



Restoration of Native Species in High Elevation Aquatic Ecosystems Environmental Impact Statement

Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks

Public Scoping Comment Analysis Report
Part 2

Scoping Period: October 7 to November 21, 2009

January 2010

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE.....	2
INTRODUCTION	2
THE COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
Guide to This Document	4
CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT.....	6
Public Scoping Comment Summary Report	10
APPENDIX A – CORRESPONDENCE INDEXES	32
APPENDIX B – INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE AND INDIVIDUALS	58
APPENDIX C – INDEX BY CODE.....	60
APPENDIX D – QUESTIONS BROUGHT FORWARD AT PUBLIC MEETINGS.....	64
 Table 1. Comments Received by Correspondence Type.....	3
Table 2. Summary of Issue Topics, Codes, and Number of Comments Received.....	6
Table 3. Comments Received by State	7
Table 4. Comments Received by Country	8
Table 5. Comments Received by Commenter Type.....	9
Table 7. Index of Organizations	32
Table 8. Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters	32
Table 14. Index by Code.....	60

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

This document includes information and issues garnered from the second public scoping period for the proposed restoration of high elevation aquatic ecosystems project. Scoping occurred from October 7 through November 21, 2009. Part one of the scoping report includes public input that was received during the previous scoping for this project in 2007. Both reports will be utilized by the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks (parks) interdisciplinary planning team to identify issues and alternatives related to the proposed restoration of native species in high elevation aquatic ecosystems within the parks.

A notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement was published in the Federal Register for this project on October 7, 2009. Simultaneously, the National Park Service (NPS) provided information on the proposed project with a press release and/or letter by email or mail to more than 380 individuals, interest groups, agencies, and businesses on the parks' mailing list, and to 32 area tribes or tribal representatives. An additional press release was sent to the same mailing list informing the public about public informational meetings on the proposed project, which were held on November 5 in Three Rivers, CA and on November 13 in Fresno, CA.

Information about the project scoping was picked up by the Associated Press and was published in area newspapers and on the internet on various public and government websites. Area newspapers that published stories related to the proposed project and scoping include: The Kaweah Commonwealth (October 30), The Visalia Times Delta (October 27), and The Fresno Bee (October 26). Websites included: abclocal.go.com (October 26); cbs13.com (October 26); mercedsunstar.com (October 26); kcbs.com (October 26); fresnobee.com (October 26); ksrw.sierrawave.net (October 7); Save the Frogs (November 18); treehugger.com (November 22); National Parks Traveler (November 20); Sierra Forest Legacy (November 12); and redding.com (October 30). Also the story was broadcast on "The California Report" (November 16), which airs on various local radio stations in California.

In addition, further information was provided on the proposed project after scoping ended at Golden Gate Press (December 3) and at alternatives2toxics.org (December 16).

Two public informational meetings were held to provide information on the proposed project during the scoping period. Aquatic Ecologist Danny Boiano provided a presentation with background information on the proposal. The public was invited to ask questions and discuss issues during the presentations. There were 17 participants at the Three Rivers meeting and eight participants at the Fresno meeting. All information and questions provided by participants was documented and is included in this scoping report.

There were 709 comment letters received during the scoping period. Commenters provided input by a variety of methods, including letters, email, hand delivery, and through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) system. All comments received were entered into the PEPC database and are a part of the public record.

Table 1. Comments Received by Correspondence Type

Type	# of Correspondences
Web Form (PEPC)	13
Other	1
Letter	1
E-mail	694
Total	709

Of the 709 comment letters, 652 were one of two form letters and 54 letters were from individuals, two were from businesses, and two were from interest groups or their representative.

Each comment letter received was reviewed by the parks interdisciplinary team to determine the potential issues and impact topics related to the proposed project. This scoping report provides a synopsis of the comments generated during the second scoping period.

THE COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and correlate similar public comments into a format that can be used by decision makers and the Restoration of Native Species in High Elevation Aquatic Ecosystems EIS team. Comment analysis assists the team in organizing, clarifying, and addressing technical information pursuant to *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) regulations. It also aids in identifying the topics and issues to be evaluated and considered throughout the planning process.

The process includes five main components:

- developing a coding structure
- employing a comment database for comment management
- reading and coding of public comments
- interpreting and analyzing the comments to identify issues and themes
- preparing a comment summary

A coding structure was developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. The coding structure was derived from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during internal NPS scoping, past planning documents, and the comments themselves. The coding structure was designed to capture all comment content rather than to restrict or exclude any ideas.

The NPS PEPC database was used for management of the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic and issue. Some outputs from the database include tallies of the total number of correspondences and comments received, sorting and reporting of comments by a particular topic or issue, and demographic information regarding the sources of the comments.

Analysis of the public comments involved the assignment of the codes to statements made by the public in their letters, email messages, and written comment forms. All comments were read and analyzed, including those of a technical nature; opinions, feelings, and preferences of one element or one potential alternative over another; and comments of a personal or philosophical nature.

Although the analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, this content analysis report should be used with caution. Comments from people who chose to respond do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public. Furthermore, this was not a vote-counting process, and the emphasis was on the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received, or whether a commenter supported or opposed the proposed project or alternatives.

Definition of Terms

Primary terms used in the document are defined below.

Correspondence: A correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. It can be in the form of a letter, email, written comment form, note card, open house transcript, or petition.

Comment: A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It could include such information as opinions on the use of a potential management tool, to request or provide additional data regarding the existing condition, to provide information on laws and regulations, or provide an opinion debating the adequacy of an analysis.

Code: A grouping centered on a common subject. The codes were developed during the scoping process and are used to track major subjects throughout the EIS process. All scoping comments were considered to be important as useful guidance and public input to the scoping process, but only substantive comments were analyzed in the Public Scoping Comment Summary Report. At this phase of the project, almost all comments are treated as being substantive. No opinions expressing support or opposition for the proposed project are included in this summary.

Guide to This Document

This report is organized as follows:

Content Analysis Report- This is the basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code. The first section of the report provides a summary of the number of comments that were coded under each topic. The second section provides general demographic information, such as the states where commenters live, the number of letters received from different categories of organizations, etc.

Public Scoping Comment Summary- This report summarizes the substantive comments received during the scoping process. These comments are organized by codes and have been taken from the text of the public's comments.

Correspondence Index of Organizations- This table provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types as defined by PEPC (and in this order): businesses; conservation/preservation groups; federal government; university/professional society. Each piece of correspondence was assigned a unique identification number upon entry into PEPC. This number can be used to assist the public in identifying the way NPS addressed their comments.

Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters- This table provides a listing of all of the individuals who submitted comments during the initial public scoping period. Like the previous index, each correspondence was assigned a unique identification number which can be used to assist individuals in identifying the way in which NPS addressed their comments. This list is organized alphabetically.

Index By Organization Type- This list identifies all of the codes that were assigned to each individual piece of correspondence and is arranged by organization type. Individual commenters are also included in this report and are identified as Unaffiliated Individuals.

Index by Code- This table lists which commenters or authors (identified by PEPC organization type) commented on which topics, as identified by the codes used in this analysis. The report is organized by code, and under each code is a list of the authors who submitted comments that fell under that code, and their correspondence numbers. Those correspondences identified as N/A represent unaffiliated individuals.

CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT

Table 2. Summary of Issue Topics, Codes, and Number of Comments Received

Code	Description	# of Comments
AE12000	Affected Environment: Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat	2
AE22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use	3
AE30000	Affected Environment: Baseline information	569
AL1000	Alternatives: Elements Common To All Alternatives	1
AL2000	Alternatives: Alternatives Eliminated	1
AL3000	Alternatives: Envir. Preferred Alt./NEPA § .101&102	4
AL4000	Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements	32
AL6000	Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives	662
AL7000	Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered	7
AL8000	Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components	10
AQU1000	Aquatic Habitat: Affected Environment	1
AQU2000	Aquatic Habitat: Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems	7
AQU3000	Aquatic Habitat: Cumulative Effects	1
CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments	2
CL1000	Climate Change: Climate change analysis	3
CM3000	Cumulative Effects: General cumulative effects analysis	7
CO1000	Cost of Proposal	2
GA5000	Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives	10
INF1000	Informational: Available research and studies	7
MI1000	Mitigation: Suggested mitigation	1
MO1000	Monitoring: Monitoring and response plan for project success and/or failure	1
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	1
PN1000	Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy	1
PN11000	Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates	3
PN4000	Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	1
PN8000	Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action	13
SE4000	Socioeconomics: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	2
VE4000	Visitor Experience: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	1

VH100	VALUES - Value the history or cultural resources	1
VU4000	Visitor Use: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	3
WH4000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	7
WH5000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts	3
WI1000	Wilderness: Guiding Policies, Regs, Laws	1
WQ4000	Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	3
WQ5000	Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts	1
Total		1374

Table 3. Comments Received by State

State	Percentage	# of Correspondences
OK	1%	5
NJ	1%	10
MN	1%	6
UN	2%	14
AK	0%	3
CA	26%	188
ND	0%	2
AL	0%	2
PR	0%	1
MA	2%	14
VA	5%	36
AR	0%	3
NM	0%	3
WI	0%	3
MD	3%	20
TN	1%	4
OH	1%	8
NE	0%	2
KS	0%	1
IL	2%	12
ME	0%	3
MI	1%	5
GA	1%	4

UT	0%	3
NH	0%	2
CO	3%	21
NY	3%	22
MT	1%	4
RI	1%	4
DC	0%	3
SC	0%	3
IN	0%	3
WA	7%	50
ID	1%	7
MO	1%	8
MS	0%	1
CT	1%	9
FL	3%	23
LA	1%	4
NV	1%	4
TX	2%	11
VT	0%	1
HI	0%	2
AZ	2%	12
PA	1%	10
NC	2%	13
OR	2%	15
KY	0%	3
Total		709

Table 4. Comments Received by Country

Country	Percent	# of Correspondences
Not Provided	1%	5
South Africa	0%	2
Croatia	0%	2
Brazil	0%	1

United Kingdom	2%	16
United States of America	83%	587
New Zealand	0%	1
Nepal	0%	1
Spain	1%	4
Germany	0%	2
Australia	4%	29
Ecuador	0%	1
Greece	0%	1
Afghanistan	0%	1
Canada	6%	41
Belgium	0%	3
Bulgaria	0%	2
Sweden	0%	2
Switzerland	0%	1
Turkey	0%	1
Netherlands	0%	1
Colombia	0%	1
Portugal	0%	3
Italy	0%	1
Total		709

Table 5. Comments Received by Commenter Type

Organization Type	# of Correspondences
Business	2
Conservation/Preservation	2
Unaffiliated Individual	705
Total	709

Public Scoping Comment Summary Report

These comments were scanned and copied from letters, emails, and forms received during the initial public comment period from October 7 through November 21, 2009. They have been paraphrased or modified to clarify content, and to correct grammatical or spelling errors, but the intent of the comment has not been altered.

AE30000 Affected Environment: Baseline information

Correspondence Id: 708 Comment Id: 120718 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Overwhelming evidence shows that a fungus and not trout are the demise of the yellow-legged frog.

Correspondence Id: 708 Comment Id: 120717 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Trout have coexisted with frogs in the Sierras for over one hundred and fifty years without diminishing population until the last two decades, which coincides with the same period that the devastating Chytrid fungus has swept the world. According to John Biemer's article, we now know that the fungus has invaded the Sierras and is killing large numbers of yellow-legged frogs.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120712 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide all other locations of MYLF in California.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120711 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide data on food habit studies of MYLF in SEKI National Parks.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120694 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide a list of all aquatic species in these habitats, including all invertebrates.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120680 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Most of the science being done on amphibians now is pointing to the chytrid fungus as a significant cause of amphibian declines.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 276 Comment Id: 120654 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The presence of introduced fish pose a serious impediment to the recovery of these species. Evidence has also been accumulating that non-native fish greatly alter native ecosystems.

Correspondence Id: 1 Comment Id: 120650 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Do we know enough about the species life history requirements to ensure restoration success?

Correspondence Id: 343 Comment Id: 120628 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The cause of the decline of the yellow legged frog is a virus (not predation).

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120585 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: An exhaustive survey of ALL species should be undertaken in the lakes to be poisoned.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120591 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: More information is needed to illustrate how the population of MYLF in any given location obtains equilibrium. Should a surfeit of MYLF always be considered as undesirable?

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120594 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: We have little evidence from longitudinal studies to indicate whether or not the current populations of MYLF in any given location have reached equilibrium or whether they are, in fact, declining. MYLF populations have been devastated not only by predator fish, but also by disease, pesticides blown in from the Central Valley, and poor air quality.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120615 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide a specific description of historic populations of MYLF. A general map displaying the historical range is not sufficient as it is possible that certain drainages within the range did not have a population.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120616 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Identify lakes with historic populations of MYLF from which the populations have been extirpated. Note two subsets: Lakes with fish populations and those without. To the extent possible note when populations have become extirpated (point of this is that if extirpation occurs after 30, 40 to 100 years after introduction of fish then another mechanism may be responsible for extirpation. If extirpation occurred in lakes that never had fish then that is more evidence that another mechanism is present.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120617 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Identify lakes that have populations of fish and MYLF. (I would suggest that if such lakes exist that they not be treated as these would be case where for some reason the ecosystem is in some balance and to mess with it may put existing MYLF populations at risk)

Correspondence Id: 343 Comment Id: 120627 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The trout and frogs have been living together for over 150 years in the Sierras without a problem.

Correspondence Id: 13 Comment Id: 120632 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I don't think there is good evidence that the fish are eating the frogs, and the decline is most likely due to other factors. There is a world-wide decline in amphibian (sp?) species due to fungus problems.

Correspondence Id: 276 Comment Id: 120653 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Non-native fish are a contributing factor to the demise of the frogs, *Rana muscosa* and *R. sierrae*, which are currently candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 120658 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frogs were formerly one of the most abundant vertebrates in California, but have since disappeared from over 90% of the lakes they once inhabited, in large part due to the introduction of non-native trout.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120685 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: In high mountain lakes, fish may die out if not re-stocked.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120700 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Review the evidence that the prevailing cause of mountain yellow-legged frog decline is due only to exotic fish and chytrid fungus. Discuss chytrid fungus effects on MYL frogs in systems with native fish.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120701 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Analyze the historic role that rotenone formulations and antimycin have played in causing the declines of MYLF in California over the 60 or 70 years these poisons have been used by CDFG without public review or knowledge and by other entities.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120709 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide specific data showing evidence that chytrid resistance is emerging in sites that had large populations of MYLF prior to infection, as referred to in the Scoping Notice.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

AE12000 Affected Environment: Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120619 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Identify what wildlife populations use fish as a resource and how these populations would be affected.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120598 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Trout have managed to maintain a presence, even under fairly austere and sometimes nutrient-poor conditions. So, it seems to me that trout are much more adapted to life in these lakes than are MYLF.

AE22000 Affected Environment: Visitor Use

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120618 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Identify recreational uses within the backcountry that may be affected by the proposed action. (Including % of trips utilizing commercial packers that involve fishing).

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120605 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: One lake is not equal to any other lake. Each lake in the Park has its' own ambience and trout are part of this incredible experience. Each backpacker who fishes has memories of that special lake with special trout.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120596 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Remote lakes are the very fisheries that have provided indescribable joyful experiences of catching and eating trout for generations of backpackers! Knowing that trout await the ardent backpacker is part of the awesome experience that Sequoia and Kings Canyon Parks provide.

AL1000 Alternatives: Elements Common To All Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120673 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Public education should be a component of every alternative.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

AL2000 Alternatives: Alternatives Eliminated

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120676 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Antimycin is not registered for use in California Piscicides containing antimycin should not be considered in the range of alternatives because of their toxicity and nonregistration for use in California.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

AL3000 Alternatives: Environmentally Preferred Alt./NEPA § .101&102

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120606 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: This area has reached an equilibrium that the current plan will dramatically alter. With less diversity (no trout in nearly 100 lakes that formerly had trout), will there be maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources? The quality of renewable resources is not enhanced by destruction of several species in favor of one.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120603 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: NEPA Section 101 - Most of these lakes have had trout in them for more than 100 years (including prior to the start of Grinnell's study). That makes them important historic, cultural and natural aspects of our local heritage.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120602 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: NEPA Section 101 - The area has a wide range of beneficial uses of the environment RIGHT NOW, don't gamble with this incredible resource and the possibility of undesirable and unintended consequences.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120601 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: How does destruction of a fishery for the sake of another species (MYLF) fit with being a trustee of the environment?

AL4000 Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 120725 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Only apply Rotenone where gillnetting and electrofishing are impractical.

Correspondence Id: 707 Comment Id: 120722 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Given equals (in terms of MYLF restoration benefit) between a poor to average fishery trailside lake and a remote trail-less lake, priority for removal should be given to the trailside, more accessible, lake or basin. This appears to impact more anglers, but it should be kept in mind that very few of the lakes in Seki are easily accessible in terms of hiking distance, anyway. Those that seek accessible fisheries can fish roadside waters or other lakes outside of Seki that are easier to reach. For Seki backcountry anglers, remote, trail-less lakes are highly prized by the most dedicated hiker anglers.

Correspondence Id: 707 Comment Id: 120721 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: it appears as if priority is given to killing fish in more remote lakes, with the rationale that fewer anglers will be impacted. I disagree with this general approach and recommend one that is based more on the quality of the fisheries rather than accessibility. I recommend the following prioritization for fish removal: (A) Avoid removal of fish from lakes that have low density populations with large fish, if possible, because (1) such lakes are an uncommon prize for high lake anglers, given that the majority of Seki trout-bearing lakes do not grow particularly large trout and (2) low density trout populations have the highest potential to be able to coexist with MYLF anyway (as I am aware from both personal experience and having seen data on this). (B) Lakes overpopulated with stunted fish should have the top priority for fish removal.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120706 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Describe re-education program to prevent the general public and CDFG from making future introductions of non-native species into the project areas.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120687 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Non-native fish can be removed in many areas by mechanical, species-specific means (gill nets, seines) that do not impact non-target species.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120672 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Alternatives should also address limiting or controlling other activities in order to protect these aquatic ecosystems and MYLF in particular, including ceasing pesticide use in SEKI, controlling stock use to avoid adverse impacts, protecting riparian areas and wet meadows from adverse human impacts, limiting the spread of the chytrid fungus and working with other federal and state agencies to prevent pesticide use and drift in the High Sierra.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120671 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: NPS should also consider as an alternative a fully developed integrated species control plan. That is, instead of focusing only on an objective of fish eradication, review the potential of controlling, by

physical means, populations of fish to keep them below their critical threshold of concern instead of eradication, which can rarely be achieved.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120670 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: At least one alternative should include restrictions on recreational fishing in order to prevent the illegal transfer of fish from one lake to another, or using anglers appropriately as a means to removing fish from these lakes.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120669 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Pheromone traps could also be developed to trap unwanted fish.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120668 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: NPS should look creatively at using stimulus money or other appropriations to put people to work in SEKI doing manual fish removal. It is beneficial to the ecosystem and the economy.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 120647 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The yellow leg frogs exist in many of the lakes that have no trout and can continue to exist in those lakes while trout exist in others.

Correspondence Id: 2 Comment Id: 120644 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Let NATURE take its course for a change. If nature doesn't want those fish in those lakes any longer you can rest assured that nature will deal with the problem, on her own time table and at her own leisure. Our human intrusion is not necessary.

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 120642 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: These ecosystems are functioning just fine without our help. Leave them alone.

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 120641 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Let nature take care of itself.

Correspondence Id: 7 Comment Id: 120640 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I hope you can leave non native fish in many lakes and perhaps streams while still restoring yellow legged frogs and all other native animals, including invertebrates.

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 120639 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Alternative Solutions to poisoning: - Lift the limit restrictions to fisher men/women. - Allow fishing without license. - Use nets on the smaller lakes and ponds to relocate the trout. - Allow chumming. - Open trails/roads for accessibility. - Communicate lakes and ponds in jeopardy of poisoning. Post that such lakes and ponds are not subject to restrictions.

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 120637 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Tell the public to stop catch and release for a year.

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 120636 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Build something to keep the frogs from the fish.

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 120630 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Why not engage the public in solving the problem? Have a contest, with maps to the problem lakes and streams, say, in a discrete time period that allows you to study first whether this helps the frog population, before you feel you must resort to poison. Offer educational flyers on how to look out for and help protect frog habitat areas at the same time. Free camping for folks who catch at least one trout during a two-week contest period. Give overfishing a chance--we're so good at that elsewhere on the planet.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120624 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: My bias is towards preserving fish populations in fishing lakes with small populations of larger fish, not those overpopulated with stunted fish.

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 120614 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: There are a number of other management techniques to use as an approach to this dilemma; 1. Increase the limits on the lakes and streams that are over populated by trout 2. Increase angler awareness regarding the lakes and streams that are over populated by trout. 3. Create a federal fishing license yearly/monthly/daily/ & that would encourage visitors to fish the over-populated lakes and streams while visiting the national park. 4. Encourage angler groups to fish the overpopulated lakes and streams and to donate catch to homeless shelters. We should all be thinking of the best use of this resource. Poisoning the lakes and ecosystem needs to be the management technique of last resort.

Correspondence Id: 142 Comment Id: 120612 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: As an avid fly angler, I would like to see this project carried out in lakes that don't support big populations of catchable trout. There are lakes that are overpopulated with starving brook trout and provide little recreational fishing potential anyway and so wouldn't be overly missed. Such lakes, along with lakes that have difficult access and are seldom visited need to be considered before lakes that are near popular trails, especially those with populations of larger rainbows.

Correspondence Id: 300 Comment Id: 120611 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Fish are voracious predators of not only tadpoles, but also of eggs, as well as insects that provide food for amphibians. For all of these reasons, the Park should remove non-native fish from the Park.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120595 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Encourage populations of MYLF in remote areas where the efforts do not include destruction of trout fisheries.

Correspondence Id: 352 Comment Id: 120413 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Pay anglers by the pound for trout caught (although that may not be necessary given the fact

that trout are good eating). Publicize the program widely, and consider running busses to Fresno, and perhaps even Los Angeles to transport anglers.

Organization: Fienbaum Associates

Correspondence Id: 352 Comment Id: 120412 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Allow anglers access to the park (perhaps for a reduced fee) and do not require a fishing license.

Organization: Fienbaum Associates

Correspondence Id: 352 Comment Id: 120411 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: There are better ways to restore an ecosystem into which a non-native predator has been introduced. In New Zealand, for example, non-native deer were introduced to a series of islands off the coast. The government sponsored a highly successful round-up and relocation program. Closer to home, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has dealt with salmon predation by removing the pikeminnow from tributaries of the Columbia River. BPA pays anglers to catch the pikeminnow, and has done so for the past 10 years. The program is highly successful and has resulted in markedly increased salmon runs.

Organization: Fienbaum Associates

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120407 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Discourage 'catch and release.' Educate backcountry fishermen about the problem and encourage them to catch and eat or catch and discard.

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120406 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Encourage fishing in affected lakes by eliminating the requirement for a fishing permit and perhaps even offering some sort of small reward for evidence of each fish caught.

Correspondence Id: 344 Comment Id: 120397 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I would encourage the NPS personnel to reduce the number of lakes to be eradicated of fish and to examine other ways to have the public help catch the fish and enjoy the nourishment they provide in the high country.

Correspondence Id: 344 Comment Id: 120395 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Another proposal would be to only eradicate the trout in about five of the lakes in each of the seven water shed areas. This would reduce the goal of eradication of trout in 35 total lakes (including the 11 already treated) instead of 85. This would reduce the overall costs as well as possibly eliminate the need to use Rotenone (toxin to gill-breathing organisms).

Correspondence Id: 344 Comment Id: 120394 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I would think that some other alternatives could be used to add to the recreation of the hikers/public visitors and reduce the costs for the Government that is using our tax payers' money. One thing that could be done would be to eliminate or raise the limit of the number of fish that can be caught in certain lakes.

AL6000 Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives

Correspondence Id: 707 Comment Id: 120724 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Gillnetting by its very inefficient nature, buys time to be able to see how restoration and other aspects of the program are proceeding.

Correspondence Id: 354 Comment Id: 120610 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: These frogs have declined precipitously in recent years due to both trout predation and chytridiomycosis. We have a chance here to help mitigate at least one of those factors, in a situation where mitigation has clearly been shown to be beneficial.

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120409 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: There is no guarantee that it will have the desired effect because of the unknown influence of the fungus.

Correspondence Id: 346 Comment Id: 120387 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The frogs or shrimps will survive without killing all the lakes with rotenone or whatever you are using.

Correspondence Id: 411 Comment Id: 120398 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Removing non-native fish from Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks will be a significant step in preventing the imminent extinction of the Yellow-Legged Frogs (*Rana muscosa* and *R. sierrae*).

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120589 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: To think that all trout will be eradicated from a lake and associated riparian areas is very close to a pipe dream without several instances of chemical applications.

Correspondence Id: 2 Comment Id: 120643 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The artificial introduction of lake trout was certainly a questionable action. Do you sincerely believe that yet *another* questionable action will in any way whatsoever improve or fix what's already been done?

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120679 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Fish may be one factor in the decline of amphibians in the High Sierra, but fish may not be the primary impediment to their recovery.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 120659 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Based on highly-respected scientific research: remove non-native fish species and endangered frog populations recover quickly.

Correspondence Id: 592 Comment Id: 120657 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Remove non-native fish species and endangered frog populations recover quickly. This

technique has been proven effective, and holds support from scientists worldwide.

AL7000 Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120667 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: NPS should consider more than one alternative containing non-poison fish removal methods in order to evaluate the comparative impacts (economic and ecosystem) of different types and levels of non-poison methods. We have seen agencies propose an impractical non-poison alternative in the past, only to find it did not satisfy the purpose and need of the project or was too expensive.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 347 Comment Id: 120390 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Consider the full range of methods for eradicating nonnative fish from the targeted bodies of water.

Organization: California Wilderness Coalition

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120666 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: There should be more than three action alternatives.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120625 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide a range of alternatives, including clear criteria for treatment and reintroduction that meet the purpose and need of this project.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120621 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Your set of alternatives for addressing the purpose and need (implementing the proposed action) must be consistent with the conditions described and consistent with best available science, and should, to the extent possible reflect a concern for other values in addition to the restoration of the MYLF.

Correspondence Id: 348 Comment Id: 120401 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I hope there's a low tech way to do this without poisoning the waterways.

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120404 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Consider less environmentally dangerous alternatives than poisoning.

AL8000 Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components

Correspondence Id: 707 Comment Id: 120720 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I recommend transparency with respect to the identity of basins and lakes that are being considered in the planning stage. How can the angling public offer input if we have no idea which lakes are being considered? Again, there is little harm in divulging the preliminary planning list, and such full disclosure makes for much better public relations than withholding such information.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120695 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Present the schedule of poisoning by year and specify frequency of poisoning each habitat per year.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 142 Comment Id: 120613 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I would like to be able to access a list of lakes that have been treated to remove trout. It would be preferable to know before hiking into a high lake expecting recreational fishing that there is no such potential. Perhaps such a list could be posted on the national parks website, or given to visitors inquiring about back country trips.

Correspondence Id: 276 Comment Id: 120656 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The extent of area proposed for removal of fish is a small fraction of the total area inhabited by non-native fish.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120693 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Prepare a complete map of all lakes, streams, and springs that the NPS plans to poison.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120696 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: List exact formulations of poisons to be used, including all active and inactive ingredients by amount and percentage. Include composition of neutralization chemicals and describe methods of application of poisons.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 707 Comment Id: 120719 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: A major concern of any backcountry angler (probably the greatest concern) in the restoration process is transparency. No backcountry angler wants to put in a hard backpack to lake only to be surprised by gillnets. The list of lakes with fish removal operations (current and planned) should be accessible to the public, both online and at trailheads. As of now, such information trickles only to the very few persistent ones among us who happen to know the right people (I happen to be so privileged). Full disclosure is strongly encouraged and it will go a long way toward better public relations.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120708 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Give detailed information on how the dead fish will be dealt with.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120707 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Describe how the NPS will prevent transfer of fish from the 85%95% of other waters in the park to streams and lakes where fish will be/have been removed.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120703 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Discuss sources ("closest genetic forms available" referred to on p.3, column 2, Scoping Notice) for re-introduction of the MYLF after the frogs are extirpated by the poisoning.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

AQU1000 Aquatic Habitat: Affected Environment

Correspondence Id: 346 Comment Id: 120382 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: How many lakes in Yosemite and other locations have been killed for that same frog already? How many lakes have been killed off already in your park?

AQU2000 Aquatic Habitat: Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120699 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Explain how drifting stream invertebrates that have absorbed rotenone and moved out of the project area will remain out of the food chain in areas not to be poisoned.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120583 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: What other aquatic life, native or resident, in these lakes will be killed or threatened as a result of the poisoning?

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120586 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: It is possible that endangered populations of very small organisms will be destroyed and that they will never recover after a poisoning protocol is initiated. Amphibians (including MYLF) and a host of other life will suffer and die because of the rush to enhance MYLF populations.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120692 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Aquatic poisons have a high probability of eliminating rare and endemic aquatic invertebrate species. Some species are highly specialized and restricted to narrow, localized habitats. The aquatic habitats in wilderness areas and national parks are likely to contain such species. Once removed by poisoning, such species may never recover.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120686 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: In the High Sierra, non-native fish are a major impact on many species in previously fishless lakes, streams, and springs, including aquatic invertebrates.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120684 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The EIS should fully evaluate non-native fish impacts on all aquatic species.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120677 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Formulations of rotenone kill non-target species of aquatic invertebrates and amphibians, not just fish. These poisons have long-term impacts on aquatic and terrestrial food webs, on aquatic animal communities, and may lead to extinction of some native, aquatic, non-target species.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

AQU3000 Aquatic Habitat: Cumulative Effects

Correspondence Id: 344 Comment Id: 120396 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: It is also important to realize the best attempts to increase the number of yellow-legged frogs has been seriously degraded, due to the infectious pathogen Chytrid fungus (chytridiomycosis).

CL1000 Climate Change: Climate change analysis

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120690 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Disclose the carbon impacts of the manufacture, production and use of pesticides, and any helicopter use proposed for this project.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120689 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Please disclose, analyze and evaluate the cumulative impacts of global warming on these aquatic ecosystems and species to be protected by this project. The impacts of the changes already being seen in the High Sierra combined with proposed poisoning must be evaluated.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 1 Comment Id: 120648 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The project needs to consider the hydrologic regime of the lakes in the project area and how any climate change has and will alter this regime in the future say 100 years, in increments such as decades.

CC1000 Consultation and Coordination: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120661 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Please disclose CDFG's and DPR's involvement in this project.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120660 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: To the extent this project is being coordinated in any way with CDFG, the agencies should prepare a joint EIS/EIR so that both NEPA and CEQA's legal requirements are fulfilled. Even if CDFG is not involved, a joint EIS/EIR may still be required if other State of California agencies are involved.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

CO1000 Cost of Proposal

Correspondence Id: 13 Comment Id: 120633 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: This is a terrible waste of time and money, especially in this era of tight budgets for the park service.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120577 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I am fairly certain that the costs will exceed estimates since there will inevitably be problems with the methods that are currently planned. I am against expenditure of monies for projects that are a gamble at best.

CM3000 Cumulative Effects: General cumulative effects analysis

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120705 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Review the possible toxic interaction of various rotenone formulations with residues of other pesticides on aquatic life. Review the evidence that pesticide residue, including PCB residue, multiplies or adds to the toxicity of rotenone (or other aquatic poisons) to aquatic life. Discuss how the NPS can insure that non-target organisms will be protected from toxicological interactions between aquatic pesticides and air born pesticides already in the water. Discuss how the NPS plans to determine what species of invertebrates are sensitive to rotenone and other active ingredients in rotenone formulations (or antimycin formulas) and to interactions between rotenone and other chemicals already in the environment.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120698 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Explain how the NPS will assess possible cumulative effects of chemicals in the aquatic pesticides in the food chain.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120704 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Discuss evidence for current and historic pesticide residue in SEKI aquatic systems including annual increments from windblown particles onto snow and in rain. Discuss how these residues interact with chytrid fungus or other disease agents that are linked to frog declines.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120691 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Disclose all past, present and anticipated future pesticide applications in SEKI. We are aware that NPS has been using glyphosate formulations to treat invasive weeds. These types of projects are a cumulative impact to the ecosystems in question and certainly to amphibians.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120674 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: CDFG and USFWS have released a draft EIR/EIS for the statewide fish stocking and hatchery program. This program is a connected action and a cumulative impact to the proposed aquatic ecosystem restoration project. As long as fish stocking for recreational purposes remains legal in the state, and performed by lay people in addition to agency personnel, fish will continue to be stocked in inappropriate streams and lakes. They are often replanted "by mistake" by CDFG or the public. And as long as CDFG continues teaching people to grow and release fish that problem will continue. The EIS should fully disclose the cumulative impacts of CDFG's stocking program.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120588 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Humans are part of this equation and we should accept that there has been an impact and adjust our plans accordingly. This trout eradication plan does not factor in the long-term effects of humans in this area.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120675 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The EIS should carefully evaluate how continuing recreational fishing in many SEKI lakes can protect those aquatic ecosystems and others marked for fish removal. People have historically moved fish from one lake or stream to another in order to increase fish populations where there were few or none. This practice was historically condoned by CDFG and continues today. The EIS should address how these impacts can be mitigated, including angler education.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

GA5000 Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 707 Comment Id: 120723 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: In addition to its harm to a number of living creatures in the lake in addition to the trout, the problem with rotenone is that it does in fact kill so efficiently, so if emerging data should indicate that a change in management policy would be wise (i.e. that the killing may be unnecessary or harmful) there would be no chance for revision of policy.

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120678 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Rotenone is also strongly linked to Parkinson's disease in humans.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120714 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Poisoning will destroy the environment for a multitude of species in order to benefit primarily one particular species.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120715 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: What are the systemic factors that work to naturally control the population of the frog, for instance food supply and predators that might be affected by the sudden removal of a keystone species or by the poisoning process itself?

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120664 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: While it might take longer to remove fish without poisons, manual fish removals would have far fewer impacts (i.e., no need for chemical poisons, fewer impacts to non-target species, no water pollution, no helicopters needed, etc.).

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120622 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The key to your analysis is the Environmental Consequences, intended and unintended,

direct and indirect. I expect full disclosure, including effectiveness of removal in the face of the challenge of the chytrid fungus.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120579 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Poisoning presents a multitude of environmental problems that are not entirely understood at this time. Gill nets and electro-fishing methods would be more difficult (and more time consuming and expensive) but at least some of the environmental problems caused by poisoning of the ecosystem to destroy trout populations might be reduced.

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120403 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Large scale poisoning of otherwise pristine lakes in the high Sierra will definitely have unintended consequences. We won't know what those are until we have to deal with them years or decades down the road.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120580 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Trout eradication is unsightly and will present problems for all human, aquatic, and avian life that uses the lakes.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120623 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Also include in the environmental consequences the impacts of each alternative on other values.

INF1000 Informational: Available research and studies

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120713 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Clearly state any scientific information that would be important to have, that NPS does not have, prior to moving forward with any poisoning. If the extent of impacts is not fully known, the EIS must disclose that information and state how NPS can obtain it.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120682 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: A full disclosure and thorough analysis of all of this science must be presented in the EIS.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120681 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The skin of frogs contains peptides that inhibit the growth of the chytrid fungus, but in the presence of pesticides the skin peptide defenses are suppressed and the frog becomes susceptible to disease (i.e., chytrid fungus). Experiments have been done with the pesticide carbaryl and others. Cited below are two of the studies being conducted on this issue: Davidson, C., M.F. Benard, H.B. Shaffer, J.M. Parker, C. O'Leary, J.M. Conlon, L.A. Rollins-Smith. 2007. Effects of chytrid and carbaryl exposure on survival, growth, and skin peptide defenses in foothill yellow-legged frogs. *Environmental Science and Technology* 41(5):1771-1776. Tennessen, J.A. and eight other authors. 2009. Variations in the expressed antimicrobial peptide repertoire of northern leopard frog (*Rana pipiens*) populations suggest intraspecific differences in resistance to pathogens. *Developmental and Comparative Immunology* 33(12): 1247-1257.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120683 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Address the 2007 findings by Fellers, et al. which summarized the status of frogs that had been re-introduced into places in the park where they had disappeared. Fish had never been present in these places and were not a factor. They found that there was no evidence of frog reproduction and all life history stages had disappeared within 12 months. "Dispersal, weather, water quality, and predation do not appear to be causative agents...." This is consistent with the hypothesis that chytrid fungus and/or exposure to airborne pesticides caused both declines. Fellers, G.M., D. Bradford, D. Pratt, L.L. Wood. 2007. Demise of repatriated populations of mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana mucosa*) in the Sierra Nevada of California. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology* 2(1):5-21.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120710 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Provide location data and details on CDFG program "restoring" about a dozen lakes, as referred to in the Scoping Notice.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 354 Comment Id: 120609 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The scientific research is quite clear that when trout are removed, yellow-legged frog populations (which have been nearly extirpated throughout their range) have the chance to rebound (re: Vance Vredenburg and Roland Knapp's work. In particular, the paper by Vredenburg (2004) is available freely online through the journal PNAS).

Correspondence Id: 349 Comment Id: 120399 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: My PhD dissertation provided the first study that showed that *R. muscosa* can quickly recolonize lakes where non-native trout had been removed using gill nets (Vredenburg 2004). To my knowledge, this is the only management tool in the world that has been shown to reverse the decline of an endangered amphibian (the Global Amphibian Assessment considers both *Rana muscosa* and *Rana sierrae* to be endangered species). Since my dissertation work, removal of non-native trout has been shown to work in a number of sites across the Sierra Nevada and for both *Rana muscosa* and *Rana sierrae* (Knapp, Boiano, and Vredenburg 2008).

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120587 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Efforts in Desolation Wilderness Area south of Lake Tahoe, by the Forest Service and other agencies to enhance YLF populations do not include poisoning in their protocols. They knew that public outcry and biological damage to the ecosystem is not worth the advantage gained through efficiency and much lower costs.

MI1000 Mitigation: Suggested mitigation

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120405 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Evaluate carefully current stocking programs and cease any that might affect any of the regions of concern.

MO1000 Monitoring: Monitoring and response plan for project success and/or failure

Correspondence Id: 1 Comment Id: 120652 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Is there a monitoring program in place now to establish a baseline for restoration success?

PN8000 Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120665 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Manual fish removal must not be deemed infeasible by unnecessarily constraining the purpose and need.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120663 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The purpose and need also must not arbitrarily constrain the timing of the desired fish removals. The project is not an emergency.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120662 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The overarching purpose and need of this project appears to be "restoring aquatic ecosystems and native species." The purpose and need should also reflect that the natural aquatic ecosystems are a wilderness and park value to be protected. If this EIS is aimed at ecosystem protection and restoring wilderness values, which it should be, the purpose and need of the project should be defined accordingly.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 1 Comment Id: 120651 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Are we focusing on a single species and managing all of these lakes for that or are we going to focus on a guild or species assemblage which optimizes restoration success?

Correspondence Id: 9 Comment Id: 120638 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Please consider a greater number of people instead of a few purists. The parks should offer a multitude of outdoor activities and appeal to more than just a few. I really don't like the idea of park policy being driven by a few. Let's create a preserve for the frog so they are assured of survival but let's not limit humans in the equation. Keep the parks and backcountry lakes enjoyable for individuals and families who enjoy fishing.

Correspondence Id: 342 Comment Id: 120634 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Why mess up the streams with chemicals ?

Correspondence Id: 13 Comment Id: 120631 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Trout and native frog species have co-existed for 100 years and more in the Sierras. Why is this now a problem?

Correspondence Id: 56 Comment Id: 120629 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Any poisoning of any water body is never justified.

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120620 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Your purpose and need must be attentive to real conditions described in the affected environment.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120593 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Yellow-legged frogs are obviously not tolerant of competition or predation. Perhaps they are more resilient than we give them credit for: they have survived in these lakes despite all that humans have thrown at them. Do they really need our intervention to survive?

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120590 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: How many Mountain Yellow-Legged Frogs are enough?

Correspondence Id: 345 Comment Id: 120402 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Eliminating trout from up to 80 lakes is NOT removing trout from SEKI. Hundreds of lakes with non-native trout in SEKI will be left for anglers.

Correspondence Id: 347 Comment Id: 120388 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: If there is a conflict between human enjoyment of wilderness and the need to restore or protect natural ecosystems we believe that the latter is a much higher priority.

Organization: California Wilderness Coalition

PN1000 Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy

Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 120626 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The restoration programs for both Sequoia/Kings Canyon and Yosemite should be combined into a single unified process.

PN11000 Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120716 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Management with non-specific poison violates the National Park Service Management Policies.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120688 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The waters of SEKI have exceptional quality and most would qualify as Outstanding National Resource Waters. NPS should review EPA standards, guidelines, and examples for maintaining natural species in such waters under the Clean Water Act antidegradation provisions. While the Clean Water Act allows for temporary departure of water quality standards in special circumstances, it simultaneously requires full protection (no killing) of all native species.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120604 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Why must the current generations' values trump past generations' values?

PN4000 Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority

Correspondence Id: 276 Comment Id: 120655 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The presence of non-native fish in the Parks is not consistent with a goal of the National Park System to preserve native ecosystems and biota.

SE4000 Socioeconomics: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 120635 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I think you will be hurting the income to the parks as well as the fishing license, fishing supply stores, etc.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120599 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: There will be an economic cost to foothill communities where backpackers who fish often stop on their way up to Sequoia and Kings Canyon Parks. Visalia and Three Rivers are examples of communities that people stop at and spend money on food and other goods at a variety of vendors. If less people backpack because of this proposal there will be less money spent on the way to the park trailheads. I predict that Park receipts will also decline somewhat because of reduced collections of Park entry fees.

VE4000 Visitor Experience: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 120645 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Trout are no longer planted and exist due to their ability to survive naturally in these lakes. They provide a needed source of recreation and food for folks hiking and camping in the back-country. Generations of people who have hiked, back-packed, rode horses and accessed these lakes over the last 50 - 100 years have enjoyed the excitement of fishing these high altitude lakes, enjoyed the eating the trout and worked to preserve the area.

VH100 VALUES - Value the history or cultural resources

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120592 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: There are also historical and heritage factors to consider: I personally know families who view these lakes and these trout with strong reverence and respect. This proposal is going to destroy a fishery that they and their family have utilized for more than 60 years. Trout fishing in high Sierra lakes often in specific locations is a part of these families' ethnic heritage.

VU4000 Visitor Use: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120600 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: If this project goes forward as planned, the future will not have the same recreational opportunities that existed in the past.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120581 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Problems of poisoning - Dead and decaying trout are not pleasant to view or smell.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120578 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Humans planted trout in these lakes close to 100 years ago in many cases. Anecdotal evidence would include stocking by Basque sheep herders around the turn of the last century and other early pioneers in the area who planted trout whenever the opportunity presented itself. The trout have become an integral part of the Park experience for generations of backpackers.

WH4000 Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120702 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Discuss how the use of aquatic poisons will affect the MYLF, a species that remains in the water as a tadpole for up to four years and is aquatic as an adult.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 356 Comment Id: 120697 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Analyze the food web effects of poisoning on terrestrial as well as aquatic communities. Include birds, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and terrestrial invertebrates that depend on emerging insects for food as well as those that depend on aquatic invertebrate forms for food.

Organization: Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 120646 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I have observed bear catching these fish so I suspect they also benefit from this additional food source.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120597 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Fishing pressure on native Golden Trout (or even hybrid Golden Trout) will increase and their populations may suffer accordingly.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120584 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Poisoning the riparian fluvial environments has significant impacts, not only in the immediate area of the lake or stream but throughout the ecosystem. Raccoons and other animals that depend on the trout and other animals living in the water will suffer a significant depletion of a food source that they rely on.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 120582 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: What about all of the migratory ducks and geese that use these lakes for a resting spot? How will migratory waterfowl that utilize these lakes for resting spots be affected by both the poisoning itself and the eco-system change that will result? What effect will the removal of a food source for Golden Eagles and Bald Eagles affect the survival rate of those species?

Correspondence Id: 344 Comment Id: 120393 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: I am concerned that, although the park's reports include the staggering number of trout that were caught and killed (23,000), there is no mention of any other animals or fowl being caught and killed unintentionally. This could be a negative impact on the population of natural species of birds, animals and other things that were not suppose to be caught and killed.

WH5000 Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts

Correspondence Id: 351 Comment Id: 120607 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Why use poisons to kill healthy trout when you acknowledge that a mystery virus may be the true cause of harm to frogs?

Correspondence Id: 349 Comment Id: 120400 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Given the chance these [frog] species will bounce back and current research on chytridiomycosis shows that some populations are able to survive the epidemic currently sweeping across the Sierra Nevada.

WI1000 Wilderness: Guiding Policies, Regs, Laws

Correspondence Id: 347 Comment Id: 120392 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Discuss in the EIS of how each alternative will comply with the Wilderness Act and the NPS' wilderness policies and regulations.

Organization: California Wilderness Coalition

WQ4000 Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 120608 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The Rotenone chemical compound will be put into our pristine snow melt fed lakes and streams to kill all of the trout. This is the water that will eventually service the lodge and drink.

Organization: Sierra Lodge

Correspondence Id: 352 Comment Id: 120410 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: Although you contend that the poison you will use is non-toxic to humans, I question whether that matter has been studied fully, especially as it relates to children. Furthermore no poison that kills trout can be "safe" for every other living species.

Organization: Fienbaum Associates

Correspondence Id: 353 Comment Id: 120408 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: The negative environmental effects [of poison] could be significant, and I'm also concerned about ingesting the poison, as I and my family certainly will when we drink the water.

WQ5000 Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts

Correspondence Id: 1 Comment Id: 120649 Coder's Initials: NEH

Comment Text: How will acidic deposition impact the lakes and the life cycle of the YLF?

APPENDIX A – Correspondence Indexes

Table 6. Index of Organizations

Correspondence ID	Receipt Date	Name	Organization
Businesses			
352	11/20/2009	Bob Fienbaum	Fienbaum Associates
18	11/19/2009	Dave W. Paradis	Sierra Lodge
Conservation/Preservation			
347	11/23/2009	Ryan Henson	California Wilderness Coalition
356	11/19/2009	Julia Olson	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, and High Sierra Hikers

Table 7. Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters

UN = Unknown

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	State/Province	Country
1	No	Kept Private	MD	USA
2	No	Kept Private	MA	USA
3	No	Kept Private	CA	USA
4	No	Koch, Tom	UN	USA
5	No	Bissiri, Mark	CA	USA
6	No	Public, Jean	UN	USA
7	No	Unger, Art	CA	USA
8	No	Kept Private	CA	USA
9	No	Ommen, Terry L.	CA	USA
10	No	N/A, N/A	UN	USA
11	No	Serverian, Marianne	UN	USA
12	No	Kept Private	CA	USA
13	No	Kept Private	CA	USA
14	No	Early, Gayle	CA	USA
15	No	Wakabayashi, John	CA	USA
16	No	Kept Private	CA	USA
17	No	Arroues, Kerry D.	CA	USA
18	No	Paradis, Dave W.	CA	USA
19	Master (414156)	Owen , Rochelle	WA	USA

20	Yes (414156)	Streicher, Jeff	TX	USA
21	Yes (414156)	Johnstone, Ruben	VA	USA
22	Yes (414156)	Marsden, Danielle	OT	GBR
23	Yes (414156)	Richards, Hazel	OT	GBR
24	Yes (414156)	Jackley, Julia	OR	USA
25	Yes (414156)	Boggs, James	AZ	USA
26	Yes (414156)	Hager, Tamara	VA	USA
27	Yes (414156)	Warren, Madeline	England	GBR
28	Yes (414156)	Wilson, Nicole	NC	USA
29	Yes (414156)	Skelton, Alisha	British Columbia	CAN
30	Yes (414156)	Hurd, Judith	MA	USA
31	Yes (414156)	Hucul, Bernard	British Columbia	CAN
32	Yes (414156)	Woodall, Helen	UN	AUS
33	Yes (414156)	oran, ebru	Turkey	TUR
34	Yes (414156)	Lazaroff, Cat	MD	USA
35	Yes (414156)	bailey, tucker	NC	USA
36	Yes (414156)	Ackerman, Laura	WA	USA
37	Yes (414156)	Muul, Kersti	WA	USA
38	Yes (414156)	Jordan, Meyer	FL	USA
39	Yes (414156)	Ayers, Karin	CO	USA
40	Yes (414156)	Argo, Allison	MA	USA
41	Yes (414156)	Hocking, Dan	NH	USA
42	Yes (414156)	Smith, Geoff	MT	USA
43	Yes (414156)	Burgoyne, Doug	British Columbia	CAN
44	Yes (414156)	Wake, David & Marvalee	CA	USA
45	Yes (414156)	Klehn, Leah	NY	USA
46	Yes (414156)	L, Carmen	Spain	ESP
47	Yes	Westerman, Albert	KY	USA

	(414156)			
48	Yes (414156)	Janicelli, Barbara	FL	USA
49	Yes (414156)	Tompkins, Arlene	MI	USA
50	Yes (414156)	Bray, Rebecca Dr. D.	VA	USA
51	Yes (414156)	Moriarity, Julia	MO	USA
52	Yes (414156)	Bryant, Jessica	CA	USA
53	Yes (414156)	Freeman, Lisa	WI	USA
54	No	Friesema , Paul	IL	USA
55	No	Jones, Nancy	CA	USA
56	No	Public, Jean	NJ	USA
57	No	Williams, Michael	OR	USA
58	Yes (414156)	Higgins, Cathy	IN	USA
59	Yes (414156)	Proudman, John	VA	USA
60	Yes (414156)	Outman, Deborah	GA	USA
61	Yes (414156)	Groner, Maya	PA	USA
62	Yes (414156)	Olivares, Michele	CA	USA
63	Yes (414156)	Kiehl, Tim-Rasmus	Ontario	CAN
64	Yes (414156)	Rosado, Jaime	OT	PRT
65	Yes (414156)	Spear, Stephen	WA	USA
66	Yes (414156)	Rohr, Jason	FL	USA
67	Yes (414156)	Spencer, Carol	CA	USA
68	Yes (414156)	Doyle, Janet	VA	USA
69	Yes (414156)	Koo, Michelle	CA	USA
70	Yes (414156)	Miller, Sarah	GA	USA
71	Yes (414156)	Powell, Gary	TX	USA
72	Yes (414156)	Parfitt, Janet	Somerset	GBR
73	Yes (414156)	Woods, Ryan	KS	USA
74	Yes (414156)	Avramov, Stefan	Bulgaria	BGR
75	Yes (414156)	Copernik, Perla	MD	USA
76	Yes (414156)	Beatty, Gabriele	WA	USA

77	Yes (414156)	Walters, Sandra	ID	USA
78	Yes (414156)	Davis, Liora	FL	USA
79	Yes (414156)	Heemeyer, Jennifer	IN	USA
80	Yes (414156)	Gildersleeve, Steve	MN	USA
81	Yes (414156)	Ohmer, Michel	CA	USA
82	Yes (414156)	Ro, Ro	WA	USA
83	Yes (414156)	Silverman, Francine	CA	USA
84	Yes (414156)	Dixson, Marcie	FL	USA
85	Yes (414156)	Smith, Mike	England	GBR
86	Yes (414156)	Andersson, Magdalena	Sweden	SWE
87	Yes (414156)	Ayliff, Lucinda	VA	USA
88	Yes (414156)	Harris, Megan	CA	USA
89	Yes (414156)	Dale, James	UK	GBR
90	Yes (414156)	Binder, Breanna	VA	USA
91	Yes (414156)	Noble, Lorraine	British Columbia	CAN
92	Yes (414156)	Beidel, Jennifer	VA	USA
93	Yes (414156)	Dennis, Gudrun	FL	USA
94	Yes (414156)	Castro, Jessica	FL	USA
95	Yes (414156)	Krause, Donald	IL	USA
96	Yes (414156)	Krause, Janet	IL	USA
97	Yes (414156)	Beard, Becky	DC	USA
98	Yes (414156)	Gross, Joyce	CA	USA
99	Yes (414156)	De Groot, Judy	FL	USA
100	Yes (414156)	Luliucci, Danielle	NY	USA
101	Yes (414156)	Hendrickson, Kristi	WA	USA
102	Yes (414156)	Williamson, Beth	CO	USA
103	Yes (414156)	Straughter, Lola	FL	USA
104	Yes	Moriarity, Ann	MO	USA

	(414156)			
105	Yes (414156)	Sheetenhelm, Erika	CA	USA
106	Yes (414156)	Van Sluys, Monique	Brazil	BRA
107	Yes (414156)	Subnet, Suzanne	NY	USA
108	Yes (414156)	Bond, Erin	UT	USA
109	Yes (414156)	Popowski, Kathleen	WA	USA
110	Yes (414156)	Bishop, Meghan	CA	USA
111	Yes (414156)	Boggs, James	AZ	USA
112	Yes (414156)	Howse, Jennifer	AZ	USA
113	Yes (414156)	Brokaw, Vanessa	CT	USA
114	Yes (414156)	Mead, Heidi	SC	USA
115	Yes (414156)	Hiemstra, Jordan	Ontario	CAN
116	Yes (414156)	Skene, Jennifer	CA	USA
117	Yes (414156)	Reynolds, John	TX	USA
118	Yes (414156)	Newberger, Tim	CA	USA
119	Yes (414156)	Devitt, Tom	MA	USA
120	Yes (414156)	MacKenzie, Jason	CA	USA
121	Yes (414156)	Sousa, Jennifer	RI	USA
122	Yes (414156)	Wright, Tia	MD	USA
123	Yes (414156)	D'Amore, Nina	CA	USA
124	Yes (414156)	Poorten, Tom	ID	USA
125	Yes (414156)	Sheehan, Nancy	NY	USA
126	Yes (414156)	Gardner, Wilma	CA	USA
127	Yes (414156)	Lewis, Todd	England	GBR
128	Yes (414156)	Routman, Eric	CA	USA
129	Yes (414156)	Upson, Kirsten	CA	USA
130	Yes (414156)	Koppelberger, Hannah	VA	USA
131	Yes (414156)	Ferguson, Aeronica	OK	USA

132	Yes (414156)	Reyes, Marco	Equador	ECU
133	Yes (414156)	Catenazzi, Alessandro	CA	USA
134	Yes (414156)	Catenazzi, Alessandro	CA	USA
135	Yes (414156)	Hall, Erin	OR	USA
136	Yes (414156)	Dubas, Catherine	VA	USA
137	Yes (414156)	Lam, Brianna	VA	USA
138	Yes (414156)	Barron, Laurence	OR	USA
139	Yes (414156)	Rowley, Jodi	UN	
140	Yes (414156)	Hoffmann, Michael	DC	USA
141	Yes (414156)	Van Dernoot Lipsky, Laura	WA	USA
142	No	N/A, N/A	UN	USA
143	Yes (414156)	Ginn, Leon	PA	USA
144	Yes (414156)	O'Brien, Aileen	LA	USA
145	Yes (414156)	Grinavic, Tierney	MD	USA
146	Yes (414156)	Ayliff, Bruce	VA	USA
147	Yes (414156)	Popowski, Kathy	WA	USA
148	Yes (414156)	Carlson, Stacy	CA	USA
149	Yes (414156)	Smith, Janet	British Columbia	CAN
150	Yes (414156)	Pat, Gran	TX	USA
151	Yes (414156)	Reeder, Micheline	CA	USA
152	Yes (414156)	Mueller, Rachel	CO	USA
153	Yes (414156)	Schwartz, Rachel	CO	USA
154	Yes (414156)	Hoke, Kim	CO	USA
155	Yes (414156)	Smith, Chris	CA	USA
156	Yes (414156)	Scott, Steve	WA	USA
157	Yes (414156)	Bricker, Nelson	IN	USA
158	Yes (414156)	Ferguson, Sheryl	CO	USA
159	Yes (414156)	Perizzolo, Vicki	CA	USA

160	Yes (414156)	Hornberger, Danielle	CA	USA
161	Yes (414156)	Miller, Melissa	TX	USA
162	Yes (414156)	Milani, Kevin	CA	USA
163	Yes (414156)	Colson, Stephanie	OK	USA
164	Yes (414156)	Finlay, Jacques	MN	USA
165	Yes (414156)	Hoke, Robyn	CA	USA
166	Yes (414156)	Burrowes, Patricia	PR	USA
167	Yes (414156)	Maness, Rhonda	AL	USA
168	Yes (414156)	Shields, Robert	CA	USA
169	Yes (414156)	K, Lily	CA	USA
170	Yes (414156)	Samachisa, Julia	CA	USA
171	Yes (414156)	Barkow, Carolyn	CA	USA
172	Yes (414156)	Roederer, David	CO	USA
173	Yes (414156)	Hoke, Suzanne	NJ	USA
174	Yes (414156)	Hardy, H. Nick	FL	USA
175	Yes (414156)	Horning, Laura	OH	USA
176	Yes (414156)	Werner, Jen	AZ	USA
177	Yes (414156)	Engler, Michelle	CA	
178	Yes (414156)	Frischer, David	CA	USA
179	Yes (414156)	Wimmer, Vanessa	WA	USA
180	Yes (414156)	Sharp, Patricia	OR	USA
181	Yes (414156)	Laycock, Margaret	CA	USA
182	Yes (414156)	Prasad, Menita	British Columbia	CAN
183	Yes (414156)	Bercier, Frankie	ND	USA
184	Yes (414156)	Tyler, Steve	CA	USA
185	Yes (414156)	Gerrie, Philip	CA	USA
186	Yes (414156)	Jones, Nicholas	CO	USA
187	Yes	Sousa, Wayne	CA	USA

	(414156)			
188	Yes (414156)	Nel, Sonya	OT	CAN
189	Yes (414156)	T., Mandi	CA	USA
190	Yes (414156)	Uang, Elaine	CA	USA
191	Yes (414156)	Risman, Daniella	CA	USA
192	Yes (414156)	Bravo, Nereida	CA	USA
193	Yes (414156)	Martinez-Solano, Inigo	Spain	ESP
194	Yes (414156)	Small, Gretchen	AK	USA
195	Yes (414156)	Beal, Chris	OT	CAN
196	Yes (414156)	Foley, Mary	CA	USA
197	Yes (414156)	Earl, Rhoderick	South Wales U.K.	GBR
198	Yes (414156)	Minbiole, Kevin	VA	USA
199	Yes (414156)	Daly, Christy	PA	USA
200	Yes (414156)	Faber, Rachel	NJ	USA
201	Yes (414156)	Greinke, Pamylle	NY	USA
202	Yes (414156)	Paduraru, Mariana	GA	USA
203	Yes (414156)	Pearlberg, Gerry	NY	USA
204	Yes (414156)	Bauerle-berg, Kathleen	MD	USA
205	Yes (414156)	Casey, Liz	Ontario	CAN
206	Yes (414156)	Lewis, Phil	England	GBR
207	Yes (414156)	Buslot, Chantal	OT	CAN
208	Yes (414156)	G., Raja	OT	CAN
209	Yes (414156)	Becker, Matthew	VA	USA
210	Yes (414156)	Davis, Cynthia	VA	USA
211	Yes (414156)	Rudin, David	CO	USA
212	Yes (414156)	Milani, Gina	CA	USA
213	Yes (414156)	Smith, Jeff	UT	USA
214	Yes (414156)	East, Denise	CA	USA

215	Yes (414156)	Peterman, Bill	MO	USA
216	Yes (414156)	Creusere, F. Michael	KY	USA
217	Yes (414156)	Mikasa, Gail	CA	AFG
218	Yes (414156)	Francis, Colleen	CA	USA
219	Yes (414156)	Refuerzo, Judy	CA	USA
220	Yes (414156)	Wesp, Linda	IL	USA
221	Yes (414156)	Gunter, Stuart	VA	USA
222	Yes (414156)	Zuniga, Liliana	CA	USA
223	Yes (414156)	Manolesco-Ami, Alexandra Marcella	Ontario	CAN
224	Yes (414156)	Reynolds, Chanel	WA	USA
225	Yes (414156)	Sheehy, Michael	CA	USA
226	Yes (414156)	Brennan, Julia	IL	USA
227	Yes (414156)	Katona, Lisa	IL	USA
228	Yes (414156)	Davidson, Elizabeth	AZ	USA
229	Yes (414156)	Zink, Andrew	CA	USA
230	Yes (414156)	Parkaceva, Ivona	OT	CAN
231	Yes (414156)	Wesley, C	England	GBR
232	Yes (414156)	Navarrete, Isamara	CA	USA
233	Yes (414156)	Goad, Kristine	NC	USA
234	Yes (414156)	Opiniano, Laurence	WA	USA
235	Yes (414156)	Vincent, Kim	CA	USA
236	Yes (414156)	Swei, Andrea	CA	USA
237	Yes (414156)	Samachisa, George	CA	USA
238	Yes (414156)	Dyrdahl, Kari	MN	USA
239	Yes (414156)	Kerkhofs, Rita	Belgium	BEL
240	Yes (414156)	Tan, Stephen	WA	USA
241	Yes (414156)	Gardiner, Julia	CA	USA
242	Yes	Walke, Jenifer	VA	USA

	(414156)			
243	Yes (414156)	Perry, Laura	NY	USA
244	Yes (414156)	Hingley, Jonah	VA	USA
245	Yes (414156)	Dodge, Celeste	CA	USA
246	Yes (414156)	Brown, Robin	KY	USA
247	Yes (414156)	Ward, Terone	CA	USA
248	Yes (414156)	Victorica, Alberto	CA	USA
249	Yes (414156)	Williams, Akhee	CA	USA
250	Yes (414156)	Sheehan, Katie	CA	USA
251	Yes (414156)	Walker, Treca	NM	USA
252	Yes (414156)	Clasen, Liz	NC	USA
253	Yes (414156)	Raulinaitis, Audra	IL	USA
254	Yes (414156)	Todgham, Anne	CA	USA
255	Yes (414156)	McFadden, Michael	IL	USA
256	Yes (414156)	Hall, Evan	Ontario	CAN
257	Yes (414156)	Cheng, Tina	CA	USA
258	Yes (414156)	Schloegel, Lisa	NY	USA
259	Yes (414156)	Clouser, Judy	CA	USA
260	Yes (414156)	Furman, Deanna	CA	USA
261	Yes (414156)	Derri, Jennifer	NY	USA
262	Yes (414156)	Zweifler, Franceska	NY	USA
263	Yes (414156)	Milligan, Sue	British Columbia	CAN
264	Yes (414156)	Sharp, Doug	CA	USA
265	Yes (414156)	Boisvert, Elizabeth	CA	USA
266	Yes (414156)	Knight, Barb	NC	USA
267	Yes (414156)	Stoelting, Ricka	CA	USA
268	Yes (414156)	Sullivan, Sherri	CA	USA
269	Yes (414156)	Sprinkle, Judy	CA	USA

270	Yes (414156)	Feldman, Krishna	CA	USA
271	Yes (414156)	Keever, Megan	CA	USA
272	Yes (414156)	Fox-Fernandez, Irvin	CA	USA
273	Yes (414156)	Kupferberg, Sarah	CA	USA
274	Yes (414156)	Prater, Stacy	CA	USA
275	Yes (414156)	Campbell, Ida Mae	MA	USA
276	No	Bradford , David F.	NV	USA
277	Yes (414156)	Marangio, Michael	CA	USA
278	Yes (414156)	Roland, Jelica	UN	
279	Yes (414156)	McQuillen, Harry	CA	USA
280	Yes (414156)	Thomas, Scott	AK	USA
281	Yes (414156)	Miller, Lisa	WI	USA
282	Yes (414156)	Schaeffer, Paul	OH	USA
283	Yes (414156)	Wong, David	Australia,	AUS
284	Yes (414156)	Saturen, Ben	CA	USA
285	Yes (414156)	Williams, Yvette	UN	
286	Yes (414156)	Perks, Sharron	Australia	AUS
287	Yes (414156)	Kelehear, Crystal	Australia	AUS
288	Yes (414156)	Hollingsworth, Gemma	OT	CAN
289	Yes (414156)	Sumner, Joanna	australia	AUS
290	Yes (414156)	Bordbar, Robert	MD	USA
291	Yes (414156)	Bray, Dianne	Australia	AUS
292	Yes (414156)	Ford, Stewart	Australia	AUS
293	Yes (414156)	Mitchell, Jeffrey	CA	USA
294	Yes (414156)	Fontaine, Anna Louise E.	Quebec	CAN
295	Yes (414156)	Shemai, Barak	CA	USA
296	Yes (414156)	Oliver, Deb	Australia	AUS
297	Yes (414156)	Valenzuela, Kerri	CA	USA

298	Yes (414156)	Simpkins, Clay	UN	
299	Yes (414156)	Saylor, Lorelei	CA	USA
300	No	Buckley, John	CA	USA
301	Yes (414156)	Martin, Aletta	MO	USA
302	Yes (414156)	Kowalski, Ginny	NJ	USA
303	Yes (414156)	Biro, Dr. Peter	Australia	AUS
304	Yes (414156)	Fenner, Aaron	Australia	AUS
305	Yes (414156)	Opiniano, Michelle	WA	USA
306	Yes (414156)	Beckmann, Christa	Australia	AUS
307	Yes (414156)	Feldman, Kenneth & Jane A	WA	USA
308	Yes (414156)	Clause, Adam	CA	USA
309	Yes (414156)	Heard, Geoffrey	Australia	AUS
310	Yes (414156)	Feldman, Ann	WA	USA
311	Yes (414156)	Winans, Sheryl	MD	USA
312	Yes (414156)	Levy, Robert	NY	USA
313	Yes (414156)	Hemmings, Viktoria	NV	USA
314	Yes (414156)	Raftery, Samantha	British Columbia	CAN
315	Yes (414156)	Stinnett, Ken	NM	USA
316	Yes (414156)	Child, Travis	OT	CAN
317	Yes (414156)	Phelps, Jennifer	CA	USA
318	Yes (414156)	Tewell, Kevin	WA	USA
319	Yes (414156)	Hall, Samantha	DC	USA
320	Yes (414156)	Ritchie, Euan	Australia	AUS
321	Potential (415488)	Wong, David	British Columbia	CAN
322	Yes (414156)	Rovito, Sean	CA	USA
323	Yes (414156)	Genova, Marina	OT	CAN
324	Yes (414156)	Nuske, Susan	Australia	AUS
325	Yes (414156)	Macdonald, Stewart	OT	CAN

326	Yes (414156)	Frog, Big	MD	USA
327	Yes (414156)	Meredith, Helen	England	GBR
328	Yes (414156)	Padilla, Anne	NM	USA
329	Yes (414156)	Milmoe, Joe	VA	USA
330	Yes (414156)	Spencer, Tom	Australia	AUS
331	Yes (414156)	Nickles, Laura	VA	USA
332	Yes (414156)	Rohrbaugh, Lindsay	MD	USA
333	Yes (414156)	Sartore, Joel	NE	USA
334	Yes (414156)	Tompkins, Arlene	MI	USA
335	Yes (414156)	Le, Trisha	CA	USA
336	Yes (414156)	Manthoyianni, Evangelia	Greece	GRC
337	Yes (414156)	Merkel, Barbara	VA	USA
338	Yes (414156)	Holland, Jennifer	MD	USA
339	Yes (414156)	Salinas, Taryn	VA	USA
340	Yes (414156)	Julien, Melissa	TN	USA
341	Yes (414156)	Riley, Chris	MT	USA
342	No	Hayes, Harry	CA	USA
343	No	Boothroyd, Bert	UN	USA
344	No	Duba, Larry	CA	USA
345	No	James, Richard	UN	USA
346	No	Franks, Ken	CA	USA
347	No	Henson, Ryan	CA	USA
348	No	Hood, Timonie	CA	USA
349	No	Vredenburg, Vance	CA	USA
350	No	Mo, Michelle	CA	USA
351	No	Pfadisch, Armin	CA	USA
352	No	Fienbaum, Bob	UN	USA
353	No	Kane, Dan	CA	USA
354	No	Whittaker, Kellie	CA	USA
355	Potential (415488)	Largay, Bryan	CA	USA
356	No	Olson, Julia	OR	USA
357	Yes (414156)	Loucks, Lynn	OK	USA
358	Yes (414156)	Perizzolo, Victoria	CA	USA
359	Yes (414156)	Keogh, David	UN	AUS

360	Yes (414156)	Katie, Weiss	NJ	USA
361	Yes (414156)	Jessica, Hurd	MA	USA
362	Yes (414156)	Amber, Hurd	MA	USA
363	Yes (414156)	Matt, Ellerbeck	UN	CAN
364	Yes (414156)	Tiffany, Hurd	MA	USA
365	Yes (414156)	Ellis, Vioilet	UN	CAN
366	Yes (414156)	Hurd, Kevin	MA	USA
367	Yes (414156)	Rich, Susan	VA	USA
368	Yes (414156)	Rachel, Kutschera	OR	USA
369	Yes (414156)	Lima, Christopher	CA	USA
370	Yes (414156)	Manasco, Roger	OK	USA
371	Yes (414156)	Manasco, Karen	OK	USA
372	Yes (414156)	Lague, Stacy	MA	USA
373	Yes (414156)	Broaten, Vanessa	CA	USA
374	Yes (414156)	Silver, Eric	MO	USA
375	Yes (414156)	Brown, Cathy	CA	USA
376	Yes (414156)	Hobbs, Raelene	UN	AUS
377	Yes (414156)	Bohnen, Julia	MN	USA
378	Yes (414156)	Angel, Jaqueline	AZ	USA
379	Yes (414156)	Boks, Stacey	UN	USA
380	Yes (414156)	Miller, Trish	MO	USA
381	Yes (414156)	Naylor, Pamela	NE	USA
382	Yes (414156)	Bonzani, Eric	NJ	USA
383	Yes (414156)	Keach, Frederick	CA	USA
384	Yes (414156)	Houle, Kristine	CA	USA
385	Yes (414156)	Cameron, Neil	UN	AUS
386	Yes (414156)	Laptop, Stoddard	WA	USA
387	Yes	Clark, Milton	FL	USA

	(414156)			
388	Yes (414156)	Goldman, Sara	VA	USA
389	Yes (414156)	Newton, Barbara	ME	USA
390	Yes (414156)	Warrendorf, Diana	TX	USA
391	Yes (414156)	Rocha, Ricardo	UN	PRT
392	Yes (414156)	Scott, Stephanie	WA	USA
393	Yes (414156)	Hayes, Jim	OH	USA
394	Yes (414156)	Pinchak, Deane	NC	USA
395	Yes (414156)	Osbourn, Michael	MO	USA
396	Yes (414156)	Gallow, Karen	CA	USA
397	Yes (414156)	McLeoad, Lianne	UN	CAN
398	Yes (414156)	Phillips, Pamela	AR	USA
399	Yes (414156)	Burns-Fulkerson, Galen	NC	USA
400	Yes (414156)	Rodrigues, Sofia	CA	USA
401	Yes (414156)	Stuart, Simon	UN	GBR
402	Yes (414156)	Hayes, Claire	OH	USA
403	Yes (414156)	Currier, GerryAnn	NY	USA
404	Yes (414156)	Stuckert, Adam	MS	USA
405	Yes (414156)	Turnbow, Casey	TN	USA
406	Yes (414156)	Meiter, Braden	PA	USA
407	Yes (414156)	Donovan, Christine	MA	USA
408	Yes (414156)	Martelle, Ann	RI	USA
409	Yes (414156)	Reed, Jacqueline	AZ	USA
410	Yes (414156)	Cameron, Anne	OT	CAN
411	No	Trezise, Jack	UN	AUS
412	Yes (414156)	Trezise, Julie	UN	AUS
413	Yes (414156)	Jane, Alice	UN	USA
414	Yes (414156)	Bostick, Carol	CA	USA
415	Yes	Poppe, Naomi	WA	USA

	(414156)			
416	Yes (414156)	Stewart, Kevin	UN	CAN
417	Yes (414156)	Tamrakar, Rijan	UN	NPL
418	Yes (414156)	Fulton, Kristine	AK	USA
419	Yes (414156)	Weilbach, Adriana	UN	ZAF
420	Yes (414156)	Inlove, Rich	OR	USA
421	Yes (414156)	Peterson, Kiri	CA	USA
422	Yes (414156)	Smith-Remick, Donna	PA	USA
423	Yes (414156)	Halliday, Tim	UN	GBR
424	Yes (414156)	Erickson, Lawrence	CA	USA
425	Yes (414156)	Metcalfe, Laura	UN	AUS
426	Yes (414156)	Lee, Cynthia	MN	USA
427	Yes (414156)	Ferguson, Sheryl	CO	USA
428	Yes (414156)	Harwood, Lynda	TX	USA
429	Yes (414156)	Bennett, Kara	TX	USA
430	Yes (414156)	Alberts, Allison	CA	USA
431	Yes (414156)	Ramsey, Jennifer	CA	USA
432	Yes (414156)	Griffin, Mark	PA	USA
433	Yes (414156)	Bowles, Cheri	WA	USA
434	Yes (414156)	Magill, Georgia	VA	USA
435	Yes (414156)	Ross, Carol and Susan	CO	USA
436	Yes (414156)	Warren, Paula	VA	USA
437	Yes (414156)	C., Mark	UN	CAN
438	Yes (414156)	Lumley, Chelsey	AZ	USA
439	Yes (414156)	Bukowski, Patrick	CT	USA
440	Yes (414156)	Erickson, Robyn	CA	USA
441	Yes (414156)	Vayu, Satya	OR	USA
442	Yes (414156)	Walker, Joan	CA	USA

443	Yes (414156)	Smale, Mary A.	ME	USA
444	No	Lawler, Dr. Sharon	CA	USA
445	Yes (414156)	Schellenberg, Reena	TX	USA
446	Yes (414156)	Witte, Alan	FL	USA
447	Yes (414156)	Wilmore, Seth	VA	USA
448	Yes (414156)	Barkow, Carolyn	CA	USA
449	Yes (414156)	Rymal, Rebecca	VA	USA
450	Yes (414156)	Drummond, Janet	UN	USA
451	Yes (414156)	Nettleingham, Debbie	UN	AUS
452	Yes (414156)	Stammers, Danny	UN	NLD
453	Yes (414156)	Phillip, Magasich	WA	USA
454	Yes (414156)	Janicelli, Barbara	FL	USA
455	Yes (414156)	Jimerson, Paul	CA	USA
456	Yes (414156)	Vermeys, Michael	NV	USA
457	Yes (414156)	Isbell, Julianne	AZ	USA
458	Yes (414156)	Rowland, Barbara	BC	CAN
459	Yes (414156)	Crum, Gabbi	CA	USA
460	Yes (414156)	Kniesner, Patti	OH	USA
461	Yes (414156)	Dumas, Susan	Abingdon	GBR
462	Yes (414156)	Ashton, Don	CA	USA
463	Yes (414156)	McIvor, Bronwyn	BC	CAN
464	Yes (414156)	Anderson, Caro	AR	USA
465	Yes (414156)	Kenealy, Patricia	WA	USA
466	Yes (414156)	Shepard, Donald	CO	USA
467	Yes (414156)	Dawes, Chelsey	AZ	USA
468	Yes (414156)	Snyder, Matthew	CA	USA
469	Yes (414156)	Bolfing, Sr. Sharon	TX	USA
470	Yes (414156)	Moran-Hodge, Melissa	WA	USA

471	Yes (414156)	Walsh, Mary	FL	USA
472	Yes (414156)	Jones, Nora	NS	AUS
473	Yes (414156)	Alms, Brandon	MO	USA
474	Yes (414156)	Barrett, Jerri	CA	USA
475	Yes (414156)	O'Neill, Rick	BC	CAN
476	Yes (414156)	McCollum, Anita	UT	USA
477	Yes (414156)	Brocha, Kristen	ON	CAN
478	Yes (414156)	Roy, Rachel	NSW	AUS
479	Yes (414156)	Faltdt, Kathy	QLD	AUS
480	Yes (414156)	Correa, Juana	UNK	COL
481	Yes (414156)	D'andrea, Erich	MI	USA
482	Yes (414156)	Taylor, JP	FL	USA
483	Yes (414156)	Rufo, Lorraine	NY	USA
484	Yes (414156)	Harris, Megan	CA	USA
485	Yes (414156)	Lester, Michelle	WA	USA
486	Yes (414156)	Schupbach, Pippin	CA	USA
487	Yes (414156)	Browning, Luna S.	VT	USA
488	Yes (414156)	Meyer, Darah	CO	USA
489	Yes (414156)	Keeley, Robert	FL	USA
490	Yes (414156)	Breakell, Rachel	CT	USA
491	Yes (414156)	Williamson, Brian	RI	USA
492	Yes (414156)	Schupbach, Stephani	CO	USA
493	Yes (414156)	Hodum, Peter	WA	USA
494	Yes (414156)	Bland, Brian	SC	USA
495	Yes (414156)	Riley, Becky	NY	USA
496	Yes (414156)	Gohr, Michelle	AZ	USA
497	Yes (414156)	O'Brien, Aileen	LA	USA
498	Yes	Scott, Steve	WA	USA

	(414156)			
499	Yes (414156)	Gerdes, Sylvia	FL	USA
500	Yes (414156)	Sussman, Mark	MD	USA
501	Yes (414156)	Solomon, Liam	UNK	GBR
502	Yes (414156)	Meidell, James	WA	USA
503	Yes (414156)	Korelitz, Lynne	MD	USA
504	Yes (414156)	Bordbar, Robert	MD	USA
505	Yes (414156)	Shields, Shawn	NJ	USA
506	Yes (414156)	Hopkins, Gareth	BC	CAN
507	Yes (414156)	Woodley, Steven	CA	USA
508	Yes (414156)	Bleyer, Jon	CA	USA
509	Yes (414156)	DiaVonti, Gino	FL	USA
510	Yes (414156)	Calvert, Stacy	CO	USA
511	Yes (414156)	Fausti, Kris	OR	USA
512	Yes (414156)	Hoffman, Patricia	CA	USA
513	Yes (414156)	Darby, Alex	Dorset	GBR
514	Yes (414156)	Wilson, Adam	CT	USA
515	Yes (414156)	Miles, George	FL	USA
516	Yes (414156)	Dobiey, Mark	UN	DEU
517	Yes (414156)	Mohr, Robby	WA	USA
518	Yes (414156)	McLoughlin, Jim	CA	USA
519	Yes (414156)	Urbina, Jenny	IL	USA
520	Yes (414156)	Meyer, Peg and Bill	OH	USA
521	Yes (414156)	Popowski, Kathy	WA	USA
522	Yes (414156)	Armstrong, James	CA	USA
523	Yes (414156)	Avramov, Stefan	UN	BGR
524	Yes (414156)	Springer, Chris	BC	CAN
525	Yes (414156)	Cudahy, Julie	OR	USA

526	Yes (414156)	Searle, Catherine	OR	USA
527	Yes (414156)	Oliveira, Sonia	UN	PRT
528	Yes (414156)	Antia, Robert	MA	USA
529	Yes (414156)	Younger, Charles	PA	USA
530	Yes (414156)	Petersen, Joanne	CA	USA
531	Yes (414156)	Wittenberg, Sara	AR	USA
532	Yes (414156)	Serrano, Sparrow	CA	USA
533	Yes (414156)	Steele, Christine	CA	USA
534	Yes (414156)	Hill, Lauren	CT	USA
535	Yes (414156)	Dennis, Gudrun	FL	USA
536	Yes (414156)	Du Plessis, Yvonne	BC	CAN
537	Yes (414156)	Jones, Alicia	WA	USA
538	Yes (414156)	Pease, Pam	MD	USA
539	Yes (414156)	Borowske, Alyssa	CT	USA
540	Yes (414156)	Ennis, Anastasia	CA	USA
541	Yes (414156)	Germaine, Dgermaine	CA	USA
542	Yes (414156)	Bolstra, Aharon	CA	USA
543	Yes (414156)	Pearl, Randall	WA	USA
544	Yes (414156)	Gustafson, Kyle	ND	USA
545	Yes (414156)	Ho Lim, ChingChi	LA	USA
546	Yes (414156)	Adler, Michael	NJ	USA
547	Yes (414156)	Selig, William	CA	USA
548	Yes (414156)	Cahn, Marjorie	MD	USA
549	Yes (414156)	Lane, Georgianna	WA	USA
550	Yes (414156)	Starkey, Michael	CA	USA
551	Yes (414156)	Garcia, David	UN	ESP
552	Yes (414156)	Harlow, Lisa	WA	USA
553	Yes	Sweet, Stewart	WI	USA

	(414156)			
554	Yes (414156)	Jones, Melissa	NC	USA
555	Yes (414156)	McDonald, Megan	WA	USA
556	Yes (414156)	Wallace, Katie	CO	USA
557	Yes (414156)	Ayliff, Philip	VA	USA
558	Yes (414156)	Weng, Kevin	HI	USA
559	Yes (414156)	Corsi, Cynthia	PA	USA
560	Yes (414156)	Higgins, Christine	CA	USA
561	Yes (414156)	Galeano, Sandra	LA	USA
562	Yes (414156)	Bishop, Phil	NZL	NZL
563	Yes (414156)	Hickman, Michael	UN	ZAF
564	Yes (414156)	Outman, Deborah	GA	USA
565	Yes (414156)	Baker, Alea	WA	USA
566	Yes (414156)	Payne, Ruth	IL	USA
567	Yes (414156)	Ward, Krystal	VA	USA
568	Yes (414156)	Marsh, David	VA	USA
569	Yes (414156)	Phillips, Raine	CA	USA
570	Yes (414156)	Stanton, Ashley	VA	USA
571	Yes (414156)	Bond, Monica	CA	USA
572	Yes (414156)	Brock, Elaine	WA	USA
573	Yes (414156)	Davis, Liora	FL	USA
574	Yes (414156)	Detheridge, Simon	UN	USA
575	Yes (414156)	Brochman, Mark	MD	USA
576	Yes (414156)	Grinavic, Tierney	MD	USA
577	Yes (414156)	Clark, Kenneth	NY	USA
578	Yes (414156)	Rae, Fred	UN	USA
579	Yes (414156)	Martin, James	MA	USA
580	Yes (414156)	Hayes, Marc	WA	USA

581	Yes (414156)	Duke, Guy	BC	CAN
582	Yes (414156)	Savelle, Michele	WA	USA
583	Yes (414156)	Romano, Antonio	Lazio	ITA
584	Yes (414156)	Palmer, Meredith	OH	USA
585	Yes (414156)	Coleman, Andrew	AL	USA
586	Yes (414156)	Phillipsen, Ivan	OR	USA
587	Yes (414156)	Dyrdahl, Kary	MN	USA
588	Yes (414156)	Janiszewski, Cheryl	MD	USA
589	Yes (414156)	Nickell, Jillian	IL	USA
590	Yes (414156)	Peterson, Judy	WA	USA
591	Potential (415488)	Buzzell, Rebecca	NH	USA
592	Master (415488)	L, Carmen	NA	ESP
593	Yes (415488)	Roddy, Karen	ME	USA
594	Yes (415488)	Thabet, Amy	NC	USA
595	Yes (415488)	Grundeland, Thomas	NJ	USA
596	Yes (415488)	Anderson, Julie	CO	USA
597	Yes (415488)	Perrotti, Lou	RI	USA
598	Yes (415488)	Johnson, Pieter	CO	USA
599	Yes (415488)	Theis, Rick	NY	USA
600	Yes (415488)	Menezes, Nikki	UN	USA
601	Yes (415488)	Hurme, Kristiina	CT	USA
602	Yes (415488)	Fulkerson, Jay	NC	USA
603	Yes (415488)	Rollins-Smith, Louise	TN	USA
604	Yes (415488)	Fessler, Brandon	WA	USA
605	Yes (415488)	Dill, Audra	CO	USA
606	Yes (415488)	Burns, Regina	NC	USA
607	Yes (415488)	Lee, Alyson	MA	USA
608	Yes	Seimon, Tracie	NY	USA

	(415488)			
609	Yes (415488)	Curry, Tierra	AZ	USA
610	Yes (415488)	Neville, Brad	BC	CAN
611	Yes (415488)	Arsenault, Elizabeth	VA	USA
612	Yes (415488)	Bolt, Clay	SC	USA
613	Yes (415488)	Walters, Sandra	ID	USA
614	Yes (415488)	Hulth, Marta	Uppland	SWE
615	Yes (415488)	Elliott, Lang	NY	USA
616	Yes (415488)	Wiley, John	NC	USA
617	Yes (415488)	Travers, Brad	CA	USA
618	Yes (415488)	Farrar, Satu	BC	CAN
619	Yes (415488)	Ghirardi, Greg	NY	USA
620	Yes (415488)	Treer, Dag	UN	HRV
621	Yes (415488)	Kuljeric, Marija	UN	HRV
622	Yes (415488)	Eisenberg, Tobias	UN	DEU
623	Yes (415488)	Scanlon, John	QLD	AUS
624	Yes (415488)	Santana, Framl	CA	USA
625	Yes (415488)	Scheidt, Nancy	CA	USA
626	Yes (415488)	Morgan, Jess	QLD	AUS
627	Yes (415488)	Farrell, Julie	New South Wales	AUS
628	Yes (415488)	Drew, Durty South	FL	USA
629	Yes (415488)	Hansen, Martha	VA	USA
630	Yes (415488)	Ells, Stephanie	BC	CAN
631	Yes (415488)	Rufo, Lorraine	NY	USA
632	Yes (415488)	Van Wagner, Tom	CA	USA
633	Yes (415488)	Hoke, Larre	NJ	USA
634	No	Feldman, George	CA	USA
635	Yes (415488)	Kahn, Ted	MD	USA
636	Yes	Craig, Carol	FL	USA

	(415488)			
637	Yes (415488)	Taylor, Morgan	PA	USA
638	No	O'Connell, Seth	MT	USA
639	Yes (415488)	Gillette, Nancy	CA	USA
640	No	Ferrigno, Jessica	CT	USA
641	Yes (415488)	Phelps, Jesse	OR	USA
642	Yes (415488)	Vredenburg, Curtis	WA	USA
643	Yes (415488)	Vreeland, Leslie	CO	USA
644	Yes (415488)	Hagey, Travis	ID	USA
645	Yes (415488)	Williams, Michael	unk	AUS
646	Yes (415488)	Holland, Fern	HI	USA
647	Yes (415488)	Joneson, Suzanne	ID	USA
648	No	Pool, Alicia	CA	USA
649	Yes (415488)	Berndt, Doug	WA	USA
650	Yes (415488)	Davidson, Carlos	CA	USA
651	Yes (415488)	Krynak, Tim	OH	USA
652	Yes (415488)	Wilson, Zachary	OR	USA
653	Yes (415488)	Bongiovanni, Nan	CA	USA
654	Yes (415488)	Wirtz, Emily	WA	USA
655	Yes (415488)	Miranda, Joanne	NY	USA
656	Yes (415488)	Kerkhofs, Rita	UN	BEL
657	Yes (415488)	Palmeri-Miles, Amber	WA	USA
658	Yes (415488)	Lu, Christine	CA	USA
659	No	Lipsky, Michael	VA	USA
660	Yes (415488)	Goldberg, Caren	ID	USA
661	Yes (415488)	Loh, Derek	CA	USA
662	Yes (415488)	Roland, Jelica	UN	BEL
663	Yes (415488)	Krussman, Eric	CA	USA
664	Yes (415488)	Meyer, Kathie	CA	USA
665	Yes (415488)	Bireley, Rich	CA	USA

666	No	Trenham, Peter	WA	USA
667	Yes (415488)	Tobler, Ursina	UN	CHE
668	Yes (415488)	Barreca, April	WA	USA
669	Yes (415488)	Hansen, Alexander	MI	USA
670	Yes (415488)	Jonathan, Stead	CA	USA
671	Yes (415488)	Pope, Karen	CA	USA
672	Yes (415488)	Welsh, Hart	CA	USA
673	Yes (415488)	Rachowicz, Lara	CA	USA
674	Yes (415488)	Hayes, Kathleen	CA	USA
675	Yes (415488)	Fielden, Kelli	CO	USA
676	Yes (415488)	Otto, Anae	CA	USA
677	Yes (415488)	Shepley, Holly	CA	USA
678	Yes (415488)	Motta, Beatriz	CA	USA
679	Yes (415488)	Warenycia, Dee	CA	USA
680	Potential (415488)	Alvarado, Carlos	CA	USA
681	Yes (415488)	McGriff, Darlene	CA	USA
682	No	Patla, Debra	ID	USA
683	Yes (415488)	Marr, Shenandoah	CA	USA
684	Yes (415488)	Cranston, Peggy	CA	USA
685	Yes (415488)	Gil, Marlon	TX	USA
686	Yes (415488)	Green, Erin	IL	USA
687	Yes (415488)	Shenouda, Mary	CA	USA
688	Yes (415488)	Breedveld, Koen	CA	USA
689	Yes (415488)	Ferrigno, Joan	CT	USA
690	Yes (415488)	Mclver, Bill	CA	USA
691	Yes (415488)	Ballengee, Brandon	NY	USA
692	Yes (415488)	Tatarian, Trish	CA	USA
693	Yes (415488)	Langkilde, Tracy	PA	USA
694	Yes	Bobzien, Steven	CA	USA

	(415488)			
695	Yes (415488)	Schwartz, Susan	CA	USA
696	Yes (415488)	Birmingham, William	CA	USA
697	Yes (415488)	Calvert, Allen	NV	USA
698	Yes (415488)	Beaulaurier, Diane	CA	USA
699	Yes (415488)	Tewell, Tony	WA	USA
700	Yes (415488)	Forbus, Beth	CA	USA
701	Yes (415488)	Marlow, Karla	CA	USA
702	Yes (415488)	Carlson, Ann	MT	USA
703	Yes (415488)	Ann, Julie	TN	USA
704	Yes (415488)	Merkel, Barbara	VA	USA
705	Yes (415488)	Lentz, Christian	NC	USA
706	Yes (415488)	Riley, William	MI	USA

APPENDIX B – Index by Organization Type and Individuals

The Index by Org Type reports display the number of correspondence IDs that have coded comments associated with them. Each correspondence ID can be associated with multiple comments/codes and use the same code as another correspondence ID. Each correspondence ID is only counted once.

Business

Fienbaum Associates - 352; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. WQ4000 - Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. Sierra Lodge - 18; WQ4000 - Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives.

Conservation/Preservation

California Wilderness Coalition - 347; AL7000 - Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered. PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. WI1000 - Wilderness: Guiding Policies, Regs, Laws. Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA - 356; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. AL1000 - Alternatives: Elements Common To All Alternatives. AL2000 - Alternatives: Alternatives Eliminated. AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. AL7000 - Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered. AL8000 - Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components. AQU2000 - Aquatic Habitat: Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems. CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: General Comments. CL1000 - Climate Change: Climate change analysis. CM3000 - Cumulative Effects: General cumulative effects analysis. GA5000 - Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives. INF1000 - Informational: Available research and studies. PN11000 - Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates. PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. WH4000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives.

Unaffiliated Individuals

N/A - 1; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. CL1000 - Climate Change: Climate change analysis. MO1000 - Monitoring: Monitoring and response plan for project success and/or failure. PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. WQ5000 - Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts. 2; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. 3; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 4; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 5; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. VE4000 - Visitor Experience: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. WH4000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. 7; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 8; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 9; PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. 12; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. SE4000 - Socioeconomics: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. 13; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. CO1000 - Cost of Proposal. PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. 14; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 16; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 17; AE12000 - Affected Environment: Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat. AE22000 - Affected Environment: Visitor Use. AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. AL3000 - Alternatives: Envir. Preferred Alt./NEPA § .101&102. AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. AQU2000 - Aquatic Habitat: Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems. CM3000 - Cumulative Effects: General cumulative effects analysis. CO1000 - Cost of Proposal. GA5000 - Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives. MT1000 - Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments. PN11000 - Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates. PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. SE4000 - Socioeconomics: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. VH100 - VALUES - Value the history or cultural resources . VU4000 - Visitor Use: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. WH4000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. 19; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. 56; PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking

Action. 57; AE12000 - Affected Environment: Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat. AE22000 - Affected Environment: Visitor Use. AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL7000 - Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered. GA5000 - Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives. PN1000 - Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy. PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. 142; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL8000 - Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components. 276; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. AL8000 - Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components. PN4000 - Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority. 300; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. 342; PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. 343; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information. 344; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AQU3000 - Aquatic Habitat: Cumulative Effects. WH4000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. 345; PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action. 346; AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. AQU1000 - Aquatic Habitat: Affected Environment. 348; AL7000 - Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered. 349; INF1000 - Informational: Available research and studies. WH5000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts. 351; WH5000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts. 353; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. AL7000 - Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered. GA5000 - Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives. MI1000 - Mitigation: Suggested mitigation. WQ4000 - Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives. 354; AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. INF1000 - Informational: Available research and studies. 411; AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. 592; AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. 708; AE30000 - Affected Environment: Baseline information.

University/Professional Society

N/A - 707; AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements. AL6000 - Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives. AL8000 - Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components. GA5000 - Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives.

APPENDIX C – Index by Code

This table lists the commenters and topics commented on (identified by the codes used in this analysis). The report is organized by code, and under each code is a list of the commenters who submitted comments that fell under that code, and their correspondence numbers as assigned by the park. Those identified as N/A represent unaffiliated individuals.

Table 8. Index by Code

Code	Description	Organization	Corr. ID
AE12000	Affected Environment: Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat	N/A	17, 57
AE22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use	N/A	17, 57
AE30000	Affected Environment: Baseline information	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	1 13 17 19 57 276 343 708
AL1000	Alternatives: Elements Common To All Alternatives	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
AL2000	Alternatives: Alternatives Eliminated	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
AL3000	Alternatives: Envir. Preferred Alt./NEPA § .101&102	N/A	17
AL4000	Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements	California State University, Fresno	15
		Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		Fienbaum Associates	352

		N/A	2 3 4 5 7 8 12 14 16 17 57 142 300 344 353 707
AL6000	Alternatives: Degree to which alternatives meet project objectives	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	2 17 19 346 353 354 411 592 707
AL7000	Alternatives: Full range of feasible alternatives considered	California Wilderness Coalition	347
		Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	57 348 353
AL8000	Alternatives: Full disclosure of alternative components	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	142 276 707
AQU1000	Aquatic Habitat: Affected Environment	N/A	346
AQU2000	Aquatic Habitat: Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	17
AQU3000	Aquatic Habitat: Cumulative Effects	N/A	344
CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356

CL1000	Climate Change: Climate change analysis	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	1
CM3000	Cumulative Effects: General cumulative effects analysis	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	17
CO1000	Cost of Proposal	N/A	13 17
GA5000	Impact Analysis: General Impacts from Alternatives	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	17 57 353 707
INF1000	Informational: Available research and studies	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	349 354
MI1000	Mitigation: Suggested mitigation	N/A	353
MO1000	Monitoring: Monitoring and response plan for project success and/or failure	N/A	1
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	N/A	17
PN1000	Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy	N/A	57
PN11000	Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	17
PN4000	Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	N/A	276
PN8000	Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action	California Wilderness Coalition	347
		Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356

		N/A	1 9 13 17 56 57 342 345
SE4000	Socioeconomics: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	N/A	12 17
VE4000	Visitor Experience: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	N/A	5
VH100	VALUES - Value the history or cultural resources	N/A	17
VU4000	Visitor Use: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	N/A	17
WH4000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Wilderness Watch, HSHA	356
		N/A	5 17 344
WH5000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts	N/A	349 351
WI1000	Wilderness: Guiding Policies, Regs, Laws	California Wilderness Coalition	347
WQ4000	Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Fienbaum Associates	352
		Sierra Lodge	18
		N/A	353
WQ5000	Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts	N/A	1

APPENDIX D – QUESTIONS BROUGHT FORWARD AT PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public Meeting, Three Rivers, California, November 5, 2009

1. How do you do frog counts?
2. How many of the 85 lakes are within a mile of a maintained trail?
3. My concern would be within a mile a maintained trail, a good trout fishing lake, exclude it from the 85 lakes proposed?
4. What do you consider a native trout other than golden trout?
5. Sequoia is here because of the concern of the Tulare county people. We are used to having some good fishing. It sounds like there will still be some. Your physical activity to get rid of fish ends at the waterfall. Does rotenone end at the waterfall?
6. With this fungus, you are using tax payer dollars. There is a fungus that is spreading and killing frogs, so the frogs could die anyway. Why still take out the fish?
7. What about the native species of trout? Do they kill the frogs as well?
8. The mandate seems to be your interpretation. You can preserve the species by not adding the chemical. More of the public could support this project if you didn't consider chemical. You don't need to go to the degree to meet your mandates. We don't know how much balance we are talking about.
9. What was the situation before the glaciers came? What do the fossil record tell us?
10. What criteria do you use to arrive at the percentage of total high country lakes?
11. What is it about the Endangered Species Act that requires this action?
12. Why can't you restore less than 85 lakes and still meet your goals?
13. In the 1980s, when Maurice was here as a biologist, there were studies about trout, condition and aquatics of some park lakes. Did they make observations about mountain yellow legged frogs during those studies?
14. What role does the California Department of Fish and Game play in this program?
15. What is the projected cost?
16. Is the funding for this secure for the length of time to implement it?
17. We can't let the frog disappear. Will rotenone kill other gilled organisms?
18. How do you reestablish native species in the affected lakes?
19. At the bottom of the waterfall, what effect does potassium permanganate have on the system?
20. How far downstream will the chemical go?
21. Are you going to collect fish after they float to the top? What will you do with the dead fish?
22. What damage does the project do to other animals?
23. What do you consider a large lake?
24. If you treated a lake one year, are you going to go back year after year to get the eggs? How long does treatment last per lake?
25. Who ultimately decides which alternative you select after the EIS is drafted?
26. How good is the science? Are there previous studies from similar environments?
27. Would you be using a drip system for the poison?
28. Will somebody be there to monitor the equipment?
29. What about the backpackers who fish for sustenance? How would this project affect them?
30. What do you do with the dead fish?

Public Meeting, Fresno, California, November 13, 2009

1. The park needs to put the presentation of information out there for the public. Put it on “UTube” or similar venue in order to improve knowledge and understanding.
2. Provide more public information to lead to better understanding. Most people don’t understand the whole project and are against it without a lot of knowledge.
3. The public perception is that this is a fish v. frog issue, however, it is clear from the presentation that we are talking about a whole aquatic ecosystem, not just frogs.
4. This project is in the park, but what about the rest of the High Sierras, and what are the preservation efforts out of park?
5. Are we thinking about what places could be preserved for fishing outside of the park, rather than gill netting in the popular fishing lakes in SEKI?
6. The Leopold Report established the precedent for restoration in the Sierras in the 1960s.
7. Gill netting and electrofishing have been very effective. Why change your management options? The current decisions seem well thought out and moderate in scope.
8. We need more information about Rotenone and its effects.
9. Elaborate on the strategy for multi-agency conservation assessments. How we are going to work together to assess the status of sensitive amphibians in the High Sierras?
10. Graph: are populations crashes pictured on graph based on fungus, or what causes the crash?
11. Suggestion to end the presentation with slides that demonstrate a healthy environment and good fishing opportunities.
12. Do you have safe, Chytrid free populations?
13. What spreads the chytrid fungus? What do we know about the spread of the fungus?
14. How many fish have we killed so far?
15. There are a lot of things going on that are causing amphibian decline, but fish are clearly one of things that are severely affecting the populations. It seems like there’s a baseline being established.
16. How far does this project go? Will we look at more eradication efforts or stick to the scope of project? The problem will likely continue through multiple generations, not just our lifetimes. How do we sustain this program?
17. What is this going to cost? What are the economic impacts?
18. Who’s doing the work?
19. While this will sustain a native environment for our kids, what’s the cost?

20. Fish are there because we wanted to encourage people's interest in the parks.
21. Even though we support flyfishing, we understand that the greater purpose is to preserve the environment as a whole. Can we find a happy medium to serve both our interests?
22. Brook trout and rainbow trout are very resilient species; golden trout adapt more slowly. Participant is surprised that these lakes have been able to sustain fish.
23. Are there frogs in lakes where there are high populations of fish?
24. Preference to use remote lakes rather than popular ones. Participant suggests that we use the more popular lakes and not the remote lakes. Remote lakes are accessed by the most dedicated anglers, a tiny minority of the angling community. Why not take out the more accessible lakes first?
25. One of the things that make lakes popular is the size of the fish, not necessarily the accessibility? Why not prioritize for treatment the lakes with the smaller fish?
26. What lakes are going to be part of this project? What lakes have already been treated?