness experience."

Direct aircraft to already developed strips in the communities near the Monument.

To provide landing strips in the Monument would violate the spirit of what the RAC expressed.

Airstrips should not be used in the Monument. Aircraft should use existing airstrips in nearby towns thus supporting those communities.

Retain this quiet place by also restricting aircraft to the developed airstrips in proximity to nearby communities.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument. Encourage aircraft to utilize airstrips in gateway communities. It'll be good for local economies.

No development of air strips or airport runways.

Do not allow any airstrips in the Monument proper. Restrict all recreational landings to gateway communities outside the Monument.

Some question allowing aircraft in the Monument due to liability issues for BLM. The Montana Pilots Association has the following comment. 1) First, there is liability on all uses in the area; 2) the State of Montana has a statute called "recreation u liability" which limits such liability; 3) pilots carry major liability insurance; and 4) what recreational use requires a higher stand of training than pilots. We must have biannual flight reviews to FAA standards.

Obviously, any attempts to open up any of the nearby primitive strips must be resisted. I believe any airstrips within 5 miles o the Monument boundary which are not now approved for use by the FAA should maintain that designation and thus be useab only in case of emergency.

Having the remote airstrips available during firefighting activities is prudent. The airstrips are already there and with maintenance carried out by Montana Pilot Association members, the BLM would have a valuable firefighting resource availab

Prohibit the use of airstrips within the Monument because commercial fixed-wing and helicopter scenic overflights over the Monument would intrude on the primitive character of the region or compromise the natural soundscape and recreational experience of Monument visitors.

Maintain these airstrips in the minimal impact fashion that they have existed in the past.

Do not open airstrips in the Monument. It would be better to direct plane traffic to existing airstrips in surrounding communitie

No private aircraft.

Please ensure that the quiet of this area is not broken by private planes. Do NOT open airstrips in the Monument, instead, planes should land in surrounding communities.

Reasonable access is already available by established roads, and airstrips would only add to the noise and confusion from which we visit wild and scenic rivers to escape.

Keep the existing airstrips open.

No airstrips in Monument.

Continue to use the existing airstrips in the Monument.

All ten airstrips should remain open. Road access to the airstrips is unnecessary.

Airstrip maintenance could be accomplished by enlisting the Montana Pilot Association similar to the way that the Forest Serv does with Benchmark and Shaefers Meadows.

The number of airstrips should be limited.

I would like to see all existing airstrips remain open to unlimited public use and maintained by private individuals on a volunta basis at no expense to the public. Improvements should be limited to creating a safe aircraft operational environment. Appearance would remain as it has been since the original construction took place in the 1950s or 1960s. Weed manageme could be handled on a volunteer basis also.

Landing strips have no legitimate administrative purpose and should be prohibited in the Monument.

Maintain the six primitive airstrips in the Monument.

Prohibit the use of airstrips in the Monument.

Let's keep the existing airstrips available to the flying public. I do not foresee a need to have access to the strips by road. Recent maintenance has been successfully accomplished by volunteers flying in, doing maintenance, and flying out.

We must not have the presence of aircraft.

BLM should prohibit the use of airstrips within the Monument other than two that have been in continuous use. All others sho be declared closed and prohibited.

If any use of airstrips within the Monument is allowed the use of those airstrips for the purpose of hunting big game should be specifically prohibited (interagency cooperative action with FWP).

Close all airstrips.

Prohibit use of airstrips in the Monument.

Low flying aircraft and airstrips are inappropriate and should be prohibited in the Monument.

If people truly want a back country experience it cannot be possible if airstrips are allowed to be built and used in this same backcountry.

Access to airstrips in gateway communities is readily available, and these communities will benefit economically from the use developed airstrips outside the Monument boundaries. Furthermore, because air traffic would introduce excessive noise and disruption (as well as potentially cost-prohibitive maintenance and liability on the part of the BLM), use of any airstrips (all currently unauthorized and unplanned) within the Monument should be prohibited.

Airstrips should be prohibited in the Monument. Air traffic should be directed to existing airstrips in surrounding communities.

Prohibit airfields.

Please forbid the development of any air plane landing strips in the Monument.

BLM must keep closed all backcountry airstrips.

Airstrips are prohibits.

Aircraft access to this area is unnecessary.

We are writing to urge you to adopt a management plan that excludes so-called recreational or backcountry airstrips from the Monument. To allow these exclusive recreational "club houses" in areas such as the Bullwhacker and Cow Creek would grea diminish the character of the Monument that the Proclamation intended to preserve.

Prohibit backcountry airstrips.

As you are well aware, it is impossible to endorse a particular project prior to full evaluation of all aspects of its design and potential impacts. As time goes on, it is suspected that FWP will be called upon for views regarding these and other potentia impacts on fish and wildlife resources in the Breaks. However, it is believed that the members of the Montana Pilots Associa who are working with you and your staff regarding aviation in the National Monument boundaries are attempting to do so in a constructive, and measured and hopefully ultimately, productive fashion.

Use the airstrips and airports in the communities. No airstrips in the Monument.

The landing strips should not be ignored. It seems that there is significant public liability of the BLM were to ignore this issue Also, if the BLM authorizes continued use, the administrative and liability issues are substantial.

The fundamental question is the appropriateness of this use in the Monument. We suggest that the use is not appropriate within the Monument. We have no objection if alternative sites for landing strips are found outside the Monument. We also believe that gateway communities offer good landing opportunities.

The BLM should also close the airstrips in the Monument and reclaim those sites to native vegetation.

No aircraft.

Airstrips would be restricted in the Monument. If we have to have any they would be designated and primitive. Not really desirable and certainly not needed. Management must address standards for the number and level of any airstrip in the Monument. If not controlled it could become the negative force that snowmobiles are in Yellowstone.

Allow natural restoration to complete their work on long-closed backcountry airstrips in the Monument.

Prohibit use of airstrips in the Monument.

Long-closed backcountry airstrips should be permanently abandoned.

Continue the restoration process on the long closed airstrips in the Monument.

Keep airstrips closed.

We don't need airstrips that will allow disturbance and easy access. Allowing air access will destroy the character of the Monument. Forbid it.

No airstrips should be allowed within the Monument boundaries.

No airstrips located anywhere within the Monument.

Airstrips and low flying aircraft should be prohibited, they are inappropriate here.

Keep the number of airstrips that exist in the Monument to provide for a diversity of visitor experience. Will allow access for emergency services (fire fighting, search & rescue). Will allow access for recreation opportunities.

Close all airstrips.

Prohibit use of airstrips.

No air strips in the Monument.

There are many airstrips situated on public lands that are open to the public for access to recreational opportunities. These airstrips are located in national parks, national monuments, wild and scenic river corridors, wilderness areas and national recreation areas.

Airstrip development conflicts with all the cultural and historical values of the Breaks.

Airstrips should be prohibited in the monument.

Keep 10 airstrips in the Monument open for public use.

Prohibition of all airstrips and commercial scenic overflights.

Prohibit recreational airstrips in the Monument. Encourage airplanes to use airstrips in nearby communities.

Keep quiet skies by using existing airstrips, instead of opening new airstrips.

Prohibit the use of airstrips within the Monument.

Prohibit overflights, buzzing, and landing by aircraft within the entire Monument.

BLM should also close the airstrips in the Monument and allow nature to complete its work in reclaiming those sites.

The airstrips need to be closed on Monument land.

Limit or prohibit airplane flights into this area or over this area.

No air strips.

Consider closing the airstrips in this area.

Airstrips should be banned.

Airfields existing should be allowed to be overgrown and obliterated.

Do not open the airstrips located within the Monument.

Forbid opening private airstrips in the Monument altogether to maintain the quiet beauty of the Monument.

Aircraft should use airstrips in nearby communities with no new landing strips constructed within the Monument.

No airstrips should be allowed within the relatively small area protected within the Monument.

No airstrips or scenic overflights.

Close all airstrips within the Monument.

Prohibit use of aircraft landing strips adjacent to the corridor or within the Monument. The BLM should seek to restore the natural environment on areas previously used for aircraft landing.

No airstrips should be permitted in the Monument.

Consider permanent closure of any actual or imagined airstrips on public lands within the monument.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument. Instead, encourage aircraft to land in existing airstrips in gateway communities, which will benefit local airports and communities.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument and direct existing airstrips in surrounding communities.

Prohibit airstrips in the Monument, and direct air traffic to existing airstrips in surrounding communities.

No airstrips should be opened. There are airstrips in gateway communities and these should be utilized. This will bring reven to these communities, provide access to pilots, and prevent excessive noise and disruption in the Monument.

Airstrips should be located outside of the Monument.

Airstrips are to be only in the surrounding communities which exist presently.

Close all of the make-shift airstrips.

The airstrips located within the Monument need to remain closed.

BLM should also close the airstrips in the Monument and allow nature to complete its work in reclaiming those sites.

The current primitive air strips need to be included in a management plan.

Close all airstrips on Monument land.

No airstrips.

Prohibit the use of airstrips in the Monument.

Prohibit airstrips.

The use of airstrips within the Monument should be prohibited.

The aviation community (MPA) want to keep all the airstrips open in the Monument at no cost or expense to the BLM. We wi maintain the airstrips. We also need vehicle unrestricted access to the airstrips.

Immediately eliminate all physical evidence of the approximate ten (10) or more illegal and avowed legal aircraft landing/takeo airfields throughout the entire Monument.

2311

The impact of overflights should be regulated by a designation of special airspace, similar to that of the Grand Canyon. Pilots not need to fly at low altitudes in order to enjoy the splendor of the Breaks, and don't need to fly in all areas.

Ranchers need to make overflights at various altitudes as part of their normal management practices. They especially need t locate cattle that have strayed to the river bottom during the "hot season."

Restrict flyovers to 1000' above surface (keep the Air Force from buzzing the river).

Commercial fixed wing aircraft and helicopter overflights should be regulated so that their noise and presence does not intrud on the primitive character of the region or on the natural soundscape.

The RAC did address commercial low level recreational flights over the area. We asked that these be banned as not compat with the area.

Regulate or prohibit overflights that disturb the visitors in the Monument.

It is also important to minimize low-elevation overflights to help preserve the primitive nature of the landscape and provide a quality experience for visitors.

Prohibit air travel over the Monument to whatever extent possible.

Height restriction for aircraft flying over except emergency.

Given the lack of any settlement within the Monument area, the FAA regulations provide that there is no minimum altitude requirement for overflight.

Helicopter overflights should not be allowed.

No need to allow commercial scenic overflights.

Tour over flights not be allowed.

Tell Air Force to monitor their flyovers more stringently.

Overflights of the Monument should be very restricted, and prohibited in the Wild and Scenic region.

Since the Federal Aviation Administration and National Defense Agencies regulate the nation's airspace, the Monument plan should not address any aircraft overflight issues.

BLM should limit commercial scenic overflights.

Routine law enforcement, search and rescue operations, wildlife management and other activities for the benefit of the public should not have to deal with any overflight restrictions.

Limit the number of airplane flights over the area.

Air commerce is important to Montana. Any overflight restrictions over the Monument would hinder intrastate commerce.

Prohibit commercial scenic overflights.

I believe that the airspace above the Monument should remain open to pilots of planes and helicopters so that those who are handicapped or unable to endure long days of travel can see it by air.

Sightseeing overflights should be strictly limited.

Insist on no low-flying aircraft (floor of 10,000 ft over and within 5 miles of the Monument seems minimal to me).

Prohibit scenic flights over the Monument.

The Monument is 149 miles in length from east to west. In the event of low cloud ceilings or other adverse weather, a flight in north-south direction could be hampered. Safety of flight is of primary concern and should not be negatively influenced by an overflight restrictions.

No air flights over the area.

Before it becomes a problem, prohibit commercial scenic overflights.

Prohibit all commercial scenic overflights.

Quiet skies.

Prohibit overflights.

All river corridor flights should be prohibited.

The BLM should also request a minimum ceiling flight height of 1000' above ground level of the FAA to ensure no scenic fligh and "buzzing" of the area within the Monument.

The BLM should make recommendations to the Federal Aviation Authority to restrict private, commercial, and military overflig in the Monument. These recommendations should emphasize eliminating air travel in the Monument.

Planes could make as much disturbance as a boom box.

Adopt regulations to ensure that Monument character and qualities are unaffected by commercial operations. Such regulation may include banning scenic overflights as a policy to insure that Monument wilderness and primitive qualities are maintained

Prohibit low-flying aircraft.

Ban scenic overflights as a policy to ensure that Monument wilderness and primitive qualities are maintained.

The agency should prohibit any future commercial scenic overflights.

Limited sightseeing flights.

Prohibit commercial scenic overflights before they can become the almost intractable problem they are in such national treasures as Hawaii Volcanoes NP and Grand Canyon NP. Protecting the airspace of the Missouri Breaks NM will reduce environmental and social impacts as well as making it one of the rare places in the American west where skies are not noisy day.

Prohibit all commercial scenic overflights.

I am concerned that tour overflights not be allowed.

Fewer planes in area. Use not a problem.

Planes are a problem during hunting season – hunters flying and hunting immediately (MDFWP).

Need planes for livestock maintenance. More regulations only complicate layers of management.

State law very specific about flying/hunting.

Flying does not impact antiquities.

Air Guard flying in Monument. How will that be managed?

Have been flying checking cows and felt that there should be no restriction.

Light airplanes keep high altitude because of military flights.

Minimum flight for aircraft.

Noise issue of aircraft brought up.

Overflight restriction (2000) would (could) be a safety concern.

Put minimum levels along the river.

Take all appropriate and effective steps to eliminate the possibility of sight-seeing overflights.

Please keep commercial sightseeing flights out of the monument.

Do not allow scenic overflights.

No over flights by any planes should be allowed.

Overflights of the area should also be restricted for similar reasons.

Prohibit all commercial scenic overflights.

All flights over the monument by commercial tourist operations should be prohibited.

Oppose any overflight restrictions.

No overhead air traffic (i.e. helicopters, floatplanes or parasailing and skydiving).

Commercial fixed wing and helicopter scenic overflights over the Monument shall not intrude on the primitive character of the region or compromise the natural soundscape and recreational experience of Monument visitors. Regulations shall be adopt to ensure that Monument character and qualities are unaffected by commercial operations, and such regulations may include banning scenic overflights as a policy.

Prohibit commercial scenic overflights.

Prohibit all scenic overflights.

Commercial fixed wing and helicopter scenic overflights over the Monument should be prohibited.

Commercial overflights should at the very least be minimized or prohibited before they start.

Overflights, such as the scenic tours which plague many of our national parks, be disallowed.

No overflights.

No airplane or helicopter overflights for scenic viewing.

With irregular boundary lines and 80,000 acres of private land, neighboring landowners must not be restricted from the Monument airspace.

Off limits to overflights.

The BLM should make recommendations to the Federal Aviation Authority to restrict private, commercial, and military overflig in the Monument. These recommendations should emphasize eliminating air travel in the Monument.

2320

If road numbers must be reduced, utilize these for hiking, non-motorized vehicles.

Please provide a policy of roads closed unless designated open. Keep all vehicles (ATVs, dirt bikes, OHVs etc.) on establish roads and manage this area as non-motorized.

Close roads that threaten cultural, historical, archaeological features (e.g. tepee rings, buffalo jumps, Kid Curry site). Prohibit excavation or removal of petrified wood, fossils (e.g. dinosaur digs).

Manage a minimum road system to key public access points.

Prohibit new roads on the Monument.

Limit human impacts by limiting motorized vehicles to established roads, closing user-created roads.

Access roads should be planned for efficiency instead of allowing them to proliferate haphazardly. One road servicing 4 wells better than 4 roads servicing 4 wells. Roads create a lot of dust and soil compaction that affect air quality, water percolation, aesthetic values.

ATVs should have their trails also.

I think access roads need to be left open for sight seeing of this (white rocks) area for people who would like to drive to or tak tour bus trips to the area.

No new roads. Close the Gist Road at Bullwhacker overlook. It was built in 1947 for ranch access. No reason for it to be op now.

Limit the number of roads, only the most essential number.

Create a low impact road system that transports visitors only to key public access points.

Have less access for four wheelers. Leave access for ranchers on leases or limited use of four wheelers. Hunting on 4 wheelers be banned.

Plan roads and trails for all types of users. Handicapped persons may need motors, others should be able to access an area foot, horse or mountain bike without the noise and danger of fast moving vehicles.

Only existing, legal routes should be recognized as part of the transportation plan. All other routes should be closed unless designated open by criteria determining an administrative use. Any motorized route shall not impair wildlife habitat, sensitive sites nor the integrity of the proclamation of the Monument.

Keep motorized vehicles only on established roads.

There should be no new construction of roads down to the river.

There needs to be overlooks for people who would like to see the area.

No use of motor vehicles to retrieve game.

BLM should approach the subject of defining the resource road system from the starting point of : "All roads are closed unles designated open." Regardless of whether any roads are actually closed this process will discipline the RMP to open roads on where a real need exists. Seasonal closures to prevent wildlife conflicts and terrain damages should be additionally imposed coordinate with FWP.

I do not support the growing mechanization / motorized and habitat fragmentation. Please close many of the roads in the Monument.

The BLM must clearly and completely close all lands within the Monument boundaries to all forms of energy resources exploration or development.

Motorized vehicles restricted to designated roads only. Restore and rehabilitate old roads no longer needed.

The BLM must not allow recreational off-road motorized vehicle use to damage the river or stream banks, or the soils and riparian habitat.

Provide for a Monument transportation system that relies on science to determine road retention and closure, and the protect of natural and historic resources. Many roads must be closed and the landscape restored. All user-created routes must be closed and restored. There are too many roads in the Monument today and too little management of motorized use. The planning should include solid provisions for monitoring and enforcement.

Due to the rugged nature of Monument land, general maintenance like what is being done should take care of transportation years to come.

The Monument must be protected from the illegal use of these off-road vehicles. If I had anything to do with the use of off-roa vehicles, I would ban them entirely from the Monument. However, in the spirit of compromise, I can agree to allow their use o designated roads.

I am against closing roads in the Monument area. I would like to see the BLM set a mileage average per section which would include some two-track roads. This would be an average per area, example Bullwhacker area. Since most of the sections do have roads the number of miles per section wouldn't be great (5 to 10 miles per section).

I believe current road closures to public access should continue.

No new roads. Close roads that are highly erodable or hazardous.

My main concern is that the regulation confining ATVs to existing roads be strictly enforced. I realize in a vast area like the Monument this will be hard to accomplish, but with extensive education, signs, and some stiff fines for violators, perhaps the message will get through.

Limit the roads in the Monument to established routes and close those routes created by users to retain the backcountry peac and quiet. Some double track routes could be changed to non-motorized trails.

No new roads. Close roads that are highly erodable or roads that serve no purpose.

Close roads that lead to cherry stemming.

No new roads would be necessary.

Limited roads.

The present roads should remain open and accessible.

Collector and resource roads should be considered closed unless designated open and clearly signed.

Disallow any off-road vehicles within the Monument.

No off-road vehicular, OHV, motorcycle, or mountain bike travel.

If pickups can't go, no ATVs then either. Roads should have some maintenance. No special constructed bike roads.

To require horses and such is stopping those who would use it the most.

No speed bumps.

Leave existing roads open. Maintain current public access. Do some maintenance on roads as needed. Also signs as need

Will BLM look at RS 2477 rights-of-way when decisions are made to keep open or close a road?

Prohibit ORVs on undeveloped land.

No motorized 4 wheelers or motorcycles either cross country or on user-created "rut roads."

The Monument should consider a special rule during the big game hunting season to allow motor travel on designated 2-track for game retrieval during the hours of 10 a.m. - 2 p.m. (see State block management).

Roads must remain open for fire suppression.

Only existing legal routes should be part of the potential transportation plan and all other routes should be closed unless designated open for administrative purposes.

To control noxious weeds, motorized vehicle use should be prohibited on two-tracks. Vehicle use should be limited to develo and maintained roads. Knapweed plants often are caught on the undercarriage of recreation vehicles and spread for hundred of miles.

Vehicle access to range improvements must be restricted to ag uses and not for outfitted hunting.

Road access should never, ever interfere with plants and animals and their needs. No ATVs or jet skis to ever be allowed wit the Monument area.

All ORVs need to be kept on designated, existing, improved roads. There needs to be active enforcement of this. User-creat routes need to be closed to prevent fragmentation of habitat and to preserve backcountry solitude. Some two-tracks could be converted to hiking trails.

A minimum road system for visitors; roads that are closed unless designated and signed open; motorized vehicles (including bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs) kept out.

What is the liability in the event that an aircraft or motorized vehicle hits livestock or wild game? Reimbursement for damage

If a route is closed to motor vehicle traffic, it should be closed to all motorized or mechanized vehicles.

I've heard comments on creating ATV or bicycle trails. These are not allowed but certainly horse or hiking trails would be a g use for converted "resource roads."

Keep the area a wild experience with a minimum of motorized vehicles.

Close roads where there is increasing cherry stemming and roads that are highly erodable or hazardous.

Overlooks should be for cars. Put fee box by it.

Maintain all BLM roads.

What is going to happen with gas tax roads in the Monument? If they are closed will BLM compensate the counties for lost funds?

We must limit motorized vehicle use to bladed roads. Currently existing two-track ways must be converted to single track trai for foot, horse, or mountain bike (human powered) use.

We would like the option of being able to go in to repair and maintain the existing and old roads so as to be able to fight fires, in case of accidents rescue could be made more easily.

Restore unneeded roads to natural condition.

Define what definition of a road is.

No road closures without public comment or hearing.

Protect this unique landscape by limiting the number of roads to those established routes that provide reasonable access with destroying solitude.

All existing roads open.

Nonessential roads should be turned into hiking/non-motor trails. Opportunities for solitude should be emphasized by limiting ORVs to bladed/graveled roads; roads should not go beyond ridge tops. The Gist Road should terminate where the warning sign is displayed.

No jeeps, 4-wheelers, trail bikes, RV parks. Keep roads to the absolute minimum.

Convert 2-tracks to non-motorized trails.

Analyze the impact of current road system on wildlife.

Improve signage on scenic back country road leading into Two Calf Creek so unprepared drivers are aware of road condition Very spotty.

I totally agree with the ban on roads and preserve the back country solitude.

There is an access via private road through a wheat field and goes on to a huge flat open space, 20 miles from Big Sandy on gravel road. Big enough for a wedding with 150 people.

The region I am most familiar with is Bullwhacker and Cow Creek drainages. I would like to see the main roads and some of longer two-tracks stay open to public use year round.

Close and rehabilitate many if not all two-tracks where other roads are available. Limit "spider-web" aspect of roads (like on oil/gas maps - small tracks proliferate).

Until we know what roads/trail county/state will assert claim to and keep open under RS2477, why are we asking people now what roads they want opened/closed? Also, the key element that must be considered is what is the impact on the objects of antiquity.

Review every two-track road. Be selective about how many will be open. Close those that have negative impact on wildlife a vegetation.

I believe that the BLM should designate a minimal motorized and mechanized vehicle transportation network restricting vehic of all types to designated roads within the Monument to protect Monument objects and natural environment(s).

Close and rehabilitate roads where needed and user-created roads to prevent erosion and the spread of noxious weeds.

Restrict access on routes that are only used for private or administrative access.

There should be a minimum of roads and no motorized recreational vehicles on any part of our public wilderness lands. No SUVs, ATVs, PWC, aircraft, or "tours" using same. (The above vehicles have a use for emergencies but very little else.)

What kind of protection will the rancher be given in the case of certain road closures so that he may still tend to his livestock?

Limit ORV use to a few roads and trails.

No new roads. Maintain the existing trails as they are. No improvements on trails. Trails are for motorized vehicles.

Roads should be closed where necessary to protect the resource. BLM also can employ seasonal road closures as is curren done in State Block Management Areas.

Eliminate all recreational use of ATVs.

Restrict road use, creation and motorized vehicle access.

The Monument should employ a game retrieval road privilege during the hunting season to allow use of 2-tracks between 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Put signs on open roads.

Restrict motorized and mechanized vehicles to designated roads within the Monument, and restore illegal user-created road either foot trails or a natural condition.

Minimum number of roads.

BLM should consider transferring spur/ghost or what the BLM calls "resource roads" into a coordinated trail system for hiking biking (mountain) and horse use.

We oppose the closure of any existing roads in the monument area.

No new roads. Close roads where erosion is out of control, and where they become hazardous, and where "cherry-stemming out of control.

Do not allow ATVs and four-wheel vehicles off roads established for accessing trails or the rivers.

Make it easier for the rancher to check livestock.

Maintain roads.

No new access roads. Use and improve existing roads. Limit further erosion of access roads.

The maintaining of the main roads is a necessity because of the impact of more traveling. More travel causes more destructi Addressing the road issue when they are muddy.

I believe that the Gist Road should not be closed. It is the main road in that area. If you use it you should be sure of the wea

All unestablished routes in the Monument should be closed, and severe fines imposed for continued use, and jail time for mo user-created routes.

Roads on the Knox Ranch are incomplete and need to be added to.

Close the 2 way tracks through the area meaning no motor vehicles.

Keep main roads open. Some secondary roads should be left open for permittees and landowners. Would like roads such a the one going into the Hagadone Bottom be left open to be maintained.

I don't think that any roads should be closed in the Monument area.

Designate motor vehicle travel and maintain designated roads as BLM public access roads. Do not develop any new roads. Convert many existing trails and roads to hiking, biking and horse use.

Close all user-created two-tracks and restore to a natural condition or convert to horse, foot bike trails.

"Two-track" roads or trails should be closed to motorized vehicles. Trails can be converted into biking or hiking trails. Roads that can be maintained should remain open to vehicle use. Other roads close unless absolutely necessary for livestock or ga well maintenance. No off-road motorized vehicles should be allowed except on designated open roads.

Roads need to be left as is.

Current roads should be left alone as well as trails. No off-road travel by any type vehicle. The trails in the breaks now are st 2-or 3 miles from the next one. The worst thing that happened is when the Cow Island Trail was improved.

The BLM should be required to maintain and gravel the roads within the Monument. The Monument area south of Chinook would be an excellent area for a wildlife viewing scenic byway.

Limit the number of open roads in the area to those that provide access to the rest of the Monument by foot, horseback and n motorized watercraft.

Keep motorized access to a minimum and on designated roads only. I would reclaim user-created roads.

No limit to weeded roads. No restriction to open roads.

Close roads where erosion occurs. Close roads where cherry stemming is out of control. Close roads that have no legitimate purpose. Clarify "low-impact."

In the Bullwhacker, close the road to the Gist Ranch at the ridge overlooking the Missouri River and create a trailhead. This i logical destination point, because the road beyond the ridge is signed dangerous and subject to continual erosion.

Prevent further development and new roads.

There seem to be a number of additional roads popping up along the river corridor. These need to be limited.

Limit roads to established ones that provide straightforward access.

Limit motorized use to a few number of established roads that provide general access to the Monument without crisscrossing the landscape with two-tracks & ATV routes.

The BLM should designate a minimum transportation network.

Recommend leaving all roads open for game retrieval.

We are opposed to road closures of any kind during the big game hunting season. This will allow the hunting pressure to be spread more evenly throughout the Monument. Signage on outside boundary roads (all) within Monument concerning OHV u

prohibition off trail in Monument.

Limit the number of roads to established routes. Close all user-created roads and trails.

Include greatly minimizing road mileage, and keep all ORVs strictly confined to maintained trails.

All existing roads should be managed as to impact to the landscape.

Some areas should never be accessible by motorized vehicles. The Wilderness Area concept has great value and this idea should not be restricted to rugged and remote areas. Roadless areas within the Monument add another dimension to the recreational opportunities of this area.

Non-system roads that originate on private lands should be closed during the hunting season.

Close user-created routes and only allow reasonable access routes.

No roads should be closed. Access should be granted to all.

Motor vehicles must be limited to maintained roads and prohibited from 2-tracks and user-created routes.

Cease any new recreational road creation and start healing the old roads. Eliminate all motorized recreational vehicles.

Limit vehicles to existing maintained roads only. These constructed roads are numerous enough. The rough terrain takes ca of erasing unused roads so those should be allowed to renaturalize.

I suggest creating a designated tourist scenic motor route somewhere in the Monument that will provide a two-to-four hour vis experience of the breaks to tourists who will not be around for extended use of the Monument. A model would be the Slipper Ann motor route operated by the CMR Refuge.

Roads are so extensive in the Monument they overrun the basic qualities of the open, remote and undeveloped character for which the Monument was designated. The BLM should create a minimal transportation system designed to prevent damage the Monument resources and wildlife habitat. All other routes should be designated closed to public motorized use with the understanding that they can be used for emergency administrative use or a valid right of way. No new roads or motorized tra should be constructed or permitted.

Full protection to the natural and historical values of the river and adjacent lands can only occur if the number of roads into th Monument are limited. Existing roads provide adequate access and maintain the timeless quality of the Missouri River corrid

Where motorized vehicles are to be used be certain they are only used on designated roads: close and rehabilitate roads wh needed to protect wildlife habitat and prevent introduction of noxious weeds and to prevent erosion; restore to the natural condition or convert to foot trails all user-created roads and unofficial ways.

No more roads and no road improvements.

Severely limit roads.

Inventory all roads in boundaries. No new road building.

No new roads.

A road system is required to access the vast area but should be restricted to a minimum and not the spider web of trails and roads now existing.

Limitation on the number of roads.

Roads created after January 17, 2001 (Monument Proclamation date) should automatically be closed.

BLM provide the only access routes, minimum road system. Close trails presently cut through the area.

Two-track motorways, established by illegal use, must be closed to prevent exotic plant invasions, fragmentation of wildlife habitat, and loss of the opportunity for contemplative recreation.

Honor the motorized use/non-motorized use pattern agreed to when the wild & scenic was set up.

Close all two-track ways to motorized vehicles.

Limit motorized use to established marked trails thus protecting habitat from fragmentation and erosion while still allowing peo the use of their land.

No dirt bikes. No 4-wheelers or ATVs.

Close the two-track routes that have been established in the breaks, and prohibit motorized watercraft and air strips.

All main traffic roads should be maintained to prevent fires before fire season.

On the ground, motorized traffic must be restricted to the system roads only. User-created roads and tracks must be designated as illegal. I have seen the spread of noxious weeds, especially knapweed, within the public lands and even along actual river banks. I have seen the erosion resulting from user-made motor trails.

Prohibit driving vehicles more than 50 feet off of a designated road to set up a camp.

Roads should be closed seasonally to protect wildlife. Speed limits should be posted and patrolled.

Roads that travel along ridgelines, through erosive soils, and crucial wildlife habitat areas should be closed or rerouted. Road densities should be reduced to protect visual and sound values. Signs should identify authorized use.

Provide access to range improvements on existing roads except in WSAs.

Prohibit all motorized vehicle use off-road, except for emergency and administrative use by BLM and affiliated agencies, yearlong.

Close all two-track trails to motorized use except those that can be legitimately justified to remain open. Signs should be pos only for those that are "open." All others are to be considered closed and allowed to reclaim naturally.

A minimum number of strategically located, existing roads can be used effectively for emergency access.

Authorized roads should be minimized, especially in the Monument, for reasons of resource preservation mostly.

The Monument has too many existing roads. A travel plan or revised travel plan is needed.

FWP suggests something modeled after our (BLM & FWP) very popular and successful Chain Butte/East Indian Butte Block Management Areas. Over time the BLM and FWP have manipulated the road system to improve the distribution of elk (durin the hunting season), improve the age diversity in mule deer populations and limit seasonal impacts to the land while improvin hunting recreation.

FWP would like you to reconsider the BLM's pre-Monument plans to upgrade the Middle Two Calf Crossing Road. This area immediately west of the CMR National Refuge. It has good timber cover and is developing into a prime wintering area for wildlife. An upgraded road will impact big game security and may fragment the habitat. The existing Knox Ridge Road shoul serve those who would like to visit the Breaks during the winter months.

Road closures under the concept of equitable access would affect all parties in the same way. It is also a way to ensure that Monument belongs to all of the people not just to those who can afford to hire an outfitter.

If a road is open for motorized or mechanized travel it must be open for all. There should be no trails or two tracks for just AT or ORVs.

All roads should be considered closed unless designated open. Every road should be evaluated before opening. The criteria that are used to evaluate roads must be spelled out in detail.

The issue of roads will be one of the most contentious issues you will be facing and it will require that the management team face the reality that they are not going to please everyone. It will require you to make tough decisions. I feel that your first concern should be the protection of the landscape and the objects within.

Close and restore all unplanned roads and trails.

Ensure public access to special natural and historic sites in ways that do not compromise their natural or historic integrity.

Implement a "closed unless signed open" policy for off-highway vehicles. OHV recreation should be restricted to designated routes that are posted and clearly marked on BLM recreation maps.

Strictly enforce OHV restrictions.

Manage all Wilderness Study Areas to protect their wilderness qualities until Congress decides on their final status. Motorize access, except for government emergency vehicles, should not be allowed in Wilderness Study Areas.

Create a minimal transportation system in order to prevent damage to the historical, cultural and natural resources of the area

New roads or motorized trails have no place in the Monument and should be banned.

I also believe that motorized use be limited to established major roads. Please discourage use of trails and two-tracks in orde protect the wild nature of the landscape and minimize the introduction of weeds.

Close all two-tracks. Discussions about which vehicle routes should remain open should center on which vehicle routes are genuinely needed. Instead of asking the public to cite the name of every two-track way which should be closed to vehicle use the burden should be on those who want to keep two-tracks open to justify their existence and need.

Close unauthorized roads and trails. Mark the ones that are authorized. Police it.

A basic network of roads to access the area is essential but a proliferation of two-tracks that may have developed on every rid and draw is not in keeping with preserving the quality of the area for a variety of uses.

A minimum amount of intrusion by any kind of motorized vehicles.

We need all of the present roads and trails in the Monument. We haul our cattle out there in June and back out in October.

Only authorized roads should remain open for motor traffic. Routes should be closed unless designated open for a legitimate administrative purpose. Open routes should be determined by considering whether administration of the Monument requires road or whether the road is necessary access to private land. No user-created trail or old 2 tracks which were used for gas exploration are administratively necessary, and the two tracks that do nothing more than go to an abandoned well should be closed. The reason for having them in the first place is gone.

Noisy vehicles on the land should not be allowed, I think. There are other parks and areas for that type of recreation. A few roads to key public access places may be necessary.

All roads should remain open including tracks/trails for maintenance, fire control, etc. Closures could be seasonal, controlled a group directly affected (BLM and locals affected).

Limit the number of roads to established routes that provide limited access, and keep unnecessary off-road vehicles out of BL lands to preserve back country solitude. Where appropriate, convert two tracks to nonmotorized trails.

Closing two-track roads will prevent habitat fragmentation, the displacement of wildlife, will preserve backcountry quiet and solitude, and help control the spread of noxious weeds.

All two-tracks and "roads" should be closed to motorized vehicle use unless designated open.

Where vehicle access is needed to commercial sites such as a natural gas well or a stock tank, it should be defined in the permits allowing such use.

Close all two-track vehicle routes in the six Wilderness Study Areas.

In the Bullwhacker, close the road to the Gist Homestead at the ridge overlooking the Missouri River and create a trailhead. T is a logical destination point because the section of road beyond the ridge is signed as dangerous, being steep and subject to continual erosion and possible sloughing. Ending the road at this location would also prevent motorized travel to the river and enable BLM to honor the intent of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and designation.

Motorized access should continue only on existing authorized roads. Unauthorized two-tracks should be closed to protect habitat for wildlife and the primitive experience of visitors.

There should be no ATV or motorcycle routes.

Keeping motorized vehicles off non-roaded land is a big factor in this equation.

Numerous unplanned roads and two-track trails have developed on Monument lands. These bring vehicles, ATVs, and motorcycles which disturb wildlife and fragment their habitat, create noise for people for miles around, and place historic sites and geological features at risk. BLM must aggressively close roads and two-track trails, take steps to ensure they remain closed, and address unauthorized motorized use.

And no off road or established trails travel by 4 wheelers or the like except for emergency services. I do feel some areas sho be made accessible for seniors and the handicapped because peaceful places should not be available to only the young and very fit.

Manage remote areas to maintain their undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry character.

Keep motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles, and ATVs, on established roads.

Institute a monument-wide policy of roads that are "closed unless designated and signed open" and restore all other user-

created routes.

I urge you to ensure that it is managed as non-motorized. A minimum road system that carries visitors to key public access points is far more appropriate for such a treasured area than the sprawling network of off-road, unplanned routes currently be created.

I support keeping existing roads open for access, unless certain two tracks really should be closed. But certainly no more ne roads, and no off road use.

Please preserve as much of the Monument as possible by minimizing roads.

To do this all unplanned roads and trails should be closed and lands restored to their natural state. A policy of "closed unless designated and signed open" should be applied, and all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs should be allowed only on designated roads.

Instead of broad access, there should be a focus on the best management of a single access route that provides good opportunities for the ATV user without more widespread impact on nonmotorized river recreationists.

There should be no increased access or road building and under no circumstances any consideration of leasing should take place.

The BLM must stop the spread of user-created routes within the monument. Roads policies must be that roads are closed unless designated and signed as open. All motorized vehicles--especially dirt bikes, and ATVs--must use only these officially open roads.

The most important thing to preserve the monument at this time has to be to eliminate cross country travel (in other words th monument should be all be "closed unless signed as open"), and try to minimize the number of open roads. In all remaining undeveloped public land, the more unroaded and most natural areas should be clustered together in core areas that are large enough to be usable chunks of wildlife habitat.

Create a minimal transportation system that protects wildlife and the ecosystem.

Please close unneeded access ways: this will ultimately make your enforcement/safety team's jobs much easier. On this wh issue of closures, I agree with environmental groups that roads and trails should only be open when there is a good purpose need; otherwise the patterns of erosion and expansion and increased maintenance and surveillance continue to the detrimen other staff priorities. And please keep those ATVs limited.

Roads must remain open unless things get out of hand.

Any travel plan should prohibit interference with Sage Grouse on Spring leks, bighorn lambing areas and elk calving areas.

The transportation system should be based on the natural and historic values and scenery. Any roadways not already design should be closed.

As far as land use, I believe there should be no motorized vehicles off of minimal roads as well as the banning of mechanized mountain type bicycles.

Very few roads. No off-road travel.

Road systems should be kept to a minimum in order to prevent traffic from interfering with the wildlife, and please let us not commercialize the place.

Use existing roads and terminate many of the existing rails.

Allow "man-made" trails from dirt bikes and off road vehicles to be restored and limit the creation of any more. While hikers sometimes do their share of off-trail destruction, birding and hiking are especially unpleasant and sometimes impossible with bikers and vehicles around.

No new roads or trails should be constructed in the Monument. Use on current roads should be kept to a minimum and any roads not needed for administration should be closed and rehabilitated.

Be most cautious of the environment as you plan and install any roads.

Off road vehicles should be kept on designated roads. ATV's, dirt bikes etc. create a large and growing disturbance to the landscape that increasingly impacts vegetation and wildlife. The extent of the problem makes this means of access one that needs tight management.

Create a policy that creates a minimal road system to carry visitors to key public access points. Refurbish and restore unauthorized roads and trails to their original natural state. Set up a system of road and trail closure and use only under authorized conditions. Induce heavy fines to insure that dirt bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs follow the rules and stay on

authorized trails and roads as designated by you.

Set up a system to guarantee access to the less fortunate of us, the physically disabled and handicapped so they might enjoy the beauty also.

Last, but not least make the major points accessible for the elderly.

Keep motorized vehicles off it and minimize roads.

Both motorized and non-motorized vehicles should be allowed on both the river and the land.

Manage the Wilderness Study Areas as roadless and undeveloped, just like they were wilderness areas. Monitor and enforce grazing standards, possible encroachment by vehicles, (ATVs, 4-wheel drives, etc.) and any other activities that would degrad the roadless character.

The BLM should ensure that designated roads avoid big sagebrush habitat and that fences and power liens in these areas ar minimized.

A road system should provide public access to key sites without damaging the qualities that draw visitors to the Monument. T do this, the BLM will need to close roads within the Monument to improve fragmented wildlife habitat and halt the spread of noxious weeds. All unplanned roads and trails should be closed and restored to their natural state. Additionally, a policy of "closed unless designated and signed open" should be applied within the Monument, and all motorized vehicles, including dir bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs should be allowed only on designated roads.

As described in the State Directors Interim Guidance for managing the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument (Jun 2001), MWF believes "cross-country closure does not apply to non-motorized game carts used during a legal hunting season

Game Retrieval - Motorized vehicles may not be used for game retrieval off of designated roads. The BLM in collaboration wi the Monument Interagency Wildlife Management Council (see III, A., (1)) should review the options of a game retrieval progra of hourly and seasonal road closures to regulate hunters during the three-month archery and firearm big game hunting seaso and regulate the effect of hunter vehicular activity on wildlife vulnerability. (Any road or opportunity for retrieval must first com with IV, B., and IV,B., (1), above).

There should be no net increase in road mileage, any new roads or rerouting must be offset by the elimination of other roads. (i.e., if any new route is established for human safety or for biological concerns, the designated road mileage within the Monument should not increase).

Any user created routes to the Wilderness Study Areas should be closed, reclaimed and not considered for inclusion in the transportation plan. MWF believes all roads within the Monument that are within 1.5 miles of Sage Grouse "leks" should be closed or considered for limited, seasonal entry only.

Dispersed camping roads should be included in the analysis of the transportation plan.

The “resource” road system on the Monument should be the product of a management decision-making process that begins a zero with all resource roads declared closed to motorized use unless designated (identified) open.

Any component of the transportation plan must accommodate the full range of State of Montana approved, street legal vehicl and should not have special allowances for specific motorized vehicles: i.e., ATV routes, motorcycles, etc. (Any designated ro must be capable of travel by full size motorized vehicles and not approved to accommodate any specialized vehicle).

Designated public right-of-way roads that provide the only access to state sections within the Monument should be left open unless designated closed for specific management, biological or resource protective reasons.

All roads that originate on private lands are currently informal, undesignated roads (the exception being the road to the Wallin property); these roads should be considered closed unless designated open for specific uses. Roads that originate on private land, and then extend onto the Monument, with no public access should be closed regardless of other considerations.

Dispersed camping where a motor vehicle is present should be confined to within 100 feet of a designated system road with vehicles parked no more than 50 feet from the edge of the road.

The BLM should limit motorized travel in the Monument to the minimum amount of designated roads possible. These roads should be selected based on the protection of Monument resources, including the lack of noise pollution.

The BLM should minimize designated roads in the area of known historical sites so as not to make such sites a destination fo visitors and thereby increase their vulnerability to vandalism and degradation.

The BLM should minimize designated roads in the area of known sites of geological value so as not to make such sites a destination for visitors and thereby increase their vulnerability to vandalism and degradation.

The BLM should prohibit driving vehicles off of designated roads to set up campsites. Motor vehicles should be parked within feet of a designated road and campers would walk to their campsites.

The BLM should identify areas of high archaeological potential and should not allow motorized access to them.

It is imperative that the BLM minimize designated roads in the vicinity of known or potential archaeological sites so as not to make such sites a destination for visitors, and thereby increase their vulnerability to vandalism and degradation.

All roads in WSAs not in existence in 1976 should be closed immediately.

The BLM should prohibit roads in areas of high erosion potential.

Designated motorized vehicle routes in sheep habitat should be prohibited.

Closures should be enacted in sensitive winter range and lambing areas for bighorn sheep.

Monument lands east of the Judith River, especially those in the Bullwhacker and the land across the river to the south of the Bullwhacker (Woodhawk area, etc.) should have a minimum of roads.

Minimize roads in big game habitat.

The Missouri Breaks Monument should be managed with a minimum of roads. No new roads should be established, some roadways should be closed and seeded or restricted to specified users.

The importance of a "closed unless designated open" signing policy. There have been numerous documented instances, particularly on the north side of the river, where signs have been vandalized and closures violated. A closed unless designat open policy removes incentive to destroy signs and makes enforcement much easier.

All roads and trails within the monument are closed unless designated open by a stakeholder process.

ORVs must stay on open roads. Mechanized vehicles, including bikes, motorbikes, and ORVs, are prohibited from going off road by the Proclamation.

Prohibit driving vehicles more than 50 feet off of a designated road to set up a camp.

This means that the current travel policies for the other 7/5 million acres of BLM-managed land in Montana should not be app to the Monument.

All trends indicate that visitation and traffic within the Monument will increase significantly in the coming years. The Monume planning team cannot rely on current traffic levels as a valid measure of the appropriateness of the future transportation plan.

The BLM should close certain roads and, rather than creating new trails, convert some existing roads into trails suitable for traditional, non-motorized and non-mechanized uses.

Manage Monument lands east of Stafford Ferry similar to a wilderness area in regard to transportation and associated huntin access roads.

Protecting human health and safety. As more people visit the Monument more accidents must be expected. There are numerous roads in the Monument that are dangerous. The narrowness, steepness, and unpredictable condition of these roa should preclude their use as public roads. In the past, if a road has been deemed unsafe the solution has been to upgrade it condition. But today, blading, widening, and resurfacing are not supposed to occur until a transportation plan is in place to gu protection of the Monument. Thus, both for public safety and protection of resources, the BLM should close unsafe roads rat than continuing piecemeal upgrades.

Designated roads must avoid existing and potential prairie dog towns, providing at least a 3 km buffer, and should not be situated in areas where they would degrade suitable habitat.

Roads and motorized trails in WSAs that were not in existence in1976 are illegal and should be closed immediately and not considered in the transportation planning.

It is critical that the planning team considers wildlife and wildlife habitat in its decisions, as any decisions made in the travel p will have broad impacts on the sustainability of the area's big game populations and the length and quality of the hunting seas for the future.

Focusing on road densities and road spatial arrangements on a landscape scale, and managing for large areas of contiguous roadless land is essential to the transportation planning for the Monument, and the BLM has a legal obligation to do so.

We offer the assistance of the TWS Center for Landscape Analysis to perform any road density and spatial arrangement analyses that the BLM would be interested in using. We can provide, free of charge, their program "RoadNet" as well as train on it. This program allows the user to evaluate which roads contribute the most to habitat fragmentation, declines in habitat security and effectiveness, by strategically removing select routes and calculating the resultant habitat improvement.

The Monument's outstanding wildlife populations and their habitat cannot be adequately protected with a transportation plan t is not based on scientific review.

The Friends urges the BLM to adopt the transportation and public access plan submitted by the Friends.

Planning for growth in non-motorized, traditional forms of recreation. Regionally and nationally, growth in non-motorized recreation has increased at a rate several orders of magnitude greater than that of motorized recreation. The Monument is currently so crisscrossed by roads and two-tracks, it cannot accommodate growth in non-motorized, traditional recreation unle BLM scales back the sprawl of the existing road network.

Keep area open to public for hunting with limited access for vehicles.

Two-tracks and user-created roads should be reclaimed and re-vegetated to a natural condition or redesigned as foot and ho trails where appropriate.

As for the existing roads, I have used them and am glad for the access points available to the river bottom and other parts of land, but would find additional road building and more all terrain vehicle use destructive in the long term.

Do not lace it with roads. Resist the tendency to allow two-track roads and trails.

Roads of any sort that begin on private land extending into pubic land should be closed. Such roads are another effort to privatize a public resource.

In the upland areas motorized use should be confined to authorized roads. All unauthorized roads and two track ways should closed and reclaimed.

Vehicular travel should be on established roads.

Allow motorized access only on existing, authorized roads. Close unauthorized two track roads to save wildlife, halt spread o noxious weeds.

There should be no motorized access for ranchers or outfitters.

Protect sage grouse, bighorn sheep, elk and deer from interference by motor vehicles.

Allow vehicles on existing roads only.

Identification of Closed Roads: Physical barriers and Reclaim naturally {Range of Management Ideas]: Physical barriers unt this process takes place.

All traditional roads and trails need to remain open since the geology of the area will designate travel and it is easy to control.

Science should be used to determine road retention and closures. We agree there must be transportation access to state lan as well as access for private landowners. In the Upper Missouri River Breaks Newsletter, it is mentioned that the BLM would allow access for authorized uses of industry and government agencies. The BLM needs to address in the draft EIS specifica what authorized uses of industry and government agencies are. Access routes for administrative purposes should be restrict for only that purpose. Current existing roads that will remain in service and current existing roads that will be closed should b identified in the draft EIS.

As part of the plan, I certainly favor allowing motorized access on existing, established roads, but not on unauthorized, user-created two track blazed trails.

Allow motorized access only on existing authorized roads and this doesn't mean user-created two-tracks.

Limited access on maintained roads and abandon two-track and unauthorized roads.

All roads and trails should remain open. Public access as it is today.

ORVs are prohibited in the Monument except on designated roads. ORVs may not be used for game retrieval off of designat roads. Routes closed to motor vehicles (cars and trucks) must be closed to off-road vehicles. There cannot be improvement construction or creation of ATV or motorcycle “trails.”

Visitors will not usually see any roads, and they will hear the sounds of nature, not the sounds of motorized and mechanized vehicles.

BLM should define a transportation network that provides a minimum of road access to lands in the monument. The emphas for public access should be on visitors entering the Missouri Breaks on foot, on horseback, or by boat.

Close and obliterate roads and trails that have been created merely by the passage of vehicles, without plan nor authorization except where these form a necessary part of the transportation network. Give priority to closure of routes that are jeopardizin protection of wildlife habitat and other monument values.

Allow motorized vehicles, including ORVs, dirt bikes, and ATVs, only on those roads designated for their use.

No new roads. Encourage people to experience this unique area by the river.

Do not permit expanded road use in the breaks area. Limit our use to protect this area.

When closing unnecessary roads, keep enough of those which would be useful as fire breaks or for fire monitoring.

Restrict the Monument road system to only those roads absolutely necessary for the proper administration of the Monument. Initiating the transportation planning process with an assumption that all inventoried, existing routes are valid and that they wi remain open to motor vehicle use unless there is a reason to close them, violates the spirit of the Proclamation requiring that BLM focus on protection, not the status quo. The transportation and access plan should be initiated assuming that all roads a deemed to be closed unless designated open. No closed, restricted, seasonal or private roads should be included in the discussion regarding which existing routes should be closed and should not be included in any accounting of the number of roads closed through this planning process.

The "resource" road system on the Monument should be the product of a management decision-making process that begins zero with all resource roads declared closed unless designated open. This could be done as a three-year program with the ro not actually closed until the year has elapsed and all stakeholders have had the opportunity to make a case for keeping a roa open. Criteria for evaluating stakeholder requests for keeping a road open should be established in writing prior to start of the program.

The eventual road system shall then be drawn to meet needs of legitimate stakeholders with all unsupported roads automatic deleted from the system and closed at the end of the year.

Public right-of-way roads that provide the only access to state sections within the Monument should be left open unless designated closed for specific management reasons.

A specific definition of "road" should be established in the RMP.

All motor vehicle paths included in the Monument transportation system should be designed to accommodate all motor vehic No roads should be designated that are too narrow to accommodate all vehicles (e.g. no ATV trails or bike trails, etc.).

The Monument Interagency Wildlife Management Council should develop a program of hourly and seasonal road closures to regulate hunters during the three-month State archery and firearm big game hunting season and regulate the effect of hunter vehicular activity on wildlife vulnerability, i.e. many resource roads open during the remainder of the year should be closed fo general motor travel during the State big game season.

(Idea for interagency consideration) In coordination with the State Block management Program, BLM could allow big game hunters to use those for big game retrieval between the hours of 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. This idea is not proposed for the RMP b for future consideration as a hunter management rule after an interagency council is created to consider it.

Roads that originate on private land, and then extend onto the Monument, with no public access should be closed regardless other considerations.

Provide a limited, well planned road network to access the Monument, and please close off the many cross-country trails.

No ATV. Motorized vehicles on existing roads only.

OHV travel should be permitted during the hunting season for the purpose of retrieving downed big game.

A policy of "closed unless designated and signed open" should be applied, and all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off road vehicles and ATVs should be allowed only on designated roads.

The roads involving the monument should be severely restricted in order to protect and restore the land, wildlife, and historic sites. All unplanned roads and trails should be closed and restored to their natural state. Adopt a policy of "closed unless designated and signed open." All off-road vehicles should be banned and other vehicles should be allowed only on designate roads.

Please do what you can to keep it as wild as possible and keep gasoline motors and unnecessary vehicle traffic out of as mu area as you can.

I urge you to design a road system in the Monument that will preserve the natural landscape and the indigenous wildlife population. And please close and return all unplanned roads and trails to their natural state. Finally, please restrict all motori vehicles to designated roads only.

Close all unplanned roads and trails. Restore lands to their natural state. Zero motorized use should be tolerated on the land the air or in the waters.

Roads should be constructed using the latest in construction technology to ensure that they have as little impact on the water quality and negative visual impact as possible. However, access should be provided to as much of the park's sights as is practical so that more of it is accessible to everyone, not reserved for hikers.

Illegal roads should be rehabilitated to a natural state, and roadless lands within the park should be managed as wilderness. While jeep touring and back-country trailhead access should be provided, an emphasis should be placed on low-impact recreation such as backpacking, dayhiking, camping, horseback riding, rafting and canoeing.

Motorized recreation should be limited to a few designated jeep trails and dirt roads.

All unplanned roads and trails should be closed and lands restored to their natural state. A policy of closed unless designate and signed open should be applied, and all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs should be allowed only on designated roads.

Minimize and control the road system. The road system should provide public access to key sites without damaging the qualities that draw visitors to the Monument. Close and rehabilitate all "wildcat" roads and tracks.

BLM's policy on roads should allow access to personal land holdings within the boundary and access to range improvements and general maintenance of an allotment. Access should also include care of livestock in all areas. By limiting access based winter habitat, spring nesting areas and crucial deer habitat, virtually every road would see a closure or level of restriction. Roads should be considered open unless currently restricted and any possible future road decisions need to include communication with the affected permittee.

The total prohibition of off road vehicle use and the restriction of car travel to authorized roads.

I urge that roads be obliterated and eliminate all off-road vehicles and snow machines.

We would support the closing of all two-track ways to motorized use unless designated open for use of commercial sites such as a natural gas well or a stock tank. Such uses should be required by permit only.

Permit OHV travel during the hunting season for the purpose of retrieving downed big game.

The unroaded portions of the Monument (especially the six BLM Wilderness Study Areas and other large and scenic expanse such as the Bullwhacker area) should remain unroaded and off limits to off-road vehicles. In areas where there are roads, vehicles must be required to remain on the roads. In areas where unauthorized roads have been created, these tracks shoul be closed and returned to natural conditions. Please adopt a "closed unless designated open" policy for motorized travel. By restricting motorized use to established roads, wildlife and vegetation will be protected, weeds will not be spread, and the nat quiet will be preserved for those who venture into the Breaks.

Keep all roads open in the monument throughout the year. Most of the roads are unknown to monument visitors and are use and important to local residents.

Do not reroute roads. Let existing roads remain as they are.

Vehicle travel should be allowed to retrieve downed big game during the hunting season.

Keep existing roads open. Closure of any road should be based on a valid adverse impact to a specific object of antiquity.

Keep all roads open in the monument throughout the year. These are important roads to local residents for recreation, huntin and fire suppression. There have been no negative impacts on use of the roads in the past to the environment or wildlife. W change the rules now?

Do not reroute roads. Let existing roads remain as they are.

Vehicle travel should be allowed to retrieve downed big game during the hunting season. Impacts are negligible and hunting should not be made any harder than it is.

Vehicle travel to a campsite should be allowed within 300 feet of roads.

Roads in the monument should remain open throughout the year. Any decision to close a road should have a compelling rea and be based on the need to eliminate a substantiated threat to some object of antiquity.

Roads should be limited, but not eliminated, and trails should not be open to off-road vehicle use.

All roads, including two tracks and trails, should remain open annually. Until there is specific research by competent scientist that confirms that vehicle travel has an adverse impact on wildlife in this monument area, access to this land should remain a currently exists.

Do not reroute roads. Most of the roads have existed in this area for many years and there are no documented cases that I a aware of where vehicles have adversely impacted deer habitat areas.

Allow vehicle travel to retrieve downed big game by the most direct route during the prescribed hunting season.

There has been no negative impact from existing roads and no compelling reason to close any of them. New roads should be limited to permit gas development and to facilitate better management of the resources.

The need for seasonal road closures must be validated by credible study.

Vehicle travel to primitive campsites must be allowed up to 300 feet from the road.

Keep all roads open in the monument year round.

OHV travel should be permitted during the hunting season for the purpose of retrieving downed big game.

Keep all roads open in the monument throughout the year. Most of the roads are unknown to monument visitors and are use and important to local residents.

Do not reroute roads. Let existing roads remain as they are.

Hunting the breaks is tough and having to pack a big game animal to an authorized road is unrealistic. Vehicle travel should allowed to retrieve downed big game during the hunting season. Impacts are negligible and has been done routinely in the p without any harm to the environment.

Roads in the monument should remain open throughout the year. Any decision to close a road should have a compelling rea and be based on the need to eliminate a substantiated threat to some object of antiquity.

Keep all roads open in the monument year around. There has been no adverse impact in the past on these roads and no evidence there will be any problems in the future. Many of the roads and two tracks receive only 10-20 vehicles a year and s less than that. What's the problem with keeping them open?

Avoid building roads as much as possible.

Vehicles should be allowed on existing roads, and trail, in order for ranchers to care for their livestock.

Restrict access on routes that are only used for private or administrative access.

Roads that provide public access to key attractions should be planned and built/upgraded so as to provide access and "jump off points" while completely protecting those wilder areas from motorized vehicles of all types. This means closing lanes and gullies and stock paths and other trails to motorized use throughout most of the Monument.

Roads that are not maintained main roads should become foot and mountain bike only. No vehicles except on designated maintained roads. Leave some areas for foot traffic only. Some of us like natural areas where we have peaceful contemplati time.

“Wild” stretch of river – roads would impact designation.

Closing Gist Road: people experience solitude in different ways and access public land in different ways.

Designate an area where can ride motorized/mechanized equipment. Could/should be outside Monument.

Do not allow an area to be opened for motorized use.

Are there opportunities for 2-4 hour vehicle tour loops?

Limit roads to established routes only and close the user-created ones.

The BLM should designate a minimal transportation network in order to protect Monument objects.

All user-created roads down the spines of the breaks, with multiple pullouts added, should be eliminated.

Restore to a natural condition or convert to foot trails all user-created roads and unofficial ways.

Limit open roads to those proposed by the Friends of the Monument. All roads and two-tracks should be closed unless designated open. Close and restore all undesignated 2-track ways.

Limit the number of roads in the monument to established routes that provide reasonable access. Close user-created routes prevent fragmentation of habitat and preserve backcountry solitude. Where appropriate, convert two-tracks to non-motorized trails.

A road system should provide public access to key sites without damaging the qualities that draw visitors. All unplanned road and trails should be closed and restored to their natural state. A policy of "closed unless designated and signed open" should applied within the monument, and all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles, and ATVs should be allowed o on designated roads.

Create a minimum road system that carries visitors to key public access points.

Institute a monument-wide policy of roads that are "closed unless designated and signed open" and restore all other user-created routes.

Keep motorized vehicles (including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles, and ATVs) on established roads.

I suggest that you can have a game retrieval law that allows hunters to use the closed road for game retrieval only between certain hours of the day.

Motorized and mechanized vehicles of all types and purpose shall be restricted to designated roads within the Monument.

Transportation on land by motorized vehicles should be restricted to roads only.

Keep road building to the very minimum, allowing only those roads necessary to access key public places.

Almost completely deny access to all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs and set up a tax bre system to help private landowners develop places for outdoor rec of this nature.

Close all unplanned roads and trails.

Please do what you can to keep it as wild as possible and keep gasoline motors and unnecessary vehicle traffic out of as mu area as you can.

The same calm, relaxing atmosphere would be lost if roads were permitted. Those roads that have come about illegally shou be closed, made impassable and a heavy fine given when violated.

Carefully restrict and monitor access.

Please close and revegetate non-essential roads. Please leave in place the minimum number and mileage of roads needed provide adequate transportation access.

All unplanned roads within the monument should be closed and restored to their natural state. Off-road vehicles should be required to remain on roads designated and signed for such use, with no exceptions. In addition, the BLM must give high prio to enforcing ORV regulations.

The fragile lands within the Monument need to be protected from the scarring and erosion caused by road building (legal and illegal) and the accompanying noxious weed infestation that occurs. Many current roads and routes need to be closed and reclaimed. Motorized vehicles should be restricted to a few strategic designated and maintained roads. Some roads should converted to trails for foot traffic.

Restrict road density

Minimal roads, no ORVs or ATVs.

Another [prohibition] is the use of off-road vehicles and ATVs.

Existing roads on private property should continue to exist but travel should be restricted. ATV travel should not be allowed in the corridor except for use by ranchers and farmers and they should never be allowed to develop trails and roads in the river

corridor.

Unplanned roads should not be considered roads and instead should be closed and rehabilitated. ORV use should be restric to designated roads, as mandated by the Proclamation. This will help prevent the spread of noxious weeds, maintain areas i which solitude is possible, and protect wildlife habitat.

All motorized vehicles should be restricted to designated roads only. No motor vehicles should be allowed on trails.

I would still like to know if you can come up with a car access to the cliffs as several clubs people are interested in seeing the

Even now, there are too many roads, and far too many 2-tracks inside the monument boundary. Most of these should be clos and a carefully designed minimal mileage, minimal incursion system incorporated.

The existing roads need to stay open. Most go to water developments that need to be maintained or drift fences that need to repaired.

Some roads are used for recreational purposes like Hole in the Wall and Woodhawk and others.

Most existing two track roads in the breaks (including the WSAs) go to water developments, gas wells, fence lines and should remain open for maintenance and administrative purposes. Roads that are mainly used for recreational purposes (Hole in the Wall, Woodhawk, Lower Two Calf, etc.) should remain open for the enjoyment of everyone.

I believe the road to Woodhawk Bottom should be open year round.

Another concern of mine is that the current roads remain open. They are necessary for ranch management, fire control, hunting, game retrieval, gas wells and sightseeing.

One specific concern is the proposed conversion of the Middle Two Calf Crossing Road from a primitive trail to an all-season road, which can be expected to fragment the Woodhawk, Reed Coulee and Two Calf drainages into too many pieces that are small to provide habitat security for elk and mule deer. Given that the Middle Two Calf Crossing Road is closed by snow and during winter, application of a seasonal closure (September 1 until cattle are turned out on BLM lands in May or June) to the Middle Two Calf Crossing Road would be a very reasonable alternative.

We would support closures or seasonal restrictions to achieve: (1) improved elk distribution as a result of increased habitat security (keep elk distributed across the landscape and available to hunters during the hunting seasons); (2) improve the age structure of mule deer bucks; and (3) maximize hunting recreation while limiting impacts to the land. Examples of closures th have successfully addressed the above 3 objectives are the East Indian Butte and the Chain Buttes BMAs.

BLM and FWP have worked with landowners throughout the Monument employing our Access Montana program to provide better public access to public lands. We encourage the BLM to continue to work with these landowners with the objective of maintaining and improving public access.

Some of the primary access roads/trails that should remain open north of the river to maintain recreational access include, bu are not limited to, the 8-mile ridge road west of Judith Landing, the trail from Ragland Bench to Birch Creek to Judith Landing the Barnard Ridge Road, the Lone Tree/Ervin Ridge Road, the Lion Coulee trail(s), the Gist Ranch access trail and trail leadin across Bullwhacker Creek to Ervin Ridge, Bullwhacker Road, the Right Coulee Trail, Spencer Cow Camp Road, Squaw Cree Road, Barney Olson Road, Winter Ridge Road, Shetland Divide Road, Bull Creek Road, Power Plant Trail, and the Antelope Ridge Road.

Maintenance of adequate public access to lands within the Monument. Elk depredation on agricultural lands adjacent to the Monument has also been a chronic problem in some areas, especially along the upper portion of Bull Creek. Consequently, restricting access to these private agricultural/public land interfaces would intensify existing depredation problems attributable mule deer and elk.

It is wrong to close any of the trails into the breaks or stop motorized use of them. If you close half of them it will increase the use on the other half. Also they are all historic. Older people and people with children could not enjoy the area as it is too big You must travel far to get into areas.

Most of the two-track roads in the breaks go to a reservoir or other kind of water development. A few exist to service gas wel These roads should remain open for maintenance and administrative (BLM) purposes. Roads that are primarily used for recreation access (Woodhawk, Hole in the Wall, Lower Two Calf, etc.) should also remain open.

Prohibit motorized access to developed roads only.

Create a minimum road system leading to key access points. Institute a monument wide policy of roads that are closed unles designated and signed open and restore all other user-created routes. Keep all motorized vehicles on established roads.

I don't see why existing grazing rights should allow ranchers to drive across the land. I would restrict the use of vehicles for

them as well. Horses can get the job done without leaving unsightly two-track trails. There may be exceptions to this but I believe that most of the time vehicles are unnecessary.

Maintain a minimum road system. Motorized vehicles only on established roads.

We urge you to adopt a minimal road system and to authorize no new motor vehicles routes or sanction any user-created trai or routes. All other routes should be closed and the closures strictly enforced.

We urge BLM to hold road access inside the monument to the minimum that is necessary for protection of the monument's natural and historic values.

BLM should avoid letting old vehicle routes continue in use unless they serve a need that is identified in the management pla

I believe that the BLM should designate a minimal amount of roads for public travel and that other roads should be closed to motorized use except for emergencies. No new roads should be created, nor should there be airstrips built or allowed in the monument.

Allow motorized access only on existing roads. Close other roads.

Roads that finger off of the main arteries and wander over to ridges and overlooks should be completely closed, unless there very important reason for it to be open. Keeping all these roads open so the hunters can be more spread out and have easie access is not a good reason. Hunters can walk or ride horses. I would recommend that virtually all the finger roads going off ridge lines could be closed to motorized vehicles. Some could be kept open for a mile, for example, some could be open for to 500 yards so a camp site could be set off of the main artery. Where the road would come to an end, it could be used as a head, utilizing the rest of the existing 'road' for a hiking, horse or possibly bicycle trail. There should be absolutely no off road vehicle use, penalties and fines for violators should be stiff.

Allow motorized travel only on existing, authorized roads.

BLM administrators, fire fighters and oil and gas developers should all take a hard look at what impact they are having when driving across the land where there are no roads.

Mountain bike trails should be carefully considered because, although they are quiet, they can be abused and can become destructive as well.

Create a road system plan designed to minimize wildlife habitat fragmentation, protect cultural and historic sites, and restore wild Northern Great Plains landscape throughout the Monument. This means closing and rehabilitating the numerous unauthorized roads and user-created two-tracks to conserve viable wildlife populations, slow the spread of noxious weeds, an preserve backcountry solitude, which is so hard to find these days, especially in the Great Plains. Authorized roads should be minimized to provide public access to key sites and access points for non-motorized backcountry travel. Only allow motorize ground transportation (including ATVs, dirt bikes and off-road vehicles) on existing, authorized roads. The policy should be "closed unless designated open" to avoid confusion and misinterpretation by motorized travelers in the Monument.

I would like no new roads and some of the existing roads remediated.

Motorized access on existing roads only, close off other access to protect the land, stop the spread of noxious weeds, and preserve quiet.

Close unofficial and unplanned trails. Make roads sensitive to ecosystems, wildlife movement, and cultural/historic sites, and maintain them in a condition that minimizes the effects of traffic on the natural quiet.

I urge you to designate all parts of the monument closed to motorized travel unless designated as open. I request that roads open to motorized use only where site-specific studies indicate that wildlife habitat effectiveness is not harmed, and only whe primary monument resources, such as wildlife, historical, paleontological, and non-motorized recreation values are helped by such motorized use. I support closing all roads that do not meet these criteria.

Roads should be kept to a minimum. Trails should be outlawed to motor bikes, ORVs, etc.

Make sure all unplanned roads and trails are closed and lands restored to their natural state. A policy of "closed unless designated and signed open" should be applied, and all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs should be allowed only on designated roads.

Management plans must allow for access to hunting opportunities but provide adequate habitat security for wildlife propagatio

Travel plans should prohibit interference with sage grouse on spring leks and bighorn sheep lambing and elk calving areas.

All off-road vehicles need to be on established roads only and create a minimum road system that carries visitors to key publi access points.

Keep roads to a minimum and ATVs and such only on designated roads.

Consider limiting the number of roads in the monument to established roads that provide reasonable access, close user-crea roads to prevent fragmentation, and convert two-tracks to non-motorized trails.

Roads must be totally re-planed to be at a minimum and to provide only for a strategically panned interpretive experience to t cultural and visual sites that will enable access.

The number of roads should be limited to established routes that provide reasonable access.

Protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat is of the highest priority whether threats are from recreation or livestock grazing. Transportation management plans should protect wildlife wintering areas and prohibit interference with elk calving areas, bigh sheep lambing area and sage grouse on spring leks.

Motor vehicle traffic should be allowed only on existing, authorized roads. User-created two-tracks should be closed.

Vehicles are allowed only on authorized roads.

Limit road building to key access areas.

Keep all motorized vehicles on established, not user-created roads.

Restore user-created roads and designate "roads" as being closed unless they are signed as being open.

Motorized vehicles of all kinds should be permitted on established roads only.

Cease road construction or improvement, eliminate ATVs and other off-road vehicles.

Create only a minimum road system to carry visitors to key access view points.

No motorized off-road vehicles ATVs, and dirt bikes at all allowed anywhere in the Monument.

There should be rigorous enforcement to prevent added and close existing user created motorized roads.

I believe motorized access should be restricted to existing, authorized roads and that user-created truck, ATV, and SUV trails should be closed and heavy fines levied to those who go off road in unauthorized areas.

Allow motorized access only on existing authorized public roads. Close all unauthorized user-created two-tracks to save wild halt the spread of noxious weeds, and to preserve the solitude of the backcountry. Restore to natural condition or convert to trails all unauthorized user-created two-tracks.

The various dirt roads that meet the river need to be managed better. Some of the roads should perhaps be closed, and all o the roads should not come within a mile of the river. These roads are increasing motorized traffic which in turn is increasing degradation of the river and land through increased trash, bank erosion, and noise pollution.

The road system should provide public access to key sites without damaging the qualities that draw visitors to the Monument

The BLM should close down all non-essential roads and trails within the Monument, while creating a road system that provide public access to key sites without destroying the whole area. Vehicular access to all parts of the Monument save these publi access roads should be severely curtailed, or better, denied altogether.

Prohibit ORVs and ATVs within the entire Monument.

Closure of 2-track roads to these same remote areas.

Set up a road system that provides public access to key sites without damaging the qualities that draw visitors to the Monume

Restrict all transportation to designated roads.

Restore and protect wildlife by rehabilitating roads near sensitive wildlife habitat.

I believe limited road access to the area will help preserve this area for future generations to enjoy.

Limit roads and motorized vehicle access to well placed trail heads; close "volunteer tracks."

The BLM must not allow recreational off-road motorized vehicle use to damage the river or stream banks, or the soils and riparian habitat.

Many roads must be closed and the landscape restored. All user-created routes must be closed and restored. There are too

many roads in the Monument today and too little management of motorized use. The planning should include solid provision monitoring and enforcement, and especially for the prohibition of all off-road use.

Keep the roads to a minimum.

Emphasize nonmotorized travel within the Monument - keeping any allowed motorized vehicles to existing, improved roads.

Limit motorized vehicles to existing authorized roads.

Stay with current management that allows roads to be used by mountain bikes.

Primitive campsites within 300 feet of a road must be accessible by vehicle.

Maintain roads to a useable condition.

No off-road vehicle use.

Roads open for administrative use or right of way to private property, a valid existing gas lease, or grazing allotment, should b used solely for that purpose without impairment to the resource. Valid existing gas leases are those that were in effect on or before January 17, 2001 (Proclamation date). Administrative and private access roads should be identified and signed as restricted to all other motorized/mechanized travel. No new roads or motorized trails should be constructed.

Close existing two-track motorized trails. Establish "area closure" to all motorized vehicles, except on graded, permanent roa either now existing or to be built in the future.

Close all two-track roads to public travel and limit vehicles to bladed roads that serve as major access corridors. This will provide some balance for nonmotorized recreation opportunities, maintain the primitive quality of the Monument, limit the spre of noxious weeds, and reduce wildlife habitat disturbance (fragmentation). This seems to be in keeping with the Monument g of providing for diversity of use and maintaining natural and cultural heritage of the Monument.

Close all two-tracks. There is plenty of access into the Monument using the existing maintained roads.

Motor vehicles should only be allowed on existing authorized roads. Seasonal roads should be closed when necessary. Unauthorized two-tracks ought to be shut down and rehabilitated to protect the countryside from getting torn up and weedy, a to preserve the solitude and to keep all the artifacts and old time stuff from getting hauled out by souvenir hunters.

Allow road densities to remain at current level. There is no verifiable adverse impact documented on vehicle travel nor has frequency of vehicular travel been confirmed on most of the back country roads to validate any claim that site or sound values are being compromised. This monument is not wilderness and should not be locked away. Road decisions should be based valid threats to objects of antiquity not because a minority of people are offended by a few vehicles. Except for the main well traveled graveled roads, there is only light travel in the monument negating any need to change existing road densities.

BLM's management goals for transportation should focus on:
- Decreasing road infrastructure;
- Eliminating duplicative or unnecessary roads;
- Eliminating roads that threaten historic values, including historic landscapes;
- Restricting or limiting "off-road vehicle" use, which often threatens historic objects and resources; and
- Allowing access only for those activities that will not adversely affect the identified historic places within the Monument.

The BLM must justify its collector road designations (those allowing motorized access) as those needed for the proper management of the Monument and that are absolutely necessary for access to monument boundaries and legal access route

Close all 2-tracks to motorized vehicles. This will help control spread of weeds.

All existing roads must be left open. Roads should be used by any form of vehicle including bikes. No roads should be close Maintain all roads (people will get stranded in this area).

We urge creation of a minimum road system with the least impact possible on the serenity and wild character of the Monume No new roads or trails for motorized use should be constructed in the Monument. Creation of a monument-wide policy of roa that are "closed unless designated and signed open" since there are already too many roads in the Monument. Enforcement all motorized vehicles--dirt bikes, ATVs, off-road vehicles--on established roads only.

Collector roads (those that permit motorized or mechanized vehicles) should be properly defined as roads that "have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by t passage of vehicles does not constitute a roads. (H.R. Rep. No. 94-1163 at 17 (1976)."

Access should be limited to established roads.

Close all 2 tracks to motorized vehicles. This is a safety and enforcement issue. These tracks are not safe for vehicles and invite unwise. Also, can't enforce off-road travel with all these 2 tracks.

Determine where a trail system should be established and restore to a natural condition or convert to foot trails all user-create roads and unofficial ways.

Let the general public be aware of the actual conditions of present roads -- "gumbo" -- warn no service available.

Let the general public know what it takes to access the Monument when private land borders the Monument (no access).

The BLM should designate a minimal transportation network in order to protect Monument objects. Signs and maps directing people onto designated roads should be provided. Motorized and mechanized vehicles of all types and purpose shall be restricted to designated roads within the Monument.

Where needed to protect wildlife habitat and Monument objects, all user-created, two track roads should be closed to public use. This will also help prevent erosion and the spread of noxious weeds within the Monument.

Road access and densities: Need as many as there are now, or possibly more on as-needed basis. Reasons: Back fires are utilized more readily for fire suppression; health issues for recreationists; maintenance for existing and proposed stock water facilities; and mineral and energy extraction. After all none of the above was going to change because of Monument status.

Keep all roads open without rerouting. Nearly all the roads have been in place for many years and represent important acces routes for local recreation, fire suppression, hunting, etc. representing negligible impact to the area. Any road closure must b based on a demonstrable adverse impact not just because the area has been declared a monument.

No ATVs except on existing roads.

Leave all roads open and usable. Use all roads to all vehicles no restrictions.

Motorized or mechanized travel to a campsite should be permissible within 300 feet of roads.

In the Bullwhacker, close roads at the ridge overlooking the river and create a trailhead.

Restrict access on routes that are only used for private or administrative access.

Existing roads should be kept open. It is extremely important that there is some access, but motorized access off roads shou be highly restricted to preserve wildlife and habitat.

Routes that have not been regularly maintained as vehicle ways should be presumed unauthorized and closed until designate open for an administrative or recreational use that does not impair the values protected by the Monument.

OHV restrictions: No motorized vehicles off designated routes.

Both land and water vehicles should be strictly managed with the distinct purpose of protecting the integrity of landscape valu

All trails and 2-track ways should be closed to motorized vehicle use unless designated open (such as for access to commerc sites such as a natural gas well or stock tank). This will help control noxious weeds as well as protecting the quiet trails.

Allow vehicle access along existing roads, trails and fence lines for construction and development of range improvements and care of livestock in all areas.

The term "road" is derived from FLPMA's legislative history for the term "roadless," which "refers to the absence of roads whic have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road." H.R. Rep. No. 94-1163, at 17 (1976). Tracks created by the repeated passage of vehicles, people, wildlife, or anything else, do not necessarily constitute a road. Instead, a mechanical improvement is necessary in order to meet the definition of a road. In short, "use" or "nonuse" of a route is an inadequate ba for determining what constitutes a road.

All two-track ways and routes currently within the Monument's Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) or Areas of Critical Ecologica Concern should be closed and reclaimed. Any new routes created since WSA-designation are illegal (Wilderness Act 1977) and should be closed immediately and removed from the transportation plan.

All two-tracks should be closed. From discussions with others, I think it would be easiest for the BLM to declare all roads and track ways closed unless posted as open.

Close all roads that are highly erodable or hazardous to vehicle users.

All unplanned roads and trails should be closed and lands restored to their natural state. A policy of "closed unless designate and signed open" should be applied, and all motorized vehicles, including dirt bikes, off-road vehicles and ATVs should be

allowed only on designated roads.

All roads should be closed except those marked open. Two tracks are not roads. They should be closed and rehabilitated. Once the purpose of a road is done it should be rehabilitated.

Keep the Monument minimally impacted by off-road travel. No new roads for recreation purposes. Minimal motor vehicle access for administrative (use horses/mules where possible). Close roads that do not have a need/purpose.

Motorized access should be limited to only existing, authorized roads.

Have legal access roads along ridge line for handicapped/disabled.

Motorized access must be prohibited on all areas but existing and fully authorized roads.

Create a road system designed to protect and restore the wild, Great Plains landscape, wildlife habitat and the cultural and historic sites found throughout the Monument.

Some minor improvements could be made to the roads to make them passable in wet weather, but no major improvements.

Minimize motor use to reduce weed infestation, erosion, and fire danger.

Motorized traffic must be restricted to the existing roads.

All two-tracks, road spurs or resource roads on the monument should be closed or converted to trails for hikers and horse trekkers unless specifically shown to be needed. Close all 2-tracks in the Bullwhacker and the WSAs.

In the consultation meeting with Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, April 3, 2002, the BLM states, "The amount of roads and trails in the area are more than what is needed for administration, management and recreation." The BLM acknowledges the are too many roads. Retain as legal system roads only those which are improved, maintained or legally designated as public rights of way by the BLM, the state or a county.

Close all 2-tracks into Wilderness Study Areas.

Removing roads or closing certain areas to motorized recreation actually liberates lands - as opposed to locking them up - by allowing a broader array of public interests to thrive, including non-motorized uses that were displaced, healthy wildlife and pl populations, clean air and water, and healthier soils.

When the purpose for a road is ended, e.g. when access to a natural gas well or stock tank is no longer necessary, provision should be made to reclaim the road, and travel should no longer be allowed on it.

Public roads constructed before 1976 and maintained and used as public roads since then should be designated by BLM and noted on their records. Remaining roads and trails should be inventoried and evaluated as to their utility and appropriateness public use. Approved roads and trails should be signed as such. Others should be closed.

The BLM should review its own actions within the Monument, that is, it should minimize motorized use (land and water) for al management purposes. (Of course, this doesn't apply to emergencies such as rescue operations.)

There should be no "special use" or "sacrifice zones" for primary use by motorized vehicles in the Monument.

We urge the BLM to take a long, hard look at the network of user-created routes and potentially motorized two-tracks that can seriously compromise the Monument's historic and geologic values and its wildlife and wildlands resources, unless they are closed to motorized travel and reclaimed to a natural condition.

All roads, including two tracks and trails, should remain open. Any decision to seasonally close a road should be based on a valid threat to a specific object of historic interest. Road closures to protect wildlife habitat must be based on valid, verifiable study of the situation in the Monument by competent scientists.

Access via motorized vehicles should be limited to a modest set of established roads. ATVs should not be allowed to use unnecessary roads/trails or to create them. ATV use must be limited to prevent erosion, noise, weed intrusion and for safety reasons.

I think that access via road is as important as access from the river. Management should be aware that local people enjoy th Monument from "the top" rather than from "the bottom." All existing roads should be open.

Close excess roads/prohibit motorized on existing roads only. Limit vehicles (ATVs, bikes, etc.) to existing roads only.

Closures to protect sage grouse leks and nests. Closures to protect elk calving, sheep lambing.

Allow deteriorated 2-track ways to naturally reclaim. Clearly mark open and closed resource roads. Use closed unless designated open process for travel plans.

BLM's management goal for access should emphasize an intention to develop a transportation plan that considers impacts o historic places and values identified in the Proclamation. In particular, BLM should focus on how to maintain or improve the historic landscape.

Absolutely close all 2-track vehicle routes in the Wilderness Study Areas.

Much of the Monument is scarred by the proliferation of unofficial two-track roads. This trend has to be reversed. Most of the unofficial roads should be closed to motorized traffic.

Use of the Monument must be respectful of the uses and practices of Native Americans and to preserve all traces of their history there. Accordingly, access and travel must be carefully planned and limited to avoid conflicts with those values and uses, which are statutorily protected.

Once routes and ways have been identified for closure, the RMP should include a detailed closure and restoration plan.

Close all two-track ways to motorized travel unless specifically designated open. Plant natural species to obliterate the "way" future travel does not occur on these temporary ways. Travel should be limited to roads developed for necessary access, an roads (ways) carved by incidental travel should be planted.

Access from the top roads that lead down to the river (ex: power plant, Woodhawk, etc.) should all remain open, even the one which have been closed such as the so-called 'rancher use only' roads.

Allow motorized access only on existing and authorized roads. Close unauthorized, user-created tracks to save wildlife and preserve the solitude of the backcountry as well as preventing the spread of noxious weeds.

Restrict motorized transportation to that absolutely necessary for the visitors to enjoy the fabulous resource. A minimal road system should be developed and all motorized traffic should be required to remain on the roads. All off road travel by ATV, motorcycles and 4 wheel drive vehicles should be prohibited. Those roads not part of the official road systems should be blocked and the sites restored. Primary access to the Monument should be by river.

I would like to see the use of ATVs in the Monument limited to (marked open) roads. These roads should be determined from existing maps predating the ATV boom of the 90s. Trails should qualify as roads. All roads created after 1990 by ATVs shou be closed and reclaimed.

Continue to turn many roads to trails for horses or people. Do not try to make ATV or bicycle "trails." They can use roads tha are designated "open."

Roads in the Monument, particularly two-track trails, should be designated closed unless designated open. A special regulat for the five-week big game season should allow midday use of designated two-tracks for game retrieval. Roads that originate private land should be closed unless they provide public access.

Motor vehicle travel on land in the Monument must be on officially established roads.

Motor vehicle travel on land must be confined to officially established roads. Other routes must be closed to motorized vehic use. No new roads should be constructed.

Development of a minimal system of roads and trails and elimination of travel except on the official roads and trails.

The BLM must identify the roads that will be authorized for motorized vehicular use and close the rest of the "roads." To adhe to the mandates and purposes of the proclamation, we recommend that the BLM start with an "all roads closed" scenario. Fr this point, we suggest that you identify roads that are necessary for reasonable access, safety, and maintenance of existing rights within the Monument. The burden of proof should lie with justification for authorization, rather than justification for closure. As the Proclamation states, "For the purposes of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary shall prohibit motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes." In addition to prohibiting off-road travel, it is imperative to restrict vehicular travel to the roads that are truly necessary.

Keep the option open for game retrieval in some areas.

All roads that remain open must be available for public travel. If not, close them, at least for recreation and hunting use. Kee one road open to Montana State school land that is presently accessible by road.

No new roads or trails, close all but main roads and trails.

Land motorized access should be limited to carefully defined roads. There should be no off-road motorized use in this fragile area.

I would like to see an end to the wanderings of 4-wheelers wherever they dream of going.

Creation of minimum roads, keep ATVs on designated roads.

Close random cross-country trails that are carving up the Monument.

Unauthorized, user-created roads need to be closed and rehabilitated and the number of roads in the Monument should be limited to established, designated routes.

Off road and trail vehicle travel should continue to be prohibited in the Monument. Site-specific plans should be developed closing most vehicle trails, taking care that public access into the area from private lands is not closed. Public roads that are blocked by private landowners should be closed to all users particularly to the offending private landowner.

A minimal transportation network should be in place. Roads, of whatever nature, that begin on private land and extend on to public land, should be closed. These private access roads forestall public access and further serve to cut up blocks of public land.

Close all avowed "trails, roads, troads, ways, routes, etc." within the wildlands known as the Monument with the rare exceptio only those specifically justified "trails, roads" mandated to remain open by the Proclamation for the limited uses of internal lan ownerships. This specifically includes all motorized, mechanized equipment, vehicles of all types and purposes permanently and year-round. No exceptions.

All "trails, roads, troads, ways, routes, etc." within the wildlands known as the Monument must be designated closed unless designated open.

Do not apply the terribly flawed and illegal joint BLM-FS ORV management plan "criteria/policy" recently developed within Montana and the Dakotas to the Monument.

Do not permit any ORV, snowmobile, motorized equipment, or vehicles of any type off-road travel anywhere, anytime.

The Wilderness Study Areas, as well as the other roadless areas in the Monument, must be protected from development unti Congress decides whether to add them to the national Wilderness Preservation System. This includes the wild Bullwhacker area. In the interim, motorized vehicles must be barred from these areas.

A travel plan should be implemented for vehicle use, both on the land and river. Both motorized and non-motorized vehicles should be allowed on the land and the river.

Proclamation will guide in part how access/roads are limited/managed.

Must inform users to stay on existing roads.

What does no off-road travel really mean? Reference to statewide OHV ROD.

Need all available roads for fire and other emergencies.

A closed road will heal and disappear.

Roads to landlocked private property should remain open.

Some access roads should be clearly marked.

Need roads to access land for livestock maintenance.

Why are Power Plant and Lower Two Calf roads closed? Needed for access into Monument. Does BLM manage these road

Difference in road management between BLM/USFWS. Do roads end at CMR boundary?

If Monument is dominant reservation, why a road issue on Lower Two Calf? Can agencies reach agreement on this issue?

Need solid reason(s) for closing roads – identifiable reasons for closure.

New roads appear yearly with little need.

Why would BLM close roads? Wildlife, soils, objects, geologic, cultural, administration.

2-tracks have increased; wet years force public to go around wet area, area gets large. May decrease hunt quality.

2-tracks should be open for sportsmen.

A lot of roads on ridges cross tipi rings.

Access should be limited to bladed roads.

Allow routine maintenance.

Are gas tax roads open for public use?

Areas must be accessible quickly for fire control. Keep as many roads as possible open.

BLM should assist counties with their efforts to maintain roads.

Can drive down one route but not others. CMR is an example.

Comment that many roads used only seasonally so need to take local and traditional uses into consideration.

Concern about how many roads "planned" vs. user-created. Maybe baseline should be the roads that are maintained.

Could roads be upgraded with gravel surfaces?

Design a system for the future.

Designated for the character it has now. Would new roads and trails change the character?

Does everyone understand different road/trail classifications?

Emergency travel should be allowed on any roads that are closed. They should also be maintained so they can be located by emergency services.

Emergency use (does not mean public access – open).

Fire potential and fire restrictions could become factors in the travel management plan.

Gas roads should be closed, reclaimed.

Habitat security – big game security. Studies could provide criteria for road/trail management.

How are roads defined?

How do you limit use to ATVs? ATVs for administrative use.

How does BLM manage the transportation system? Issue is enforcement.

How many miles of roads currently in Monument?

If rancher, oil and gas company can drive off road, why can't recreationists?

Improving the road to the Power Plant; if designated a byway would funds be available?

Is every route inventoried legal?

Keep access, but not unlimited access; need to be able to get meat out.

Proclamation will guide in part how access/roads are limited/managed.

Must inform users to stay on existing roads.

What does no off-road travel really mean? Reference to statewide OHV ROD.

Need all available roads for fire and other emergencies.

A closed road will heal and disappear.

Roads to landlocked private property should remain open.

Some access roads should be clearly marked.

Need roads to access land for livestock maintenance.

Why are Power Plant and Lower Two Calf roads closed? Needed for access into Monument. Does BLM manage these road

Difference in road management between BLM/USFWS. Do roads end at CMR boundary?

If Monument is dominant reservation, why a road issue on Lower Two Calf? Can agencies reach agreement on this issue?

Need solid reason(s) for closing roads – identifiable reasons for closure.

New roads appear yearly with little need.

Why would BLM close roads? Wildlife, soils, objects, geologic, cultural, administration.

2-tracks have increased; wet years force public to go around wet area, area gets large. May decrease hunt quality.

2-tracks should be open for sportsmen.

A lot of roads on ridges cross tipi rings.

Access should be limited to bladed roads.

Allow routine maintenance.

Are gas tax roads open for public use?

Areas must be accessible quickly for fire control. Keep as many roads as possible open.

BLM should assist counties with their efforts to maintain roads.

Can drive down one route but not others. CMR is an example.

Comment that many roads used only seasonally so need to take local and traditional uses into consideration.

Concern about how many roads “planned” vs. user-created. Maybe baseline should be the roads that are maintained.

Could roads be upgraded with gravel surfaces?

Design a system for the future.

Designated for the character it has now. Would new roads and trails change the character?

Does everyone understand different road/trail classifications?

Emergency travel should be allowed on any roads that are closed. They should also be maintained so they can be located by emergency services.

Emergency use (does not mean public access – open).

Fire potential and fire restrictions could become factors in the travel management plan.

Gas roads should be closed, reclaimed.

Habitat security – big game security. Studies could provide criteria for road/trail management.

How are roads defined?

How do you limit use to ATVs? ATVs for administrative use.

How does BLM manage the transportation system? Issue is enforcement.

How many miles of roads currently in Monument?

If rancher, oil and gas company can drive off road, why can't recreationists?

Improving the road to the Power Plant; if designated a byway would funds be available?

Is every route inventoried legal?

Keep access, but not unlimited access; need to be able to get meat out.

Limitation for roads; need to work together.

Need some areas with no roads to provide a variety of recreational experiences.

Need to leave major artery roads open. Not opposed to closing segment roads/trails.

Over-the-counter tags (doe tags) plus better/more available mapping led to increased traffic and increased roads/trails.

Question about closing existing roads; roads that are there need to be maintained.

Resource roads – what is the purpose of the road, need for the road?

Roads could be multiple use.

Roads for fire control (identification).

Roads important to firefighting (roads needed for back burning).

Roads may lead to fires via catalytic converters.

Roads on ridge tops could be closed (driving on ridges hunting)

Roads should be closed unless signed open.

Should minimize road density for benefit of wildlife. Opinion expressed that roads don't affect wildlife. Comment that most su studies are in mountains, not on prairie.

Some trails for disabled access.

Standard motor vehicles must stay on open roads. Emergency use. Use motor vehicles on closed roads from 10 a.m. to 2 p to retrieve game.

Too many roads and road segments to provide quality hunting opportunities.

Too many roads; look at closing those roads that don't have access, private road system to public land (outfitting).

Use buffers or corridors to approach road/trail management.

Uses for emergencies would be appropriate, but define what an emergency is.

Visitor use/travel during wet conditions can damage road surfaces.

What happens with gas tax roads in the Monument?

What is a road? What is a trail?

What kind of roads are there now to the Monument?

When does resource road become 2-track? What will be closed? (As of when are existing roads established through use? I there a cutoff like 1990?)

Would be surprised if new roads in the breaks are being created.

Prohibit off-road vehicle use. Limit motor use by closing as many roads/routes as possible.

Please keep the surrounding road system to a minimum, requiring all motorized vehicles to stay on these designated roads.

Please keep the Monument non-motorized.

BLM should adopt a definition of "road" from the FLPMA's legislative history for the term "roadless." Tracks created by the repeated passage of vehicles, people, wildlife, or anything else, standing alone, do not constitute a road. Mechanical improvements are necessary in order for an area to be considered a road. Furthermore, whether a route is "used" or "unused inadequate to determine what is and is not a "road."

Minimum miles of roads and severe penalty for those who don't abide by the law.

Adopt an "all roads are closed unless designated open" policy.

Recognize that ORVs are prohibited in the Monument except on designated roads, and that ORV "trails" are prohibited by the Proclamation. Mechanized vehicles (bikes) off of designated roads are prohibited by the Proclamation.

No new roads, close and obliterate all unnecessary roads.

I urge the prohibition of motorized vehicles on as much of the surrounding property as possible.

Keep motorized vehicles on designated roads.

Since very few roads enter the Monument without crossing private land, that issue should be relatively easy to address. Therefore, the two-track roads going down various ridges on the public land will not be accessible to the public and that will reduce the travel on them so they will not be the problem that some people think they are. Keep all roads open.

No off-road travel by 4-wheel, ATV, seismic trucks, motorcycles and bicycles.

Use roads closed to vehicle traffic for hiking trails.

All roads that are open for vehicle travel should be open to everyone. Roads that enter public land from private land might be open for uses such as grazing but closed for hunting or recreation access unless they are also open to the public. A single primary access road should be available to land owners who own in-holdings. One public access road should be left open to each state school section within the Monument that presently has road access. There should be no special roads to accommodate only ATVs or cycles.

We recommend that you start by prohibiting all off-road vehicle travel within the Monument, at least until you get a handle on problem and can justify a less restrictive approach.

Some roads may be closed during hunting season for game security reasons if necessary. These same roads could be open during limited hours for game retrieval in some areas.

No public roads should be closed.

Provide low-standard vehicle access to the boundaries; no more paved roads than exist today. Limit motorized use within the area to a few specific signed routes.

Only a few major road access routes in the uplands would be open to motor vehicles.

No road closures at all.

Motorized and mechanized vehicles, including ATVs, should be restricted to designated roads within the Monument. The dra EIS should describe how the BLM will address motorized r4ecreation and how motorized recreation will be monitored and enforced. Unauthorized two-track trails should be closed and rehabilitated to protect wildlife and riparian areas and to preven erosion as well as the spread of noxious plant species. Some user-created two-track trails could possibly be converted to foo trails where applicable.

The BLM should create a transportation system with the primary goal of protecting the objects and values for which the Monument was created.

Historical public routes that cross private lands and are the only means for accessing public lands should be analyzed for possible designation as collector routes, and if determined as such, these roads should remain open and accessible to all unless they subordinate the habitat or security needs of wildlife.

The BLM should publish visitor maps and guides that clearly define and instruct visitors what is appropriate travel and recreational activity within the Monument. Any guides or maps published for public use should not include private and administrative land access routes. As traffic volume invariably leads to negative road impacts, we caution against mapping these routes for the general public, particularly if (such as in the case of a gas well) the use is temporary.

Ban ATVs and snowmobiles.

Limit roads.

In order to protect wildlife habitat, all spur roads should be closed and road density dramatically reduced. All roads designate as open should be located geographically to reduce habitat fragmentation and damage to other sensitive resources.

Access to the uplands should be limited to developed roads. Present two-track trails should not be allowed to become regula access roads. All efforts to limit the impact of tourism should be taken.

I would like to see you create a minimalist system designed to prevent damage to resources and wildlife habitat. All other rou should be closed except for emergency administrative use or a valid right of way. No new motorized routes should be allowe constructed.

Limit as much as possible the number of roads and recreational OHVs.

Required OHV use to look for cattle, check fence, etc. should still be allowed, but "recreational" use by ranchers and other landowners within the Monument should be under the same guidelines as everyone else.

Close the two-track land routes.

BLM should minimize the amount of road mileage in the Monument by closing and abandoning all roads that are not needed management, and by restricting roads to administrative use only.

A minimum road system that can be used by all of the public with no commercial special privileges granted. We should keep motorized vehicles on these roads and now all them to wander elsewhere.

The BLM should prohibit driving vehicles off of designated roads to set up campsites. Motor vehicles should be parked next t the road and the camper hike to his campsite.

Preserve the natural qualities of this area. I am against motorized vehicles, airstrips and overflights.

Mandate clearly identifiable motorized vehicle, equipment licenses, identification, etc. within the Monument so that violators c be publicly identified and eliminated. Post signs at the Monument boundary that clearly mandate a specific and functional equipment, vehicle identification system clearly identifiable at a distance by the public.

2322

Designated and open roads to the river should all be adequately signed and maintained.

3050

Fire management should be managed by science not the industry's need for more board feet of timber or administration favor

Recognize the historic and natural role of fire as part of the ecosystem and use prescribed fires where its effect will not conflic with the proper care of the Monument.

Fire must be reintroduced into the Monument's ecosystem where possible to mimic historical burn patterns. The draft EIS should specify how fire will be introduced and in what portions of the Monument that fire will be introduced.

Fire management should be used as a tool depending on use of area.

Fire can be used to control some areas but all fire needs control.

Allow wildfires to burn within a management plan that protects existing property (structures) and does not endanger private property within or outside the Monument. Let natural fires burn if possible/safe.

Suppress wildfire by the least destructive method available and no permanent roads should be created as a result of a wildfire response and suppression.

Restore original vegetation. Allow fires (naturally ignited).

We recommend careful consideration be given to the historic and natural occurrence of fire in what is now the Monument. On of the objectives of fire management should be to restore the native plants and species of wildlife. We do recommend fire protection of the historic structures in the Monument, with particular priority for old homestead buildings.

There should be provisions for heavy equipment use to suppress fires. This is also the reason that internal roads need to be maintained.

Fire management needs to be controlled by local hot-shot teams who can truly manage burns. There is a definite place for controlled burns because the "bull pine" tree is the major weed in the breaks and creates the biggest erosion component of breaks management. However, if fires threaten to get out of control, a policy allowing immediate heavy equipment use must in place. There is less erosion from a properly done Cat cut, which is reseeded, than thousands of acres of burned out areas costing millions of dollars to bring under control.

Prescribed burns in certain areas -- though there are very few areas of older timber stands that require prescribed burning.

Suppress wildfire by the least destructive method available. Create no permanent roads as a result of a wildfire response and suppression.

Permit prescribed burns where the effects do not conflict with the proper care and management of the objects protected by th Proclamation.

Fire management within the monument should be a mixed strategy with the ultimate goal being to control the catastrophic fire seen in recent years. This strategy should include prescribed burns in areas of heavy fuel loads, maps that identify exact locations of sites that are off limits to fire lines created by heavy equipment (remaining areas would allow use of heavy equipm for fire suppression), and areas that are identified as "let burn" areas. An important condition in determining the "let burn" are is the private property that may be in jeopardy if the fire gets out of control.

Open fires policy; open burning -- who is enforcing? Should be site-specific according to drought conditions.

Should be able to close all camping, open fires, and traveling off main road use on extreme or high danger dry conditions to prevent fires.

Allow wildfires.

In the late 70s the Breaks fell under a modified suppression plan, but nobody ever stuck with it. Fire is natural to the area and the area has many natural fire barriers, so the modified suppression plan could still work. However, if a fire becomes too 'political' for one reason or another, pull out all the stops and get some heavy equipment out there and put the fire out. Cat an dozer lines are reliable and disappear quickly when done property. There are and have been enough natural fires in the Brea that you do not need some 'burn monger' down there playing around.

All wild fires must be aggressively suppressed and prescribed burns utilized only when the permittee has options to defer use

The historic and natural role of fire as part of the landscape and ecosystem should be recognized and a policy developed to permit some natural fire in the Monument. Prescribed burns may be permitted where the effects do not conflict with the prope care and management of the objects protected by the Proclamation. Prohibit mechanical treatment of areas designated for prescribed burns where such treatment damages monument resources. Wildfire suppression should be by the least destruct methods available and no permanent roads should be created as a result of wildfire response and suppression. All post-fire restoration should use only native vegetation and should be monitored frequently to minimize spread of noxious weeds.

Fir management - concentrate on protection of life and personal property. Minimize intervention otherwise.

Let fire caused by nature burn unless it threatens inhabited areas or hardened sites.

Allow natural fire.

Most users very good about not building fires in extreme dry conditions.

How can you effectively do thinning in order to create a more natural fire environment without ruining the pristine or natural character of the Monument?

Let fires burn naturally except when they threaten private entities.

Fires should be managed on a "let burn" basis unless fires that originate on the Monument threaten adjacent private property

Fire control - put out as soon as possible with some controlled burns to improve some conditions.

I feel it is imperative that you allow flexibility to respond to changing (year to year) conditions. Controlled burns could be a us management tool, providing conditions are right.

All fires should be put out in haste unless prescribed burns.

Prescribed burns should be permitted where the effects do not conflict with the proper care and management of the objects protected by the Proclamation.

Prohibit mechanical treatment of areas designated for prescribed burns where such treatment damages Monument resources

Wildfire suppression should be by the least destructive methods available and no permanent roads should be created as a re of wildfire response and suppression.

All post-fire restoration should use only native vegetation and should be monitored frequently to minimize spread of noxious weeds.

Do not use fire as a way to manage. It is too unpredictable. Put out all fires immediately no matter if natural or man started.

Recognize the historic and natural role of fire as part of the ecosystem and use prescribed fires where its effects will not confl with the proper care of the Monument.

Controlled burns have a place in improving some conditions.

After a fire, who manages the weed concerns/problems?

Are fire plans based on past observations?

Control fires, put the fire out.

County/BLM coordinate on fire restrictions.

Establish criteria for fire restrictions for within the Monument.

Fire to regenerate Monument.

Has fire prescription plan been written?

How does landowner get input into fire restriction designations?

Lightning fire to be put out right away.

Long-term management policy “let it burn.” Fire plays important role.

Place for controlled burns.

Prescribed burns not as effective as natural fire.

Pristine environment sets stage for fire.

Controlled burns in the right conditions could be a very beneficial tool in improving wildlife habitat and range quality. Wildfires should be controlled.

In WSAs (and other areas if appropriate) prepare fire management strategies which would allow natural-caused fires to burn unsuppressed when conditions are appropriate.

4050

We suggest protection of fish and wildlife habitat take priority on public lands through processes such as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designations on BLM lands and proactive habitat management plans that recognize the biological and ecological needs of native species first.

4250

BLM should manage Wilderness Study Areas to maintain their undeveloped and non-motorized back country character.

Recommend that the existing wilderness study areas be included in the Wilderness Preservation System.

Manage wilderness study areas for minimum disturbance.

We recommend that wilderness legislation be developed for areas inventoried within the Monument as well as those areas inventoried within the CMR National Wildlife Refuge. We believe that particular concern should be given to those areas that were determined not qualified for wilderness because of primitive roads. Many of these areas connect wilderness suitable ar and could be considered for wilderness restoration when the Congress considers designation.

All WSAs should be given full wilderness protection status, in keeping with the historic unspoiled and wild nature of the Misso Breaks.

The BLM should actively monitor, evaluate and enforce the non-impairment standard for the WSAs, and illegal motor vehicle routes within the WSAs should be closed and rehabilitated.

Recommend the 6 WSAs within the Monument for wilderness designation.

Complete protection of the Monument's WSAs and other pristine wild lands must be ensured.

Close all two-track vehicle routes in the 6 Wilderness Study Areas.

Areas of wilderness being considered should be just that. If areas of this type are being considered as inholdings within the monument, they should be trod by feet and hooves only. No relaxation of the wilderness concept for the sake of multiple use other activities should be allowed, presently or in the future.

Manage Wilderness Study Areas and the Bullwhacker area and other remote areas to maintain their undeveloped, non-motorized character.

WSAs, ACECs and other remote areas should be managed as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas. Failure to do this will result in a rapid degradation of these areas.

BLM has identified 6 wilderness study areas in the monument, one area of critical environmental concern, and the Bullwhack area in the central core of the monument area. While most of the monument is a narrow strip, these represent areas with a more expansive character. They should be managed to protect their wilderness characteristics without motorized intrusions o construction.

I believe that the Wilderness Study Areas, and the Bullwhacker Area should be left in a natural undeveloped state. Please bu no facilities in these areas and allow no motor vehicles in them either.

Manage the Wilderness Study Areas to maintain their non-motorized backcountry character and protect it against invasive/noxious weed spread by ATVs.

Those areas in the Monument that are essentially undeveloped and wild should be retained in such condition for Congress to establish as wilderness.

Wilderness areas and other sensitive areas should be managed as official wilderness until such time as they can be protecte under the 1964 Wilderness Act. No roads, no off-road vehicles.

Keep the WSAs, ACEC and any remote places like the Bullwhacker as "wilderness" areas where people can hike and go but motors can go.

The BLM must actively monitor, evaluate and enforce the non-impairment standard for all WSAs on a regular basis. Regular WSA monitoring reports should be kept on file at the Monument headquarters.

All wilderness study areas should be managed to retain their wilderness qualities, with no exceptions.

BLM should recommend all acreage in the WSAs for Congressionally-designated wilderness.

The BLM must actively monitor, evaluate and enforce the non-impairment standard for all WSAs on a regular basis.

WSAs, ACECs and other remote and rugged landscapes such as the Bullwhacker should be managed as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas.

Wilderness Study Areas should be managed for undeveloped, non-motorized, primitive recreation opportunities.

Manage the 6 wilderness study areas, the area of critical environmental concern, and the Bullwhacker area for their values as undeveloped wildlands, with naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.

Manage the WSAs and other remote and rugged landscapes such as the Bullwhacker as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas.

Maintain its clear night sky, the quiet, the solitude - especially the WSAs and wilderness areas.

Reevaluate the Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) within the National Monument and recommend all acreage in the WSAs for congressionally designated Wilderness.

Relationship between road access via WSA and livestock grazing administration.

How much WSA acreage in Monument?

WSAs are managed in a manner that does not change their suitability.

The Wilderness Study Areas deserve special attention to preserve their undeveloped character.

Manage the Wilderness Study Areas, including the Bullwhacker area, plus the other remote and rugged areas, to maintain the undeveloped, remote, backcountry character.

Manage Wilderness Study Areas and as much as possible, with wilderness rules.

Protection of the wilderness values of the Bullwhacker and other WSAs must be a major priority.

We also recommend a re-evaluation of potential Wilderness Study Areas and the closure of all two-tracks within existing Wilderness Study Areas.

BLM should recommend all acreage in the WSAs, the Bullwhacker, and other wild areas in the Monument for Congressionally designated wilderness.

Until Congress acts, the BLM must manage these vital lands in a manner that protects their natural values (BLM's Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review H-8550-1).

Reevaluate the Wilderness Study Areas ("WSA") within the National Monument and recommend all acreage in the WSA for congressionally-designated Wilderness.

Manage the wilderness study and Bullwhacker areas as wilderness.

4300

The BLM should set out a program and timeline for inventorying all additional qualifying lands within the Monument boundarie that may be recommended for wilderness designation.

Other areas of the Monument currently not designated as wilderness should be inventoried and studied for suitability as wilderness.

I support protection of the Wilderness Study Areas, the Bullwhacker area, and other areas proposed for wilderness by the Friends of the Missouri Breaks.

BLM should reevaluate additional wild and remote lands in the Monument for additional recommendations. The BLM should reevaluate the Bullwhacker area for wilderness status.

Wilderness Study Areas should be established to further our knowledge of the botanical and ecological features of the wilderness and hopefully enable opportunities for serious students to further their knowledge and help protect the area even more.

Protect the Monument's wildlands and core areas and inventory more lands that can be used for wilderness protection.

Keep the Bullwhacker area primitive - no roads, etc.

Manage parts of the Monument (the Bullwhacker, for instance) as wilderness.

With respect to the "Health of the Land and Fire" issue, we recommend a re-evaluation of the Bullwhacker for its wildness characteristics and the closure of roads at the ridge that overlooks the Missouri River. As the Proclamation states, the Bullwhacker "…contains some of the wildest country on all the Great Plains, as well as important wildlife habitat." Now that th Monument has been created, the option to preserve such areas must be re-examined and pursued.

Reevaluate the wilderness qualities of the Bullwhacker area. Designate and manage it as a privative area until wilderness designation possible.

The BLM must identify additional wildlands that qualify for protection as wilderness study areas [FLPMA 43 U.S.C. Sec. 1711(a)], especially the Bullwhacker.

I support part of the Monument as wilderness.

Identify additional areas with wilderness characteristics as wilderness study areas. National Monument status involves a cha in management emphasis, which could lead to different conclusions about wilderness characteristics in areas that were not identified as WSAs in BLM's original wilderness inventory.

Reinventory the Monument for additional wilderness quality land.

The BLM should set out a program and timeline for inventorying all additional qualifying lands within the Monument boundarie that may be recommended for wilderness designation.

Re-inventory the Bullwhacker for its wilderness characteristics. The Bullwhacker is bounded on the north by the Cow Island Trail, on the east by the Cow Creek ACEC, on the south by the Irvin Ridge Wilderness Study Area and the Missouri River, an on the west by the Monument boundary.

Manage the area as a de facto wilderness area.

Re-inventory the Bullwhacker area for its wilderness characteristics. Create a place that provides quality wilderness experiences, not racing vehicles, zooming boats, and roaring planes.

5050

Will PILT dollars increase due to Monument and increased visitor use?

Visitors also create economic opportunity.

Our specific concern: That all commercial (tourism, mining, drilling, lumber, etc.) activities actually, honestly and fully show a profit. Example: Whoever needs a road must pay for the construction of that road.

Our specific concern: That the economic considerations be seen from a long-term basis.

5051

Do not guarantee privileges for commercial interests.

No subdivisions. Subdivisions and/or random residential building on private land inholdings are significant threats to the valu and solitude common throughout this Monument. Zoning may be required by the counties. Should be citizen driven.

Commercial interests should be confined to the towns near the Monument.

I think this Monument should create opportunities for jobs in surrounding local communities by placing facilities (visitor center etc.) in these towns.

No commercial venues of any kind; let them leave only footprints.

5052

The surrounding communities can well use the economic benefit of being the gateway communities to the wild and scenic experience, and the disruption to the wildlife and recreationists is completely unnecessary.

No rental cars available in gateway communities.

5053

Keep travelers off of private property. I support taking private land out of the Monument.

Don't allow private lands that remain to develop into trophy homes.

Should go on private land if desire uses like mountain bikes.

Why won't BLM address as a scoping issue the 81,000 acres of private property?

Private landowners in Monument get reimbursed for providing services for people breaking down?

80,000 acres of private land, Monument not to affect private land, cannot prohibit noise effects from private (machinery, etc.).

How will ranchers' water rights be impacted by the recreation use on the river?

Agreement on Smith for private landowners to conduct their business.

Is BLM going to let hikers know when they are getting close to private land?

Landowner "Bill of Rights."

No trophy home development.

Maps should include private property limitations to any Monument visitors.

Private property - use at owner's discretion. Don't condemn.

No restrictions on private property.

How will mapping address roads through private property?

Private landowner has right to access his private property – no ROW necessary.

Landowner should be able to get to private land, but not everyone needs to use the road.

Private landowners should retain their private property rights.

Roads should not be closed that are used to access private land.

Will BLM put any regulations on private land?

The purposeful inclusion of 81,000 acres of private land in the monument represents one of the most controversial issues in central Montana. Why can't the BLM address this issue up the supervisory chain for resolution rather than continue to be reticent about dealing with it?

In establishing your management plan for the river Monument, it is important to maintain historic uses of the area since 80,00 acres are privately owned and must be respected.

The general public does not know how to read maps very well. Who is going to be responsible to post this 81,000 acres of private property?

Landowner bill of rights so landowners know what they can do within the Monument on federal land.
Can I do this, can I not do this:
- Maintenance of water, fences
- Check cows
- Access private lands

Private land: identify it with signs and keep public off.

A private landowner should have access to his land.

Private property will be in jeopardy with road closings. Access to private property will possibly be non-existent.

The boundaries of the Monument should exclude all deeded land.

Mark boundaries clearly to minimize conflicts with private landowners.

Private land is wrongfully fulfilling a function in the monument in that it is being used to form parts of the legal boundary description of the monument. The law makes no provision for private land to form a national monument boundary and contai no language that allows such inclusions to be explained away by "the rules don't apply to private land."

Even those accessing private lands should be restricted to use on the private lands for commercial use (farm and ranch business). Ranches should be bought out whenever possible.

5054

We support the construction of a Monument Visitor Center in the gateway community of Fort Benton, and if funds are availab the construction of Monument Visitor Centers in other gateway communities.

The existing facilities are limited pretty much to the same ones now as then. New camp stops need to be developed and serviced.

Self-guided interpretation preferred.

Erect signs on roads leading into Wilderness Study Areas indicating prohibited activities. Replace faded or damaged signs.

Visitor information centers will be located in gateway communities.

I realize that with increased use campsites need maintenance. The presence of toilet facilities to avoid degradation of the hab was nice.

Need adequate signing at entrance points on Monument boundary.

Need appropriate road signing, but should not detract from the quality of the Monument.

Sign/number all roads that are open; determine where access is needed.

Locate visitor facilities in surrounding communities - not in the Monument.

Visitor information structures and signs in the Monument will not impair the primitive quality of the landscape.

Tourist info, signs and kiosks should be held to a minimum or established outside the Monument.

Better outhouse facilities.

Please limit your creation of visitor centers and public facilities to gateway communities.

No additional development will be allowed, including launch and pullout sites on the river.

We oppose putting private industry in charge of the management of any aspect of the Monument including the Visitor Center.

Do not provide additional development, including launch and pullout sites on the river.

No commercial development within the Monument. Vendors should establish their businesses in the gateway communities.

We oppose the creation of "tourist-traps" and other commercial developments. Any visitor facilities should be located in near communities and not within the Monument. A rustic, outdoor, backcountry experience should be the goal, not a drive-by, stop the gift shop type of experience.

No subdivisions for housing should be permitted on public or private lands in the Monument boundaries.

Visitor centers located in the neighboring towns would not only direct the heavier, casual tourist traffic to the appropriate economic centers of the area and away from more sensitive parts of the Monument, they can serve a useful educational role explaining to travelers the unique connection in the Monument between history and the natural world. This, in turn, will encourage those who choose to venture more deeply into the Monument to respect the regulations necessary to preserving it

Keep services/infrastructure to a bare minimum.

Visitor use, services, and infrastructure should have no impact on the wild character of the Monument.

A place for visitors to check in would be helpful.

Visitor information centers will be located in gateway communities.

Commercial development of resorts, hotels, and other concessionaires should never be allowed.

Please do not develop any boat launch sites along the river. With non-motorized boats only these developments would be unneeded.

The BLM should prohibit the construction of target practice ranges or facilities in the Monument.

No additional development will be allowed including launch and pullout sites on the river.

Fresh water availability signage.

Signs - like your signs on north side of Fort Peck Reservoir.

Let's try to keep development out of the Monument by minimizing information centers or kiosks, which should be easy if the entrance roads are kept at a minimum; and letting the surrounding communities cater to the motel and restaurant seeking tou

All infrastructure and visitor centers placed outside of Monument boundaries. Incorporate local communities in to benefit on Monument.

Keep visitor information services outside of the Monument in gateway communities. Keep structures and signs in the Monum from impairing the primitive quality of the landscape.

No additional development should be allowed, including launch and pullout sites on the river.

Keep any structural/site development to an absolute minimum.

Public told RAC to keep development in gateway communities.

Maintain the unique natural attributes of the Monument so visitors can continue to encounter a rustic backcountry experience

Visitor facilities should be located in surrounding communities rather than on the Monument.

Better signing system.

Developments should be in gateway communities – airstrips/visitor centers.

Post signs to show BLM lands?

Feasible to develop support infrastructure in the uplands.

Develop boat camps and identify those sites with signs on both sides of public land that don't have toilet facilities. The sites should be signed. People bring porta potties to use. The signs don't have to be intrusive.

Needs to be signage/interpretive signs combination ion river and uplands.

Some signs on river to let them know how far (time) from a site.

Public land along the river should identified by non-intrusive signs, i.e. post w/tent symbol.

Institute portable toilet system (no new facilities).

BLM should have all infrastructure outside the boundaries. No new infrastructure in Monument so to fully protect the resource as outlined by the Proclamation.

Keep visitor facilities and informational signs to a minimum and of natural materials.

Maintain the traditional boat ramps on the Missouri River so that even power boats can continue to launch/pull out at sites including Coal Banks, Judith Landing and Kipp Park.

Prohibit commercial development within the Monument.

Visitor information structures and signs in the Monument should not impair the primitive quality of the landscape.

Visitor information centers should be located in gateway communities.

We urge that visitor centers and most "built" visitor facilities be located in gateway communities, outside monument boundarie This reduces impact on the monument's values, while it also builds relationships with the neighboring communities, which wil gain economic benefits from providing visitor services.

Visitor use should be primarily through forms of recreation that do not require built facilities within monument boundaries.

We are opposed to adding any boat launch or pullout sites along the river, as these lead to an unwise concentration of public use and resulting impacts on the land. Once installed, they become a justification for keeping more roads open to the river th would be desirable.

Locate visitor information centers in gateway communities.

No additional development should be allowed and visitors restricted to "undeveloped recreation."

Visitor facilities and commercial development should only be located in gateway communities. Informational points of interes and public overlooks in the Monument should be sparingly used, and if so, used to increase safety and orientation within the Monument. Signs and kiosks should not impair the Monument's natural qualities.

From motor roads: at identified areas where it is logical because of view, terrain, historical/cultural points, have visitor pull-ou with educational information and limited facilities (restrooms, picnic tables where feasible). From trails: same idea at selecte locations identified for same reasons as above.

Recreational development should only be done to the extent to help preserve the wild character of the Monument or to provid visitor sanitation and protection. Visitor facilities should be located in gateway communities as much as possible or where the is current development.

Locate the Missouri River corridor and Monument, one and the same, administration and staff in Fort Benton, Montana.

Construct a Monument Visitor Center in the gateway community of Fort Benton, and, if funds are available, construct Monum Visitor Centers in other gateway communities.

Erect informational visitor kiosks in gateway communities and at key access points to the Monument. Kiosks should contain maps and information for Monument visitors, including maps of hiking trails and safety information about the importance of protecting various resources in the Monument.

Locate all visitor facilities and commercial development in gateway communities, not in the Monument itself.

Development to facilitate visitor use should be kept to a minimum. Primary visitor use facilities should be developed by privat enterprise outside the monument boundaries.

No additional development should be allowed, including launch and pullout sites on the river.

I support the construction of a Monument Visitor Center in the gateway community of Fort Benton, and if funds are available, construction of Monument visitor centers in other gateway communities such as Winifred.

Effect and enforce a strong Monument boundary sign program to clearly identify the federal land and resources. Accomplish same for public ROWs across private or state-administered land to the Monument boundary. Do the same for all remaining, after closure efforts, for all "trails, roads, troads, ways, routes, etc." within the Monument to preclude all ORV, snowmobiles, vehicles, mechanized-motorized equipment from leaving the publicly marked open trails or roads.

We recommend that the BLM prohibit commercial development within the Monument boundaries. Furthermore, all public amenities, such as information and interpretive sites, should be located outside the Monument at gateway communities.

The BLM "Analysis of the Management Situation" includes a 2001 and 2002 visitor survey. 71% in 2002, up from 2001, want campsites left as they are (numbers) and 55%, up from 2001, said to leave facilities as they are (don't fix up). Most people ar motivated to use the river for these three reasons: solitude and privacy, observing the scenic beauty, and adventure. Keep t areas primitive.

No commercial development inside the Monument. Vendors should be stationed in gateway communities.

We oppose placing private industry in charge of the management of any aspect of the Monument including the Visitor Center

We believe that recreation facilities should be confined to road heads, with the possible exception of the primitive toilets that n exist. Signing, other than at road heads, should be kept to an absolute minimum. Interpretation and necessary information should be done with written material that the visitor brings with them.

There should be no commercial development within the Monument.

There will need to be an infrastructure established to handle these people. More camping locations, drinking water, vegetatio for shade, cell sites to cover emergency calls being placed and the list goes on.

I urge the BLM to avoid making the Monument into some kind of theme park attraction with commercial development and visi facilities at all the pull outs. These kind of enterprises are best suited for the gateway communities surrounding the Monumen Signage and informational kiosks do not belong in the Monument as they take away from the rustic backcountry experience many visitors savor.

More BLM presence needs to be felt in the Monument. There need to be more of you out in the field, not in the office. How about a field office in Winifred?

Development of visitor services facilities should be in the gateway communities of Big Sandy, Fort Benton and Lewistown. Th will ensure that development in the Monument will be limited to information overlooks and interpretive sites. Development in Monument should be located on already existing roads. Facilities should be sited in order to prevent interfering with the visua

experience. Visitors should walk from parking areas to overlooks and interpretive sites.

If you want to leave the Monument as it is don't mark it with so many signs that it turns into a high traffic use area.

Limit visitor information signage within Monument to maintain primitive qualities.

A visitor center that could educate the public about the unique features of the Monument: history, geology, animal and plant li etc. would also be great.

Visitor information structures and signs within the Monument should not impair the primitive quality of the landscape. The information structures and signs should be designed such that they "fit in" with the Monument's natural landscape.

Yes to signs -- good interpretive signage, often.

Let's go easy with development, resisting temptation for a host of "visitor amenities" -- roads, parking areas, interpretive cente campgrounds, power lines, RV parks, and other developed sites that will in truth take away from the very qualities visitors com to experience.

Construct a Monument Visitor Center in the gateway community of Fort Benton, and if funds are available, construct Monume Visitor Centers in other gateway communities.

Erect informational visitor kiosks in gateway communities and at key access points to the Monument. Kiosks should contain maps and information for Monument visitors including maps of hiking trails and safety information about the importance of protecting resources in the Monument.

Camping from motor roads or trails: directed to specific camping areas developed for such activities to minimize impact on terrain. Rationale: fragile landscape and vegetation. Some areas will be the most popular.

Concentrate visitor information sites and overlooks in discrete, specific areas so that they are not spread over the entire monument.

The construction of any Monument Visitor Centers should be outside Monument boundaries. Monument Visitor Centers in the gateway communities of Fort Benton, Winifred, Big Sandy and if funds are available, the construction of Monument Visitor Centers in other gateway communities is appropriate.

There should be no commercial development within the Monument.

The BLM should conserve water resources by developing visitor facilities outside the Monument in gateway communities.

Prohibit commercial development within the Monument.

Signs that clearly illuminate allowed uses.

No commercial development within the Monument. Vendors should establish businesses in gateway communities.

The draft EIS should describe where visitor information centers will be located. We would like for the visitor services to be located in gateway communities in order to help preserve the primitive nature of the Monument.

Any developed service such as camping, parking or viewing areas installed for visitor use should be of primitive character wit the minimum of actual human alteration to the land or objects.

There should be no commercial uses within the Monument that degrade or harm the Monument's resources, and there should be no commercial use within the Monument where the access rights are not enjoyed equally by the public.

We support the construction of a Monument Visitor Center in the gateway community of Fort Benton, and if funds are availab the construction of Monument visitor centers in other gateway communities.

We oppose putting private industry in charge of the management of any aspect of the Monument including the Visitor Center.

Appropriate visitor kiosks should be erected in gateway communities and at key access points to the Monument. The kiosk should have maps and information for Monument visitors including maps of hiking trails and information about the importance protecting various resources in the Monument.

The BLM should study the cumulative impact of proposed visitor services in order to prevent the creation of so many visitor information facilities that it affects the wild character of the Monument. Confine such visitor information facilities to the smalle area possible. If visitor parking areas or information facilities are necessary, build them to ensure minimal interruption of the visual aesthetics of the landscape and encourage visitors to walk to information sites from parking areas.

Careful planning that focuses on keeping development outside the Monument would benefit the economies of the local

communities tremendously, while at the same time retaining the wild, remote character of the Monument and preserving its resources. In addition, by having only primitive campsites with minimal facilities in the Monument, there is no competition wit local economic opportunities.

Any development should be clustered in more developed areas, away from wilder, natural areas. These less developed area should include all habitat types, especially riparian areas.

There should be no commercial development within the Monument. Vendors should establish their businesses in gateway communities.

Any facilities and commercial development for visitors should be developed in gateway communities to enhance their econom rather than detracting from the uniquely remote feeling backcountry experience. Any informational signs should be within keeping of the area's natural qualities and used only to increase safety and orientation.

Do not develop launch and pullout sites on the river.

5151

Cell phone towers should be installed, for emergency use on the river.

The BLM working with DES of Chouteau County should have a joint training exercise before the year 2005.

Safety is a concern. BLM should be aware of public on this land.

A management plan must include funding availability for grants to local volunteer fire and ambulance service provided by Winifred, Roy, Denton, and Big Sandy to be able to maintain equipment and training.

I would plan for adequate emergency services so that the impact would not be felt by the local communities and their voluntee EMRS. An adequate cell phone access must be established with towers that don't conflict with the natural beauty of the Monument. Cell phone access from all angles in the Monument is a necessity. The impact in 20 years would be the same as now.

Work cooperatively on roads and air strips for emergency situations.

We also need access for emergency vehicles.

Search and rescue, fire suppression, and law enforcement exceptions to the management plan are assured by law and shou only be used in the event of bona-fide emergencies

BLM reimburses county for EMS – why should county subsidize EMS in Monument?

Law enforcement – dollars to contract with counties for law enforcement and place someone in the area or near to provide services.

With more people using the Monument, is there a way to reimburse counties for EMS?

Work harder with patrols and education.

Enforcement is too disjointed. Combine/coordinate law enforcement efforts (BLM, FWP, County, etc.).

While seems to be too much specialization in law enforcement, too difficult for one law enforcement person to learn all state a federal regulations.

How would BLM manage those people that don’t follow the rules?

People that use local emergency services should be responsible for paying for part of the rescue operation.

Could Homeland Security or Lewis & Clark provide for local emergency services?

Local counties concerned with cost of emergency services. Fees could assist with these costs.

Motorized use for emergency purposes, not only for emergency search and rescue. Should be okay for private motorized boaters.

Need to explore additional means/opportunities for funding emergency services.

BLM officers, FWP game wardens and county sheriff deputies should cross-train and be cross-deputized to enhance law enforcement.

An increased budge for law enforcement is crucial to the success of the RMP to provide actual protection of the Monument as directed by the Proclamation. At least two more FTE's for law enforcement personnel is the minimum needed.

As part of the law enforcement program, the Monument should create and facilitate a "Citizen Watch Group" to assist BLM an State law enforcement personnel. Refer to the BLM Prior Mountain Citizen Group for details.

Agreement in place to handle emergency services.

Is it possible to grant some level of law enforcement authority to someone living in the Monument?

Nothing should be prohibited if it saves a life.

What's BLM's law enforcement philosophy/approach in the Monument?

Search and rescue, fire suppression, and law enforcement exceptions to the management plan are assured by law and shou only be used in the event of bona-fide emergencies.

5152

Smith River idea to keep the place pristine - latrines.

The Monument management strategy should employ user responsibility for issues such as waste disposal. New gear for pac in, pack-out should be required. Waste disposal stations should be confined to the five major public access points.

Human waste elimination (what is the regulation?) Littering (Who is going to be responsible for picking it up? We are already seeing a major problem.)

I think it is imperative that there be signs posted at major put-in areas for floaters to "pack it in-pack it out." Some of the popu campsites can get pretty trashy. Where there are already toilets, they should either be maintained or removed. Similar signs should also be posted at overland access routes to the Monument.

Visitor management and visitor services regulations are to be founded on people being personally responsible for a "leave no trace" and "pack it in, pack it out" visit to the monument. This means visitor information and education at entry points and requirement that visitors (both on land and river) employ new technology and commercial products to facilitate their packing o all their own waste.

BLM likely will need to operate a bulk waste removal infrastructure at the five designated entry points to the River.

Can BLM pick up trash?

Concerned about litter from meth labs because of increased people.

Create a volunteer group to help on cleanup along roads/areas.

Human waste issue in uplands.

If outhouse can be placed where not obvious but can be used, will help.

Litter is increasing. Recognize enforcement is a problem. Used to be during hunting season, but now spreading into spring/summer.

Vault toilets during hunting season in uplands at strategic points.

Written agreement with county, so county could help enforce litter laws.

Littering is a problem. Some users bury litter in shallow holes. A litter dump station(s) (floating platforms) every mile or so wo help.

Toilets in uplands may be beneficial.

A pickle bucket fitted with a toilet-seat lid is now required on some rivers. Consider this for the Missouri. Provide a "scat machine" to take the waste to a city sewer system which washes and sanitizes the bucket. (See "High Country News" Augus

18, 2003 pg. 5)

Garbage collection: pack it in - pack it out. No garbage collection.

Garbage is becoming an ever growing problem. There are more and more canoeists digging a shallow pit with paddles and burying plastic and aluminum only to be pushed up and out with the ice in the spring. I have said many times there is a need a system of containers and cleanup on a routine basis.

Annual season maintenance and amenities such as potable water, clean restrooms, emergency telephone service will go a lo way in cutting down the "search for other access."

People dumping garbage on private and federal land is going to have to be forbidden. There needs to be places for people to dispose of their garbage.

Should be a pack it in-pack it out policy enforced.

All boater groups should carry portable toilets. This has been required on the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon for many years and has been very successful in controlling sanitary conditions.

5200

Likewise, please preserve the peace and quiet of the land and skies in this Monument area.

The BLM should adopt plans that prevent the spread of artificial light pollution within the Monument. No development action should be allowed that will promote artificial light pollution. The BLM should provide educational materials for recreationists t promote minimizing artificial lights in camping areas. The BLM should work with private property owners to reduce light pollu that affects the Monument.

Noise especially motorized should be kept to a minimum so as to provide opportunity for a more natural experience.

Adopt rules limiting noise from non-natural sources.

Keep the Monument as light free as possible so the sensory perception of a clear night sky can be seen and appreciated. Sh any needed lighting so that it goes down, not sideways.

The natural sounds must be preserved and light pollution from human activities must not be allowed to pollute the night skies the Monument's backcountry.

The clear night sky, free of light pollution is an important "object" needing protection in the monument.

Manage noise. Decrease pervasive noise from motors and engineers.

Silence of large, open spaces is an important value that should only be compromised out of necessity.

Light pollution from human activities will not be allowed to pollute the clarity of the Monument backcountry night skies.

The BLM should study and record the ambient, natural sources of noise in various areas of the Monument. The BLM should adopt rules limiting noise from non-natural sources. The goal should be to reduce or eliminate non-natural noise in the Monument both on the river and in the uplands.

Keep light pollution out.

The BLM should study and record the ambient, natural sources of noise in various areas of the Monument. The BLM should adopt rules limiting noise from non-natural sources.

Yes to natural quiet and solitude.

Ban boom boxes.

Control noise concerns before they happen and it becomes a problem.

Use downward directed lights to minimize light pollution and impacts to other users.

Enforce “boom box” noise restriction.

Live in a world of noise; key element of the Monument is solitude (jet skis, motorboats, ATVs).

Noise some of the time but not continuously.

Private land throughout the Monument; noise (solitude) cannot happen.

Quiet place on public land.

Generators/lights in campgrounds change the experience.

Yard lights affect night vision.

Is it necessary to consider limiting noise levels (boom boxes, generators) in popular camping areas or other areas where use are congregated (boom boxes only in February).

Prohibit artificial noise that obstructs the natural quietness and natural sounds of the landscape.

The so-called "local values" in Montana always disturb me. I think they and their limitations should be spelled out and limited severely wherever and whenever possible.

Adopt plans to prevent the spread of artificial light pollution within the National Monument.

The BLM should adopt plans that prevent the spread of artificial light pollution within the Monument. No development action should be allowed that will promote artificial light pollution. The BLM should provide educational materials for recreationists t promote minimizing artificial lights in camping areas. The BLM should work with private property owners to reduce light pollu that affects the Monument.

The natural soundscape will be preserved as a prime benefit for visitors to the Monument.

Light pollution from human activities should not be allowed to pollute the clarity of the Monument's backcountry night skies.

The BLM should include noise pollution as an impact when considering the effects of any proposed activity.

Identify through proper testing, the natural, ambient sound of the Monument and maintain such level as a benchmark measur against any other activity.

I am not in favor of any kind of light control or noise control in the Monument.

The BLM should establish acceptable limits of light pollution that are consistent with the Proclamation, and should prohibit an actions that contribute to additional light pollution.

Study the ambient noise in the Monument and prepare guidelines for restricting non-natural noise from sources such as boom boxes and motor traffic in the river corridor.

Light pollution from human activities will not be allowed to pollute the clarity of the Monument's backcountry night skies.

6050

Please maintain the national monument status and continue to protect the unique cultural, historic, geographic and visual qualities of the Monument.

All ACEC, WSAs, and other remote, primitive landscapes, such as Bullwhacker, should be zoned and managed as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas.

Protect wildlife and the wild and historic heritage of the river.

Monument's appearance should be much the same in 20 years as it was 20 years ago.

There are not enough places for someone to enjoy a bit of peace and solitude, and hence I support keeping the area as pristi as possible.

We sincerely hope you will make plans to protect its wildlife and wild character, and sanction growing motorization and habita fragmentation.

It is important to manage it as nonmotorized and restore it to the original landscape as discovered by Lewis and Clark.

The Monument should retain its correct character and be protected by the BLM to preserve its natural and wild and unpolluted aspects.

Is BLM looking at zones?

Sometimes you don’t need to do something, basically leave it there.

When groups adversely affect “objects” in Proclamation, should be precluded.

See that the wildness criterion is given higher priority than other criteria when decisions are made concerning future management of the Monument.

The natural soundscape should be preserved as a prime benefit for visitors to the Monument.

Honor the U.S. commitment to the Monument by protecting both the natural and historical values of the river and its uplands.

Maintain the Missouri River in as pristine a state as is possible, with no commercialization and minimal motorized vehicle use

Protection and preservation of the Missouri River Breaks.

All Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), and other remote and rugged landscapes suc as the Bullwhacker, should be managed as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas.

In providing for a healthy ecosystem, follow an ecological rather than a political or economic definition of the term. Commenc baseline inventories of wildlife and other natural resources and establish a monitoring protocol/program; this should include n only game species but the full complement of wildlife species that attracted the interest of Meriwether Lewis some 200 years

Manage it as non-motorized and maintain and restore it as when Lewis and Clark came through.

Wouldn't it be special if we could find a way to preserve just a few sites in their natural (God given) wonder and be able to experience those sites/wonders without the impact of man?

My wish is that the area be kept pretty much as it is with necessary maintenance and minimal development to support reasonable numbers of self-propelled travelers.

If the developments will impact traditional uses, they should be required to mitigate the impacts and not change the existing la use. (Example - if a natural gas development Is in a traditional hunting area it cannot be closed to hunters.)

The Monument should have the least amount of impact by humans and this means that the area should be left in its natural s

If a national monument is to protect objects of antiquity, why is there not one chart at this meeting identifying the objects of antiquity and where they are located, and who do none of the alternatives make reference to these historic objects?

In pursuing "minimal" management, choose individuals over outfitters, canoes over power boats and primitive conditions over development.

There are many good reasons to emphasize protection of the wild character of this place, or the high impact recreational use including the protection of native plants and wildlife, the retention of an undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry character.

Protect the Missouri Breaks from any encroachment.

Begin with what is now "authorized" and put the burden of proof for permanent change on those who champion what is curren non-authorized use.

5) * (Words "Manage these public lands in a manner that provides current and future generations the social and economic benefits compatible with the Proclamation.

This goal would allow BLM to:

Provide a diverse array of stable economic opportunities in an environmentally sound manner, including the exploration and development of existing oil and gas leases;

Provide quality opportunities to meet the demands of various publics for all resources, and a diverse array of activities that re in social benefits while minimizing negative social effects; and

Minimize the risk of catastrophic fire to values at risk within the Monument and communities adjacent to the Monument." cros out (entire section))

This goal would allow BLM to:

Provide access to State and Federal land while protecting the features of the Monument;

* (words "Provide access for diverse recreation opportunities;" crossed out)

Allow access for emergency services (firefighting, search and rescue, etc.);

Provide reasonable access for private landowners; and

Allow access for administrative needs and authorized uses of industry and government agencies.

1) * (* words "Manage these public lands in a multiple use manner consistent with the Proclamation and all current law and policy." crossed out)

2) Manage legal and physical access to and within the Monument ** (** words "to provide opportunities for diverse activities." crossed out)

I was not pleased by the Overall Mission and Management Goals, especially item 5, which indicates a plan of increased acce and increased resource extraction. This is contrary to the bulk of comments and contrary to the historic management goals o protecting the national monument as it has existed since the distant past.

Clearly it was to preserve, as close to the original as possible, the unspoiled wildness and solitude of the area.

Protect this corridor for future generations.

We ask BLM to develop a primary alternative that gives overriding priority to protection of the resource values cited in the proclamation: birds and other wildlife and their habitat, historic and prehistoric values, and opportunities for the public to experience this natural and historic environment.

Preserve this 148 miles of river in its natural, primitive state.

Roads and rangeland planning should be adjusted to what is best for these protections and restorations.

Strongly encourage Monument management of multiple use of the property - fully respecting existing mineral leases.

Consider original beauty and tranquility to be a top priority in your land management plans.

Ensure the protection and management of enough unfragmented habitat to support viable populations of all native species in region and maintain biodiversity.

Manage at regional scales large enough to accommodate the natural disturbance regimes such as fire, wind, and climate change.

Plan with long-term (decades and centuries) perspective to allow for the continued evolution of species, habitats, and ecosystems.

Allow for human use in the Monument at levels and in ways that do not result in significant ecological degradation.

An ecosystem management approach should be adopted for the Monument, with the Monument and the adjacent CMR Natio Wildlife Refuge managed as core lands essential to sustaining the integrity of the region. Wildlife populations and their habita on Monument lands should be managed as core populations and habitats, providing dispersing individuals to satellite populations or uninhabited areas outside the Monument boundaries, both upstream and downstream.

I think the plan should simply protect the characteristics of the Missouri River Breaks that led to it becoming a national monument.

The areas along the riverbanks - the small stands of cottonwoods, the places where birds and other wildlife live, the more frag geologic landmarks, etc. - deserve special attention in your plan.

We recommend that the BLM revise its “overall vision” to more adequately reflect the mandates of the Proclamation. The BLM should adopt an overall vision to promote the National Monument as “remote and nearly undeveloped as it was in 1805,” as described in Proclamation 7398, and to assure that the intent of the proclamation will be definitively reflected in each alternati presented in the BLM’s Draft RMP and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) developed pursuant to FLPMA and the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).

Attention to "multiple use" may have a place on many BLM holdings, but it doesn't have a place in the Monument, which is th subject of a site-specific and overriding public mandate, in the form of a presidential proclamation.

Manage the entire area as a monument, not a wilderness. Protect it, but allow real multi use of Monument.

Could we please keep and preserve some places for feet, for bikes, for paddles, even for rafts.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will manage the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument (Monument) in a * manner that maintains and protects its biological, geological, visual and historic objects; preserves its remote and scenic character; ** in accordance with the Proclamation and existing laws. (* words "multiple use" crossed out; ** words "and recognizes the valid existing rights and authorizations, hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities, and livestock grazing" crossed out)

Is BLM considering a zone approach to any aspect of this Monument?

Low impact and responsibility of user.

This is to be managed as multiple use and we need to consider all users.

Wildlife must be given top priority in managing the Monument. The management goal should be to maximize the experience the river and prairie environment so that it can provide for the rare sense of the area as it was in 1904/6.

We recommend that BLM revise its “overall vision” to reflect the mandates of the Proclamation. BLM should adopt an overall vision to promote the National Monument as “remote and nearly undeveloped as it was in 1805,” as described in Proclamatio 7398, and to assure that the intent of the proclamation will be definitively reflected in each alternative presented in BLM’s Dra RMP and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) developed pursuant to FLPMA and the National Environmental Polic Act (“NEPA”).

Propose and adopt a management plan that emphasizes quiet, reflective, nonmotorized use of the entire Monument.

Exercise the options that are available to you as Manager to protect this area from any activities which will have negative imp on the flora, fauna, and solitude of the Monument.

Create an interagency cooperative council to structure wildlife management programs on the Monument.

These policy directives require BLM use its broad authority under FLPMA, NEPA, the Proclamation, and other laws and polic to proactively protect the cultural, historic and ecological resources of the Monument. In order to uphold these responsibilities we urge the BLM to ensure that the overriding management principle of the resource management plan is protection of the remote, undeveloped character of the Monument, which will in turn provide protection for its biological, geological and historic resources.

This management plan needs flexibility.

The President is accorded authority under the Antiquities Act to declare land areas as national monuments to protect historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures and other objects of historic or scientific interest. Curiously, virtually all of the BLM planning for this monument centers on the protection of biological/geologic/scenic/recreation interests rather than on protecting the objects of antiquity. The management theme for this monument closely parallels wilderness protection and virtually ignores the specific provisions of the Antiquities Act.

My only advice regarding the Monument is to think of moderation.

Manage the Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and the Bullwhacker area as undeveloped.

This area is such a special place historically and geographically that it demands protection, restoration and preservation.

Manage Wilderness Study Areas, the Bullwhacker area, and the entire Monument as undeveloped and for primitive recreatio preserve special values, including naturalness and solitude.

Keep a small part of America wild for we people who enjoy natural beauty and history.

If any changes need to be made to protect riparian or scenic lands, the landowner should be over compensated for the chang

When BLM gets data put into a GIS data system, then can use info for fire restrictions, law enforcement placement, etc.

Everybody doesn’t get a piece of the pie (Proclamation).

Getting taxed more and more; low income are getting priced out (hunting).

Wilderness qualities of the Monument need to be preserved, not just hunting.

We urge you to adopt a plan that protects the Monument from motorized boats, that discourages new roads and protects the unique natural beauty of the landscape.

We should manage these lands for the public good rather than for individual or corporate gain, and we should manage them t

protect their integrity for centuries to come.

The emphasis should be on the protection end, not on the development end.

Set policy to protect and return the area as much as possible to a complete natural state.

Protect, preserve and guard the legacy that was given to us.

Consider how desperately people need a place to go, where it is silent, where we can sit quietly and just see the world as it w intended to be.

Define "Adaptive Management." Determine and establish sideboards for Adaptive Management.

The management alternative should give full protection to the natural and historic values of the river and uplands, even if that means some alteration in grazing and drilling activities.

I would like to urge you to protect the Missouri River Breaks by keeping it underdeveloped and unmotorized as much as poss and free from commercial interest.

BLM must manage the Upper Missouri River Breaks for the protection and preservation of historic and scientific values, not fo multiple uses.

It is clear that the primary purpose of the Monument is to ensure the protection of the objects identified in the Proclamation.

Prioritize management of Monument lands to protect and restore native plants and wildlife.

Retain the multi-use historical imperative of the BLM. Public lands and waterways are for the public; all the public not just the most vocal, funded or organized. Keep the public on our public lands.

Develop an unobtrusive monitoring system to keep tabs on changes and impacts of users and uses.

The RMP must protect the historic places identified in the Presidential Proclamation.

Please do your utmost to protect this pristine wilderness area, keeping in mind those voices of flora and fauna which cannot speak for themselves in any of the planning committee meetings.

Since the land looks much as Lewis and Clark saw it, present management seems to be working -- no radical changes should be made.

Manage the remote areas to maintain their undeveloped character, protect and restore healthy communities of native plants a wildlife and prioritize protection and restoration of intact wildlife habitat in all management decisions.

Please do what you can to preserve this incredible national treasure so that along with us, our children and future generations may enjoy and appreciate this remote and beautiful part of our natural world.

See that the rugged backcountry areas under your jurisdiction continue to be maintained as undeveloped and non-motorized.

Traditional usage needs to be managed to promote the primitive character.

We urge management of the Wilderness Study Areas, the Bullwhacker area, and other remote areas as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas.

The BLM's management philosophy for this monument needs to center on the requirement for protecting the historic and scientific objects of the monument and all decisions, actions, and alternatives should be based on that precept.

I would like to think that I can in the future return to the Upper Missouri and still see the character of a great river unspoiled.

The time is now to protect, preserve, and to restore the Missouri River Breaks.

In regard to the vision statement - Manage the Monument with a preserve and protect vision - not a "multiple use" vision whic traditionally has meant "develop" for the BLM. The "leave all options open" needs to be rethought.

The Monument's management should be to provide an environment for a singular human experience. The experience should one of traveling through an area rich in history, with the sights and sounds of bygone eras, with plants and animals establishe to ecological health and diversity. Opportunities to hunt, hike, camp, float, photograph and generally enjoy the area should be free from regulation as practical necessity dictates to meet Monument goals.

We strongly recommend that BLM re-draft a management vision that accurately reflects its management responsibilities for stewardship and protection, prior to releasing a draft RMP. The new draft should exclude reference to "multiple-use" principle in order to avoid public confusion and prevent BLM's planning process from being exposed to legal challenge.

I want to see a management plan that protects the natural values and wild character of the new national monument while allowing controlled use.

Make a priority of wildlife and flora protection and preservation.

Prioritize management of Monument lands to protect and restore native plants and wildlife.

Prioritize management of the Monument land to protect and restore native plants and wildlife.

In your vision statement is, "The BLM will manage the UMRBNM in a multiple use manner." Historically, multiple use was ad so the BLM lands included uses other than the sole use of grazing. Since then the BLM has tended to use "multiple use" for development of all sorts of activities. The Monument though is not an area to continue the "let's leave all our options open fo development" vision. I believe the Proclamation explicitly states, "for the purpose of protecting…" manage to close options.

Protect this short portion of the Missouri.

Maintain the undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry and protect communities of native plants and wildlife.

I would prefer the Missouri River breaks land use be left as it has been.

The right to be free from encumbrances that are imposed by new legislation and retroactively does not deal with problems tha they cause is a matter of record. Not to properly address the existing rights and privilege of ranchers and farmers is an injust and is contrary to the well being of Montana citizens.

A custodial approach to management of the Monument.

Management goals. I think your verbiage is biased towards watering down protection of the monument's "objects" in favor of business as usual.

My specific input is to totally eliminate goal #2 and goal #5. They just compromise the value of the monument and don't add anything useful or necessary.

Maintain this area in its pristine state.

Propose an alternative with a theme of protecting the land in its natural condition.

The whole area should be kept free of development, motorized vehicles, and oil and gas exploration.

The Monument should be managed to keep its pristine values.

The Monument should be managed as a monument and not as a wilderness area. Keep the Monument a multi-use resource

Work hard to devise a plan that will protect the Missouri's natural beauty and peacefulness to keep it as it was for centuries.

Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and other remote and rugged landscapes such as the Bullwhacker should be managed as undeveloped, non-motorized backcountry areas.

6051

Management efforts should be as little intrusive as possible. Leaving this area exactly as it is with a minimum amount of disturbance to accommodate foot traffic would, in my opinion, be the perfect result.

Ask BLM to honor the national monument proclamation by developing a management alternative that gives full protection to t natural and historical values of the river and the uplands.

6100

Is there a provision to amend the plan if it doesn't work?

6101

Science should be the criteria for writing a plan, not public opinion.

All proposed projects within the Monument should be required to include a site assessment for impacts to fish and wildlife species, both in terms of each species immediate response, as well as the long-term effects on individuals, populations, and communities.

All maps/analysis should use freshest data available.

Roads (density) impact wildlife; especially big game.

Roads may have a negative effect on wildlife.

We must consider the cumulative impacts of all actions/activities. Important to leave large portion of this Monument with minimal impact. Don't overdevelop.

BLM and DOI specifically prepare a management plan which recognizes that the Monument is a small, inclusive, but significa portion of the federal wildlands/wilderness of this region.

For management accountability purposes, a quantifiable index of the overall impact of all human activities on the monument must be created as a regulatory standard of measurement for "protection" as defined in the Proclamation. (e.g. noise and lig pollution would be weighed in sum with river crowding, marks on the land and all other impacts for the net, total effect of peop on the Monument.

Inventory and map (with GPS for your GIS) all of the "objects" that the proclamation directs be protected.

We are concerned about the impact the proposed Roundup Power Plant will have on the air quality of the Monument and urg you to engage in that decision process.

All alternative scenarios should describe the character and uses of the Monument in 10, 15, or 25 years, and how the Monum will be protecting natural and historical objects, such as the legacy of Lewis and Clark.

We urge BLM to develop detailed, long-term projections of the character and use of the Monument under all the presented management alternatives.

6102

Is any money available from Undaunted Stewards to develop exclosures, etc. to address areas not meeting standards?

Any budget shortfalls for maintenance of the Monument should be appropriated through the Congress.

What dollars are available to do things/plans that have been identified?

Where are dollars coming from to pump toilets and pick up trash?

Will there be dollars to implement plan?

Congress should provide additional dollars.

Specialty license plates for raising funds.

Additional funding should come via budget request.

What is the cost for management of the Monument?

MWF believes that the Monument budget must include increased funding for combating invasive plant species.

We recommend to the Director of BLM and the Secretary of the Interior that the BLM be provided with personnel ceiling (FTE and budget to provide effective stewardship of the Monument in the critical years ahead.

We recommend that all administrative functions such as grazing, oil and gas, wildlife and historic site preservation be delegat to the Monument Manager. Of course appropriate staff should be assigned to the Monument office with these functions. This extremely important to facilitate functional coordination and development of working partnerships with grazing permittees, oil gas producers and others. This is also consistent with the heritage of BLM with one manager responsible for all resources.

MWF believes that there must be secured an adequate budget for law enforcement to ensure all regulations within the RMP a protective prescriptions within the Monument as directed by the Proclamation.

The Monument budget must include increased funding for combating invasive plant species.

Tell us what "budget" we have to make our wish list from. Having a budget would be a first.

BLM must obtain more funding for law enforcement and also must coordinate law enforcement with County and FWP. No management policy has meaning if it's not enforced.

Have enough staff to protect the special places.

6103

• There needs to be a mechanism for the expression and resolution of diverse interests re. The Monument and its manageme
• Local voices must be represented in this process.
• The management plan must not be seen to be imposed from above if cooperation of local communities and citizens is desir

I suggest that any management of the Monument, if it is to be successful, must have continuing input from local interests, tha without the cooperation of locals the management of the Monument will be fraught with difficulties. Although the scoping process has engaged in an informational program (summer 2002), solicited recommendations that have been compiled and digested, and will sponsor open meetings for public input (summer 2003), the issue of continuing public participation post-200 has yet to be comprehensively addressed.

• Establish a consensus council along the lines of the RAC and the sub-group, with representation by category of interests. Precedent already exists for a special designation council with the 1999 formation of the sub-group for river management.
• The council would be charged with advising the Lewistown BLM administrators of the Monument in much the same way as t CMRAC functions, except that its role would be specific to administrative (including policy) issues concerned with the Monument.
• Composition of the council need not be with respect to the same interest categories as the other RACs. Categories may we emerge from comments and suggestions generated in the scooping process. However, membership should be limited to loca area residents, however “local” may be defined. For example: no national representatives of environmental or sporting group no state government officials, no Cattleman Association or other special interest state officials. In other words, no representation by individuals who clearly have axes to grind and are less than concerned with the communities that surround Monument.

BLM should formally adopt a wildlife management team with Montana FWP and USFWS to maintain a streamlined process to address wildlife management issues.

It's very important that a cooperative effort with FWP and USFWS and your agency be organized to better manage all the valuable resources within the boundaries of the Monument.

RMP offers opportunity for FWP, DNRC to be more active in decisionmaking and on-the-ground activities.

Use Citizen Advisory Council to help determine when an allocation process is necessary.

Adopt (formally) a wildlife management team (MT FWP, USFWS, BLM) to streamline wildlife management issues.

Creation of an interagency multi-disciplinary advisory and management council to guide decisions and implementation of management alternatives.

If you allow self-interest groups to misrepresent their numbers via phone or letter writing "trees" and segment this public land into an elitist preserve you set the stage for more segmentation, and ultimate loss to the general public of our public lands.

Take all public comments with a grain of salt realizing their source is inherently self-interested.

The BLM should establish a RAC that is solely devoted to the Monument. The Monument's long-term issues are complex enough that it should have its own RAC.

Do not use the local RAC advisory group as the primary public information and advisory source for the administration of our federal lands administered by BLM, specifically the Missouri River corridor and the Monument.

The BLM should adopt a wildlife management team that includes the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks and the US Fish and Wildlife Service to streamline the process for addressing wildlife management issues.

Create a Monument Interagency Wildlife Management Council made up from officials from the BLM, the Montana Departmen Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service that would work cooperatively in all management decisions pertaining to the wildlife in the National Monument. Suggested topics that this Council would address include coordination of travel management rules with habitat security needs of targeted wildlife species; cross training and cooperative law enforcem endangered and threatened species; public relations with hunters and anglers; scientific land use planning for the benefit of wildlife.

The BLM can best meet this direction by setting up sideboards and then developing a stakeholder process to identify open ro and access restrictions within the monument. In our view, the following items are appropriate sideboards.

We believe a stakeholder group should come from a spectrum of users that includes bowhunters, big-game gun hunters, bird hunters, ORV users, recreationists, grazing permittees, and adjacent landowners.

Re quality of life locally and in the public interest: establish advisory council along the lines of the RAC for the purpose of continuing management of the Monument and possible review of the RMP. Council might be a sub-council of the Central Montana RAC, but probably better constituted as a stand-alone entity.

Create a Monument Interagency Wildlife Management Council made up from officials from BLM, Montana Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks, and US Fish and Wildlife Service that would work cooperatively in all management decisions pertaining to the wildlife in the National Monument. Suggested topics that this Council would address: coordination of travel management rules with habitat security needs of targeted wildlife species; cross-training and cooperative law enforcement; endangered an threatened species; public relations with hunters and anglers; scientific land use planning for the benefit of wildlife.

After reading the material obtained from your meeting, it seemed to me that perhaps you have already made up your mind on extensive road closures, as every topic discussed mentioned them.

Part of any management plan should include provisions making sure that the preservation can be carried out - through public education and cooperation with private landowners as well as through patrols and enforcement.

I feel you are trying to make this an exclusive club for a few who are calling the shots.

We believe that establishing working partnerships with state agencies, users, guides and landowners will continue to be an important aspect to the future management of the Monument. The land and water in the Monument is owned and managed b private landowners as well as the State of Montana, which has the responsibility of fish and wildlife management.

MWF believes that BLM can effectively meet this obligation by organizing a formal Monument Interagency Wildlife Manageme Council. Agency members of this council must include BLM, MFWP, and USFWS.

BLM cooperate with Montana FWP to manage wildlife.

Print a map that is not vague.

Educate the public about unauthorized changes to the land. Examples: developing airstrips and opening roads.

Although your agency is obligated to engage outside interested parties, those who actually hold the applicable existing rights uses must be given credibility during the decision making process.

Formalize agreement on wildlife with other agencies.

Need to consider all comments.

Shorter lines of communication, front end with FWS & FWP, look at activities with other agencies in the beginning.

We urge you to now thoroughly assess public input, identify subjects and issues that appear to be shared by significant portio of those offering input, and reflect those expressed public desires in your management alternatives.

Provide me and the political action committee of the AARP with a copy of the scheduled hearings relative to motorized travel its elimination in the Missouri Breaks.

BLM should work with appropriate state and federal agencies to develop and implement a plague management strategy to ensure that management levels of prairie dogs are maintained.

MWF supports the creation of a BLM- Citizens Watch Group within the Monument; i.e., Pryor Mountains Citizen Mgmt. Group

Because sage grouse occupy large areas year-round it is imperative that the BLM coordinates efforts with state and federal natural resource agencies, scientists, and private landowners to successfully implement the management practices. The judgment of local biologists is of utmost importance.

Establish community advisory boards.

Lessee notification of drilling sites on BLM lands.

My recommendation to BLM to effectively meet this obligation is to create a formal Monument Interagency Wildlife Manageme Council. Agency members of this council must include: BLM, Mt. Dept. of FWP, and USFWS. Individual participants should vary according to decisions being made. This council should supplant and incorporate all the piecemeal agency relationships currently in operation.

Examples of management topics this council could more effectively deal with include: coordination of travel management rule with habitat security needs of target wildlife species - cross-training and cooperative law enforcement - endangered and threatened species management - public relations with hunters and anglers - and comprehensive scientific land use panning and habitat enhancement for the benefit of wildlife.

The BLM should adopt an overall objective to manage fish and wildlife habitat to achieve and maintain viable natural populati population dynamics, biodiversity, and distributions in a way that protects Monument resources. The BLM should work with th Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to accomplish this.

Must ___ comments from all over the country – not just local area.

Need specific meetings and a public mechanism for input prior to closing any roads.

Need to be on the agenda for future reference.

What process will be used when closing roads? (Would the permittee, public, user be involved?)

The BLM should establish long-term collaboration with local communities, organizations, local and state agencies, Native American communities, outfitters and guides, and volunteers to plan for restoration, protection, and interpretation of historical sites.

Citizens who were unable to attend the workshop/open houses should have their comments quantified on a par with other pu comments.

Public input is needed when the decision is made concerning what roads will be closed.

6104

Congress enacted the American Antiquities Act of 1906 for the purpose of authorizing the President to declare by proclamatio historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures and other objects of historic or scientific interests located on federal land to be national monuments. This law makes no reference to protecting biological, geological, or visual objects and makes no mention of preserving the remote and scenic character of the area.

In addition, in July 2003, the Wyoming federal court held in State of Wyoming v. Veneman that a federal agency lacks author to adopt wilderness style management because Congress reserved to itself the authority to create wilderness. This principle applies equally to the monument. BLM cannot expand wilderness style management when those decisions are left to Congre

What is presidential authority to withdraw gas/oil on public lands? Reserve water rights? (Need straight answer to this.)

Additional NEPA should be done for exploration and development separate from this RMP process.

The Proclamation states that the monument spans 149 miles upstream from Fort Benton. That is incorrect and requires a revised proclamation.

If the BLM presumes the withdrawal declaration in the Proclamation to be valid, then the public should be specifically told how/where the President derived that authority. To do nothing only fosters a lack of public confidence in this process.

MSGA still contends the proclamation of the monument was inconsistent with designated monument boundaries. It is stated the document, "to reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area." With over 80,000 acres of private land included within the boundary, the requirements of the proclamation were clearly not met. Although legislation is now required to change the boundary, the original boundary designation was clearly flawed.

Because neither the Constitution nor Congress conveyed any mining/mineral withdrawal authority to the President, one can o conclude that the withdrawal declared in the Proclamation is without legal basis and should be rescinded.

In keeping with the value Americans place on physical activity in the outdoors, I welcomed the Executive Order by President George Bush regarding "Activities to Promote Personal Fitness" (6/20/02): http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020620-4.html and the accompanying Healthier US Initiative: http://www.wyhitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020620-6.html.

In the Executive Order, President Bush directs all federal agencies to develop new policies and programs to increase physica activity by the public to promote physical fitness. He specifically discusses the value of regular walking and advocates "promoting the use of public lands and water" to increase physical activity and promote personal fitness. I am eager to see h President Bush's Executive Order is utilized in managing the Missouri Breaks National Monument.

The current NEPA standards should be adopted as a Monument requirement and should not be simplified or streamlined to s administration development policies.

6500

If there is exploration for gas and find gas, we surely would like to see us being able to get it developed into wells that can be useful to all.

I see no reason why we cannot produce our own gas/petroleum products. We have resources in our country. Why should we have to go to foreign countries for products if we can produce at home.

What is the authority/law that allows a President to withdraw mining/mineral rights from Monument? Hint: It's not the Antiquit Act. Also, what is authority to reserve water from the Missouri?

The Monument boundary should not be diminished.