

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks



PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY REPORT

SEQUOIA AND KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARKS

WILDERNESS STEWARDSHIP PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



April 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Public Scoping Process Summary.....	1
Nature of Comments Received.....	2
The Comment Analysis Process.....	2
Definition of Terms	3
Guide to this Document	3
CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT	5
PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY	9
GP1200 - Comment Addresses the 1986 Backcountry Management Plan and/or the 1986 Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan	9
MR1100 – Administrative Actions: Minimum Requirement	10
MT1000 – Miscellaneous Comments: General Comments.....	12
ON1000 – Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	15
OV1100 - Comment Addresses Non-NPS Overflights	16
PN4000 - Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	16
PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action	19
VH1000 - Values: Value the History or Cultural Resources.....	19
VN1000 - Values: Value the Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural, quiet, undeveloped areas)	20
VV1000 - Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities	21
VW1000 - Values: Value the Wilderness Experience	24
WL1000 - Comment Addresses Day and Overnight Use	25
WL1100 - Comment Addresses Wilderness Permitting.....	26
WL1200 - Comment Addresses Use of Campfires.....	28

WL1300 - Comment Addresses Wildlife and Proper Food Storage.....	31
WL1400 - Comment Addresses Party Size	33
WL1500 - Comment Addresses Camping and Campsites.....	35
WL1600 - Comment Addresses Human Waste Management	38
WL1700 – Comment Addressed Stock Use.....	40
WL1800 - Comment Addresses Meadow Management	51
WL1900 - Comment Addresses Research Activities	52
WL2000 - Comment Addresses Wildlife Management in Wildernes	54
WL2200 - Comment Addresses Maintenance of Trails, Bridges, or Other Infrastructure	55
WL2300 - Comment Addresses Commercial Services	57
WL2400 - Comment Addresses Endangered Species	66
WL2500 - Comment Addresses Zoning.....	67
WL2600 - Comment Addresses Wilderness Fees	70
WL2700 - Comment Addresses Extent Necessary	70
APPENDIX A	TOPIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES
APPENDIX B	CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS
APPENDIX C	CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF INDIVIDUAL COMMENTERS

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE

Introduction

The National Park Service (NPS), and Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks (SEKI) are planning to prepare a Wilderness Stewardship Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (WSP/EIS) for the Sequoia-Kings Canyon and John Krebs Wildernesses, both located entirely within the parks. Through the Wilderness Stewardship Plan process, NPS will identify and analyze a range of alternatives for achieving wilderness stewardship objectives, which include providing appropriate types and levels of access for visitors and authorized users, preserving wilderness character, protecting cultural and natural resources, and adhering to legally mandated management and preservation requirements.

As an implementation level plan, the WSP/EIS will provide detailed guidance on a variety of issues including, but not limited to: day and overnight use; wilderness permitting; use of campfires; wildlife and proper food storage; party size; camping and campsites; human waste management; stock use; meadow management; research activities; wildlife management in wilderness; cultural resources in wilderness; maintenance of trails, bridges, or other necessary infrastructure; and the "minimum requirement" for administration of the areas as wilderness. Also to be analyzed and determined is the extent to which commercial services are necessary to fulfill the recreational and other purposes of SEKI's Congressionally designated wilderness areas. This "extent necessary" determination for commercial services will be performed to ensure compliance with §4(d)(6) of the Wilderness Act.

Public Scoping Process Summary

In April 2011, SEKI released the Public Scoping Newsletter for the WSP/EIS. The newsletter provided a description of the need for action, goals of the scoping process, and questions to consider. This newsletter was released to the public for review and comment. The public was invited to submit comments on the scope of the planning process through August 31, 2011.

During the scoping period, public scoping open houses were held in various locations throughout California from April 25- 29, 2011. Meetings were held in Fresno (April 25); Oakland (April 26); Bishop (April 27); Los Angeles (April 28); and Visalia (April 29). These meetings presented information about the history of the parks, wilderness legislation, significance of the parks, purpose and need for the WSP/EIS, potential issues and concerns, and planning processes in a formal presentation. After this presentation, NPS staff were on hand to discuss commenters' issues and concerns. Commenters also had the opportunity to write their concerns on flipcharts, which were added to the public comments.

A total of 108 individuals attended the public scoping meetings in California.

- Fresno – 11 attendees
- Oakland – 20 attendees
- Bishop – 18 attendees
- Los Angeles – 14 attendees

- Visalia – 45 attendees

The public were able to submit their comments on the project using any of the following methods:

- Electronically through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website
- In person at the public meetings
- By mailing comments to the NPS
- By emailing comments to the NPS

Nature of Comments Received

During the scoping period, 912 pieces of correspondence from over 41 states and 4 countries (Australia, Germany, Slovakia, and the United States) were received during the public scoping period. Approximately 83 percent of the 912 letters (representing 1,045 signatures) were submitted by individuals living in California. The topics that received the majority of comments were regarding stock use, commercial services, and the use of campfires. All correspondences were entered into the PEPC system.

Many comments were of a subject matter that did not pertain to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for the Sequoia-Kings Canyon and Johns Krebs Wildernesses. These comments were coded and reviewed but were not included in this report as they are outside of the scope of analysis of the WSP.

Topic questions provided to the public during scoping are included as an appendix to this report (Appendix A). Summaries of responses to these questions along with representative quotes received from commenters are included in the appendix.

All comments that were within the scope of the WSP, regardless of their topic, were carefully read and analyzed and are presented in this report. Commenters will continue to be notified of the project's progress, and are encouraged to visit the NPS PEPC website at www.parkplanning.nps.gov/seki to view information pertaining to this project

The Comment Analysis Process

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and combine similar public comments into a format that can be used by decision-makers including the SEKI WSP/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 correspondence 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 codes to statements made by the public electronically on the PEPC website, in their letters, email messages, and the flipchart comments from the public meetings. All comments were read and analyzed.

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 content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received. This report is intended to be a summary of the comments received, rather than a statistical analysis.

Definition of Terms

Primary terms used in this 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. Each piece of correspondence is assigned a unique identification number in the PEPC system.

Comment: A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It should include information such as an expression of support or opposition to the use of a potential management tool, additional data regarding an existing condition, or an opinion debating the adequacy of the 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 WSP/EIS process.

Concern: Concerns are a written summary of all comments received under a particular code. Some codes were further separated into several concern statements to provide a better focus on the content of the comments.

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 further organized into concern statements. Below each concern statement are representative quotes, which have been taken directly from the text of the public's comments and **have not been edited**; therefore spelling and grammar errors were not corrected. Representative quotes further clarify the concern statements. Comments that pertained to subject matter that was irrelevant to the scoping for the WSP/EIS have not been included within the analysis of this report, but will be documented in the administrative record for this project.

Correspondence Index of Organizations: This provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types as defined by PEPC: business; churches and religious groups; civic groups; conservation/preservation groups; federal government; NPS employees; non-governmental groups; recreational groups; state government; town or city government; tribal government; unaffiliated individuals; university/professional society. In many instances, the organization type was not defined by the commenter; therefore, organizations were listed as "Unaffiliated Individuals". 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. This list is organized alphabetically, and can be found in Appendix B: Correspondence Index of Organizations.

Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters: This provides a listing of all of the individuals who submitted comments during the 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. Those correspondence identified as N/A represent individuals who did not submit their first or last name. This list can be found in Appendix C: Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters.

CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT

Comment Distribution by Code

Code	Description	Number of Correspondences	Number of Signatures
GP1100	Comment Addresses General Management Plan	2	2
GP1200	Comment Addresses the 1986 Backcountry Management Plan and/or the 1986 Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan	8	8
MR1100	Administrative Actions: Minimum Requirement	45	46
MT1000	Miscellaneous Comments: General Comments	120	121
ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	227	227
OV 1100	Comment Addresses Non-NPS Overflights	5	5
PN1000	Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy	4	4
PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance	0	0
PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis	2	2
PN4000	Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	11	11
PN8000	Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action	1	1
TQ0001	Topic Question 1: What concerns do you have about wilderness in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks?	680	680
TQ0002	Topic Question 2: What are possible strategies for the protection of wilderness resources?	367	368
TQ0003	Topic Question 3: What is important to you about wilderness use and recreation?	636	636
TQ0004	Topic Question 4: What types of activities do you consider important and appropriate in wilderness? And inappropriate?	622	623
TQ0005	Topic Question 5: What are your thoughts on party/group size, food storage practices, and campfires?	389	389
TQ0006	Topic Question 6: What are your thoughts on commercial services in wilderness, such as guided hiking, guided stock trips, and guided climbing/mountaineering?	402	402
TQ0007	Topic Question 7: What are your thoughts on appropriate management activities and techniques in wilderness (Minimum requirements)?	286	286
TQ0008	Topic Question 8: Are there any areas of the wilderness or wilderness resources that warrant special consideration?	288	288
VH1000	Values: Value the History or Cultural Resources	15	16
VN1000	Values: Value the Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural, quiet, undeveloped areas)	235	235
VV1000	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities	14	15
VW1000	Values: Value the Wilderness Experience	252	253
WL1000	Comment Addresses Day and Overnight Use	5	5
WL1100	Comment Addresses Wilderness Permitting	129	130
WL1200	Comment Addresses Use of Campfires	424	424
WL1300	Comment Addresses Wildlife and Proper Food Storage	235	235
WL1400	Comment Addresses Party Size	245	248

Code	Description	Number of Correspondences	Number of Signatures
WL1500	Comment Addresses Camping and Campsites	266	266
WL1600	Comment Addresses Human Waste Management	26	27
WL1700	Comment Addresses Stock Use	436	567
WL1800	Comment Addresses Meadow Management	34	34
WL1900	Comment Addresses Research Activities	249	249
WL2000	Comment Addresses Wildlife Management in Wilderness	231	231
WL2200	Comment Addresses Maintenance of Trails, Bridges, or Other Infrastructure	87	216
WL2300	Comment Addresses Commercial Services	275	390
WL2400	Comment Addresses Endangered Species	17	17
WL2500	Comment Addresses Zoning	42	58
WL2600	Comment Addresses Wilderness Fees	40	41
WL2700	Comment Addresses Extent Necessary	65	65

(Note: Each correspondence may have multiple comments, and each comment may have multiple codes. As a result, the total number of comments may be different than the actual comment totals)

Correspondence Signature Count by Correspondence Type

Organization Type	Number of Correspondences	Number of Signatures
University/Professional Society	1	1
Conservation/Preservation	6	7
Recreational Groups	7	8
Unaffiliated Individual	897	1028
Civic Groups	1	1
Total	912	1,045

Correspondence Signature Count by Correspondence Type

Type	Number of Correspondences
Other	15
Web Form	805
Park Form	6
Letter	80
Fax	3
E-mail	2
Petition	1
Total	912

Correspondence Distribution by State

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondences
Alabama	0.1%	1
Arizona	0.1%	1
California	82.5%	752
Colorado	0.7%	6
Connecticut	0.2%	2
Delaware	0.2%	2
District of Columbia	0.1%	1
Florida	1.4%	13
Georgia	0.1%	1
Hawaii	0.2%	2
Idaho	0.3%	3
Illinois	0.1%	1
Kansas	0.2%	2
Kentucky	0.1%	1
Louisiana	0.7%	6
Maine	0.4%	4
Maryland	0.3%	3
Massachusetts	0.2%	2
Michigan	0.2%	2
Missouri	0.1%	1
Montana	0.3%	3
Nevada	0.5%	5
New Hampshire	0.2%	2
New Jersey	0.4%	4
New Mexico	0.4%	4
New York	1.6%	15
North Carolina	0.1%	1
Ohio	0.1%	1
Oklahoma	0.4%	4
Oregon	0.5%	5
Pennsylvania	0.2%	2
Rhode Island	0.1%	1
South Carolina	0.2%	2
Tennessee	0.1%	1
Texas	0.2%	2
Utah	0.2%	2
Vermont	0.2%	2
Virginia	0.2%	2

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondences
Washington	2.0%	18
Wisconsin	0.3%	3
Wyoming	0.1%	1
Unknown	2.8%	26
Total		912

Correspondence Distribution by Country

Country	Percentage	Number of Correspondences
Australia	0.1%	1
Germany	0.1%	1
Slovakia	0.1%	1
United States of America	99.7%	909
Total		912

PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

GP1200 - Comment Addresses the 1986 Backcountry Management Plan and/or the 1986 Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan

Concern ID: 32678

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters stated that the 1986 Backcountry Management Plan and/or management of backcountry stock use are still appropriate, and that the wilderness areas should continue to be managed as they currently are under these plans.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 583

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229913

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I like the quota system implemented in the 1980's and should be continued. Has there been any study to determine if it curbed the issues that it was meant to curtail since the 1986 NEPA was completed.

Corr. ID: 822

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 231674

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel that the SEKI 1986 Backcountry Management Plan sets out a philosophy and a set of policies that are still appropriate and valid today. I don't believe that it is necessary to change much in this previous plan. I think that the wilderness areas should be managed the way that they have been for the past 20 or so years.

Concern ID: 32679

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters expressed concern that the Backcountry Management Plan and/or Stock User and Meadow Management Plan are out-of-date, do not provide enough protection of wilderness areas, and needs to be revised.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 528

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 229628

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My concerns are that the existing 'Backcountry Management Plan' and 'Stock Use Plan' are out-of-date and not adequate for protecting the unique wilderness areas of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. My hope is that these concerns will be considered in the new 'Wilderness Stewardship Plan.'

Corr. ID: 801

Organization: Sequoia Natural History Association, Sierra Club, Audubon, Society for Conservation Biology,

Comment ID: 226781

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The packstock and grazing policies have been in dire need of overhaul for over 25 years, so it is high time the park lent some attention and effort towards instituting a revised set of policies that will actually protect park resources over the near and long term.

Corr. ID: 863

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230321

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Currently the existing Stock Use Plan, which nearly thirty years old, allows unlimited commercial services in the SEKI wilderness, and they place no ceiling on the number of stock animals allowed to graze, trample, and pollute SEKI's fragile alpine meadows and lakeshores.

The existing plan fails miserably at protecting SEKI's magnificent and fragile wilderness from high-impact uses. The NPS has promised several times over the

past twenty years to update these plans to place adequate limits and controls on stock use and commercial businesses-which continue to exploit SEKI for private gain-but the NPS has never delivered on its promises.

MR1100 - Administrative Actions: Minimum Requirement

Concern ID: 32747

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The management decisions that permit only those actions necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of the Wilderness Act applied currently to SEKI should be continued in the new WSP.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 26 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 211136 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I recommend that the minimum requirement definitions applied currently to Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks (SEKI) be sustained by the new WSP. My reading of the Minimum Requirement at SEKI concludes that there are several key elements:

1. The designated wilderness areas within SEKI are heavily used by visitors seeking wilderness experiences, and sustaining wilderness-appropriate visitor experiences is key to management of the area.
2. Key to sustaining quality visitor experiences at SEKI is the presence of a broad-ranging and well-maintained trail system for use by visitors.
3. Another requirement is that visitors be managed through the presence of resident wilderness rangers.
4. A final requirement is that the lands within the Sequoia/Kings Canyon and John Krebs wildernesses be managed not only under the provisions of the Wilderness Act of 1964 but also under the provisions of the 1916 NPS Organic Act and its subsequent modifications. This requirement, which is clearly implied within the Wilderness Act, has the effect of requiring that the managing agency sustain the natural resources within these wildernesses to a higher degree of protection than is required by the Wilderness Act alone.

Concern ID: 32748

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters were concerned that the project's objectives are inconsistent with the requirements of the Wilderness Act.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 51 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 214674 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My concerns are:
1) significant adverse effects to wilderness character (e.g., mechanized intrusion, noise, loss of solitude) due to the use of helicopters within designated wilderness; 2) lack of evidence the project is necessary to meet minimum requirements to preserve the area as wilderness; 3) even if the project were necessary to preserve wilderness, the proposed actions are not the "minimum tool" for achieving the project's objectives, and therefore are inconsistent with the requirements of the Wilderness Act

Concern ID: 32750

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that the use of helicopters and chainsaws or drills for park administrative purposes and maintenance are inappropriate at the park, and the park should rely on the "minimum tool".

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 734 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 255886 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have also been surprised at the frequency of park helicopter and chainsaw use in the wilderness. Other parks do not permit such extensive use of motors in the backcountry, and I think that Sequoia and Kings Canyon should seriously consider limiting helicopter flights and chainsaw use. Lower-impact alternatives exist; hikers with comparatively minor injuries could be evacuated on horseback, for example. Mobilization of wilderness rangers could be performed using pack stock instead of helicopter drops. And crosscut saws, in the hands of experienced trail crews, can do much the same work as chainsaws but in a much less disruptive manner.

Corr. ID: 788

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230260

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Administrative activities that do not rely on the minimum tool are inappropriate (e.g., using helicopters to transport people or gear when it could be done by backpacking or with stock; using chainsaws or drills to maintain and construct trails when non-mechanical methods would suffice). Administrative activities that provide for the economy and convenience of agency staff, but that are unnecessary to protect wilderness character, are inappropriate.

Corr. ID: 906

Organization: Wilderness Watch

Comment ID: 230450

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Sadly, the use of helicopters, chainsaws and other motorized tools has become commonplace in SEKI Wilderness. Apparently, managers have deemed their use to be cheaper, more convenient, more familiar, or otherwise preferable to adhering to higher ideals (and legal requirements) of the Wilderness Act. Using helicopters to supply a trail crew or a wilderness ranger with food and other supplies are almost never necessary, and would be unheard of even in other large remote areas of the NWPS. Pack stock or backpack support is more than adequate and is indeed how such tasks are performed in Wildernesses throughout the System. Further, the use of helicopters to shuttle administrators or their supplies to and from Wilderness, to assist researchers or wildlife managers who should know how and be required to travel and work in Wilderness without such aid, or ferry fire monitors who can and should walk out of the mountains, is unnecessary and likely unlawful.

We urge you to use this planning process to rethink and revise how Wilderness stewardship is engaged at SEKI and to set it on the path toward total elimination of aircraft use except in emergencies and other rare instances where access is essential and non-motorized means isn't feasible.

Concern ID:

32751

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters stated that the NPS should end its reliance on helicopters at the park (for research, fire monitoring, bighorn sheep surveys/collars, or supplying trail crews) because it impacts visitor experiences and/or disturbs wildlife.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 156

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228890

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It should stop its extreme & unnecessary use of helicopters as the noise & confusion is disturbing to the wildlife

Corr. ID: 169

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228929

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: SEKI should stop its extensive, routine and unnecessary use of helicopters for research, fire monitoring, bighorn sheep surveys/collars, supplying trail crews, etc. The NPS should end its reliance on mechanized transport such as helicopters.

Concern ID: 32754
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some motorized use should be allowed in the wilderness to conduct landscaping and monitoring, and trail maintenance activities.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 561 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 224199 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Crews should be allowed to move in to preserve the wilderness, and more importantly, the 'hot shots' who are on the ground. Some motorized use to 'relandscape' damaged areas, remove invasive species, etc. This is the most efficient way to monitor plant and animal life, check for erosion, illegal substance agriculture, poaching, etc. Some recreational use in wilderness is appropriate since almost anything these days can qualify as wilderness.
Corr. ID: 877 **Organization:** The Wilderness Society; Back Country Horsemen of America
Comment ID: 230515 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups
Representative Quote: Management and maintenance of trails is important to facilitate the enjoyment of Wilderness by the public, both for stock and other compatible uses. Ensuring that these lands are able to be enjoyed by the public is important, and we believe the National Park Service should do what it can, consistent with the Wilderness Act, to maintain trails. The use of traditional tools and primitive means should be the first alternative when it comes to trail maintenance. However, at times, the minimum requirement might include the limited use of mechanized equipment. "Responsibly-maintained trails" in special cases may include the use of motorized equipment when it is appropriate and/or necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act, including assuring that these areas are "administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people." (Section 2a, P.L. 88-577)

Concern ID: 33530
CONCERN STATEMENT: The minimum tool requirement in the plan should include a clear and non-arbitrary process in order to adhere to the concept of wilderness.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 866 **Organization:** Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats Campaign for the Sierra Club
Comment ID: 230407 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation
Representative Quote: We urge you to include a clear non-arbitrary process to implement the minimum tool requirement in your revised plan. We realize that can lead to time consuming and expensive solutions but it is important to adhere to the concept of Wilderness as clearly defined in the Wilderness Act.

MT1000 - Miscellaneous Comments: General Comments

Concern ID: 33067
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have concerns regarding Fire Management (including prescribed burns) and/or air quality at SEKI.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 29 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 211193 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Air pollution from controlled burns should be prevented. Controlled burns should not be undertaken in high altitude areas.
Corr. ID: 703 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 229974 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: We have great concerns about the number and extent of "prescribed burns" conducted every year within our National Parks. We have done research and spoken to fire personnel and understand the philosophy of burning the underfuels to prevent uncontrolled wildfires. However, we feel that this method has

been overused and abused where other preventative measures could have worked as well or better. In fact, control burns seem to create more control burns by leaving dead trees, shrubs and branches that become fuel for the next fire season! Please also consider the effects these burns have on our health. According to the Fresno Bee:

"Mounting research shows the microscopic soot from wood burning is among the biggest air-pollution threats to the public. The specks, known as PM-2.5, can evade body defenses, lodge in the lungs, trigger many illnesses and result in premature death."

Corr. ID: 859

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230296

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Finally, I would like to see the WSP focus on specific techniques to be used in controlled burns within the wilderness. Certainly the continuing, long term effect on the forest is a prime consideration. But perhaps equally important is the immediate visual effect on visitors--to be seen for the next twentyfive to fifty years--especially when the area is large. Some poorly supervised past burns have burned unscheduled areas causing bad erosion, mudslides, and damage to streams, trails, and roads. The WSP should state that controlled burns be limited to very small areas, be well supervised and easily controlled. The 1400 acres in the Mosquito wilderness area, proposed to be burned this fall, is not a small area. I know that there are a lot of dead trees and duff between Mosquito Creek and Fowler Creek; I have been told that the plan is to burn mostly below the Tar Gap trail. However, I question how easy it will be to control a 1400 acre of fire all burning at once--plus the amount of smoke generated. If such a large expanse of burning is considered necessary, wouldn't it be better to do it in small increments?

Concern ID:

33070

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There are concerns about non-native or invasive species at the park, including visitor use management to reduce introduction of invasive species and concerns about the use of chemical herbicides.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 146

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219627

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Invasive plant species need to be controlled to maintain a native wilderness as much as possible. Non-native species are wreaking havoc across the country, and all our wilderness areas including SEKI should be protected from this.

Corr. ID: 810

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226856

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The spread of invasive weeds is a huge problem and in other parks they have become uncontrollable, which must not be repeated in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks Wilderness. The stock should be on a diet of weed-free feed several weeks before entering any parks. They too should be cleaned of any weed and seed debris before entering the Parks.

Corr. ID: 849

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228286

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: SEKI should require strict prevention measures to minimize the introduction and spread of invasive weeds from visible seeds both in their manual and on their hooves and coats. SEKI has for many years been quietly using chemical herbicides to control weed outbreaks even deep in the back country- while giving only lip service to meution measures. The NPS should 1 prohibit open sayings of park lands and require stock users to use weed-free feed. 2 require that all animals be provided weed-free feed for at least two weeks before entering the parks.

Corr. ID: 904

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 257000 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: When stock animals eat in the lowlands and then travel in the park, they can spread invasive weeds through their feces. Horses should be quarantined for a few days before a wilderness trip where they are given only seedless feed. This procedure would reduce the invasive weed problem at its source.

Concern ID: 33081

CONCERN STATEMENT: Permit applicants could be required to pass an education program to demonstrate their understanding of recreational impacts on wilderness and important wilderness skills.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 611 **Organization:** Sierra Club, Environmental Defense, Natl Res Def Council

Comment ID: 224520 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Perhaps we need to have people take a test or answer questions before their permit is granted that shows they have the knowledge of how to read a map, how to respect the land and wildlife, principles of being a clean camper and "trail etiquette". It seems logical that most people would think of these things before they go off on a wilderness trip. But a generation who is now growing up addicted to iPhones, iPads, Twitter and Facebook may not want to go off in the wilderness.

Corr. ID: 816 **Organization:** Earth Justice

Comment ID: 226889 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Education, education, education.. Suggest a short (10 question)pre-test about accepted wilderness use and ethics when the public makes their reservation or pay their fee; or a park ranger could include that information. Provide a simple brochure of accepted wilderness use and ethics.

Concern ID: 33084

CONCERN STATEMENT: Education, particularly "leave no trace" ethics, should be a part of the WSP.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 517 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 223909 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Public education is most important. Ranger programs should be used to educate the public about protection of wilderness resources. The Park service should coordinate with schools to have ranger talks at schools to educate the children. Documentaries should be developed for broadcasting on PBS. Subjects do not have to be controversial. Important yet aimple wilderness rules such as leave no trace can be taught and emphasized.

Corr. ID: 540 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 224059 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Education in our schools and media would help people understand what is appropriate in the wilderness. Perhaps the presence of people acting as land-stewards living in the area (seasonally or permanently) for consultation and advice & education would be helpful and appropriate.

Corr. ID: 745 **Organization:** n/a

Comment ID: 225369 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I strongly believe that visitor education is an absolute MUST. Visitors need to be educated on the rules/laws of the parks and more importantly why those rules/laws exist. They need to know that their actions have consequences. They need to know how to protect themselves and the wildlife from danger (i.e., storing food properly in the bear storage bins, not washing clothes/dishes/themselves in the streams, packing out what they pack in, etc.)

Corr. ID: 866 **Organization:** Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats

Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230410

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Another method we would like to suggest for reducing user impacts is to educate visitors about using the concept of "Leave-No-Trace". You currently limit the size of groups that plan to travel off trail and cross country. This is especially important in sensitive alpine areas above the tree line. If group leaders are qualified as a "Leave No Trace Trainer" you could consider allowing them to lead slightly larger groups into these sensitive areas. This would not only reduce the impacts of the group, it could also have spin off benefits. Group participants who receive LNT training could use this knowledge to reduce their own impacts in future wilderness visits. The Sierra Club is also an outings organization that requires its leaders to meet strict standards. We have organized our own LNT Trainer program for leaders of backpack outings and would be glad to share information about that with you.

Concern ID:

36106

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Communication with outside recreation groups, such as the caving community, should be included in the plan.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 781

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 231676

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Coordination with the caving community and recreation should be an important part of the proposed wilderness plan.

Concern ID:

36168

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that there is too much reliance on electronic devices such as radios and phones.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 821

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230080

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The current management strategy for the backcountry relies too much on radios and phones. Good organization and planning on the part of Park officials will minimize the need for instant communication with the outside world.

ON1000 - Other NEPA Issues: General Comments

Concern ID:

32904

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Mitigation should be evaluated in terms of both resource protection and the visitor experience. Any new mitigation should be identified in the plan so that it goes through the NEPA process including public involvement.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 823

Organization: Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230223

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Any additions within Wilderness or restrictions placed on visitors should be considered as mitigations necessary to protect the character and resources of the wilderness. All mitigations should be evaluated both in terms of resource protection and the visitors experience identified within the Wilderness Act. Any new mitigation not identified in a final Wilderness Stewardship Plan should go through a NEPA process with public involvement. Examples of mitigations are trails, campsites, bridges, ranger stations, and other permanent fixtures. Some items have transitioned from being mitigations to historical or archeological resources. The management of these Wilderness exceptions need to be identified in the Plan.

Concern ID: 33106
CONCERN STATEMENT: Impacts on natural resources resulting from climate change should be evaluated in the plan/EIS.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 183 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 229887 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The impacts of climate change will affect many natural resources in the wilderness. Research and continual monitoring will be needed to detect climate change induced impacts. Reducing other threats to wildlife and wilderness, such as pollution and invasive species, will be increasingly important.

OV 1100 - Comment Addresses Non-NPS Overflights

Concern ID: 36084
CONCERN STATEMENT: Non-NPS overflights in the wilderness, such as military, private, and commercial flights, are disruptive to the wilderness experience.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 734 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230033 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Natural quiet is perhaps the hardest of these to come by in the Sequoia and Kings Canyon wilderness areas; frequent military overflights are deeply disruptive.
Corr. ID: 767 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 225875 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In addition to helicopter flights, SEKI is plagued by military overflights. One day in Nine Lakes Basin I experienced about five overflights by low flying military jets. My nerves were really rattled by the noise and sight of the jets. I felt like I was in a war zone. I understand the military is a separate entity, but it might help if the wilderness stewardship plan included mention of this problem.
Corr. ID: 788 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230280 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In several of my trips to the SEKI wilderness, I have been surprised at how much noise from aircraft there is. Both high level overflights by either jetliners or military aircraft, and low level flights by helicopters. Any such aircraft noise breaks the spell of wilderness; civilization intrudes my mind when it should not. I also hope that Park staff will consider negotiating with the military, FAA, etc. to curtail or move flights so that they do not intrude on the Park Wilderness and its solitude.
Corr. ID: 887 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230914 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Military, commercial, private and NPS overflights are very disrupting to the peace and solitude of the wilderness experience. These activities should be limited to emergencies only.

PN4000 - Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority

Concern ID: 32770
CONCERN STATEMENT: There is concern that the Omnibus Act, Cave Resources Protection Act, and the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988 were not mentioned during public scoping or in the handouts. The absence of other legislation pertinent to wilderness management leads commenters to believe that research will not be given equal consideration as an appropriate use of wilderness.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 781 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230251 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Reference to the 1998 Omnibus Act is lacking in handouts and the verbal summary of legislation presented at the public meeting held on 26 April 2011 in Oakland, California. The absence of the 1998 Omnibus Act from a list of legislation pertinent to wilderness management is misleading, leading to a conclusion that research will not be given equal consideration as an appropriate use of wilderness. Leaving out selected legislation when considering a new wilderness plan shows a bias against certain uses such as scientific research.

Another law that seems to have been omitted from consideration is the Cave Resources Protection Act. One of the criteria found in this Act for declaring a cave significant is recreation. Encouraging cooperation between a nongovernmental agency, like the caving community, and government agencies is also part of this law

Concern ID:

32773

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The statutory authority which created both Parks as well as the Wilderness Act should be considered in the plan.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 836

Organization: High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California

Comment ID: 230263 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: While the areas at issue are the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness and John Krebs Wilderness, Congress stated that, with respect to pack and saddle stock activities, these specific wilderness areas were to be managed in a manner "consistent with the statutory authority under which the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks were created" as well as the Wilderness Act. House Report No. 110-694 (*4)(Att. 3). Thus, it is important to recognize the statutory authority which created both these Parks.

Corr. ID: 836

Organization: High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California

Comment ID: 230267 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Given this explicit language in the authorizing statute, the Wilderness Act cannot be cited as a basis to preclude in any way horseback riding in the John Krebs Wilderness Area or the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness Addition. In fact, horseback riding is the only public use which is explicitly authorized in these Wilderness Areas. Moreover, because this protection was an explicit condition for the areas being designated as Wilderness Areas, any violation of this explicit condition would not only be a violation of law, it would be reneging on a promise made to horseback riders in order to obtain their agreement to the establishment of the Johns Krebs Wilderness and the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness Addition.

Concern ID:

32774

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There is concern for the banning of stock activity since it is an historic activity and it is protected by the Wilderness Act. The pack train originated out of necessity to reach remote areas, such as the Park has to offer, and stock use is a large part of the Parks' rich history.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 817

Organization: Rainbow PackOutfitters

Comment ID: 226892

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Along this vein, we request the Park to consider the historical use of the trails, and keep them open as before to continued stock use. We request that no negative trail assignments will be made as the Inyo National Forest did in 2005, with their Not Suitable for Commercial Stock Trail (NSCS) designation. This designation was in response to a lawsuit filed by the High Sierra

Hikers group, who felt the trails belong only to human feet, and were offended by commercial services being provided into wilderness areas. As in any NEPA/EIS process a balance a balance of criteria must be met. The National Historic Act (NHPA) is included in one of these criteria that must be met. As is the Wilderness Act, and many others. We request that as the Park wades through this process, it will consider the benefits of commercial packing, stock use in the back country, private stock use, and its historical connection of stock to the land. Where else would one see a pack train? On the 405 freeway, in the city? No, because the pack train was born of necessity, to reach remote areas, such as the Park has to offer, and because stock use is a large part of the Parks' rich history. Hopefully stock use, whether commercial or private, will be allowed to continue into the Parks future.

Corr. ID: 836

Organization: High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California

Comment ID: 230268

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: "The use of pack and saddle stock is still recognized as a traditional, historically and culturally significant, and legitimate activity that will continue in the backcountry of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks." Therefore, the historic stock activity in the backcountry of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks is protected by the Wilderness Act, the specific statutes establishing both the Johns Krebs Wilderness and the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness areas and the NHPA as well. Because of this determination by Congress, NPS cannot, as a matter of law, consider any alternative in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness and John Krebs Wilderness Stewardship Plan that bans the use of stock in these areas.

Concern ID:

32776

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There is concern that backpackers are seeking exclusive use of the trails and that they want to ban stock use. No use should be given "exclusive use".

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 836

Organization: High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California

Comment ID: 230265

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Congress also directed that no one person or group should be given "exclusive privilege[s]" over the use of any parts or trails in Sequoia National Park. 16 U.S.C. § 45d (Att.6).1[1-If stock use were prohibited from any area, backpackers would effectively have an "exclusive privilege" in that area. Therefore, when backpackers express a personal distaste for sharing trails with stock and seek to ban stock use for that reason, they are essentially seeking exclusive use of that trail, which is contrary to law.]

Concern ID:

35928

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The plan should explain how the 1998 Omnibus Act directives will be coordinated with the Wilderness Act. It will be critical that both be considered on an equal and balanced basis.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 182

Organization: NSS

Comment ID: 228986

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As the SEKI Wilderness Management Plan goes forward, please indicate specifically how the 1998 Omnibus Act directives will be coordinated with Wilderness Act. As both Acts are major contributors to the final document, it will be critical that both be considered on an equal and balanced basis.

This is a very important consideration as the Wilderness Management Plan will have a direct bearing on structuring of the Cave Management Plan in years following.

PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action

Concern ID: 32663

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Objectives for the WSP should include compliance with federal laws; evaluate commercial uses in SEKI wilderness to the extent necessary per the Wilderness Act; replace the outdated Backcountry Management Plan and Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan; develop and implement a science-based wilderness management plan that would protect SEKI's park values and preserve SEKI's wilderness character; and reform SEKI's wilderness permit system.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 901

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230343

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: The "Purpose & Need" for this project should clearly articulate several long-overdue actions: 1) the need to bring SEKI into compliance with the federal laws cited above; 2) the need to substantially curtail commercial uses in the SEKI wilderness to the extent necessary and proper per the Wilderness Act; 3) the need to replace SEKI's outdated Backcountry Management Plan (BMP) and Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan (SUUMP) to acknowledge that most of SEKI is now designated as wilderness-and as such, the SEKI wilderness deserves and is mandated by law to have far greater protections put into place than exist in the BMP and SUMMP; 4) the need to develop, adopt, and implement a modern, science-based wilderness management plan that fully protects SEKI's park values and fully preserves SEKI's wilderness character; and 5) the need to reform SEKI's wilderness permit system so it is fair, and to eliminate the current preferential treatment afforded to certain commercial users. Any effort to craft a WSP for SEKI would fall short if any of these five urgent needs is not articulated in your EIS's "Purpose & Need" statement, and enthusiastically embraced by your staff.

VH1000 - Values: Value the History or Cultural Resources

Concern ID: 32741

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Cultural resources in the wilderness areas, like historic buildings, Native American sites, and cabins, need to be protected. The WSP should address how these sites will be preserved.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 26

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 211156

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The network of existing cultural resources scattered across the remote wilderness areas of the two parks needs to be sustained and valued.

Corr. ID: 29

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 211192

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Cultural resources such as historic cabins and mining sites should be preserved under the NPS mandate.

Corr. ID: 822

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 226921

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While the preservation of the flora and fauna in wilderness areas is key, there are also important cultural resources that should be preserved and maintained. These include cabin sites, Native American sites, dams, and mines. The new plan needs to address how these sites will be preserved and explanatory signs added if none exist to let visitors know the history of the site.

Concern ID:

32742

CONCERN

Information for visitors on historic and cultural sites, like placards, signs, and

STATEMENT:

ranger guided tours significantly increase the experience of historical sites for visitors, and the value of such sites. Information on sites is an important aspect of these areas, which should not be removed from wilderness areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 583

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229926

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Any American Indian culture here? I am sure there was, but it is never discussed. This could bring a multi-dimension to the park.

Corr. ID: 583

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229911

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I recently discovered Buck Rock (Sequoia National Forest) and the fire look out station. What a fantastic historic monument and spectacular example of the park's keeping things rustic, yet useful, and very fun for visitors. I also always enjoy discovering things like Knapp's cabin and Zumwalt meadow where the Park's department has placed placards that tell some of the history behind the place such as Muir Rock, and the meadow where all the sequoias were cut down in Boole Tree area, (SNF) which explains why it feels like a sequoia graveyard. Ranger talks are a great way to bring this history, our history to life. And they do a fantastic job. Re-enactments by history buffs and talks by experts could really add another dimension.

Corr. ID: 887

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230912

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Wilderness areas should recognize past historical events (not just the impact of pre-history natives) The SEKI wildernesses have witnessed Significant events and interesting "characters" during the past 150 years. I recently read a fascinating account in the Tulare County Historical Society publication "Las Tulares" recalling the activities of sheep and cattlemen in the 1800's moving their flocks and herds up the Kern Canyon from the San Joaquin Valley to the upper reaches of the Kern River and over Colby Pass to the southern parts of Kingsl Canyon Park. A similar article on the establishment of Lewis Camp on the Kern River reminded me of my experience when encountering the old store and unique water ways to the old campsites. Old miner and stocking cabins, hunter camps, and the like are interesting remains from the 18th century and should not be removed.

Concern ID:

32743

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Ethnographic and archeological resources would be best protected by removing any information on maps and other documents that would indicate the location of these sites, and by making sure trails were not in proximity to these sites.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 865

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230393

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Protect archeological and ethnological resources by not putting them on maps or otherwise revealing them and keeping trails away from them.

VN1000 - Values: Value the Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural, quiet, undeveloped areas)

Concern ID:

32757

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The natural setting of the park is one of the integral reasons that commenters visit the park, and many highly value wilderness. Commenters cited the natural sounds, smells, and vistas as major elements to their enjoyment of the park and wilderness experience, and felt that natural areas are crucial to the health of the ecosystems.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 8

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228804 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Mostly just preserve the beauty and diversity of the existing parkland. There is plenty of developed land out there. The undeveloped remoteness of Sequoia/Kings Canyon is a large part of its value.
Corr. ID: 322 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 222895 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Wilderness is important for so many reasons. We need intact, fully functioning ecosystems for the health of the planet and species living in it. Sequoia/Kings Canyon is special in particular on account of the incredible forests. Recreation should be enjoyed in a way that leaves as little human trace/pollution as possible - walking, hiking, limited fishing, camping etc.
Corr. ID: 557 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 224168 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Clean, pristine wilderness areas, where the health and integrity of the ecosystem is protected, are needed for physical and psychological human health and the health of the web of life that ultimately affects us all no matter where we live.
Corr. ID: 734 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230032 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I value having a sense of being in a wild, natural place, away from other people and society. To that end, natural quiet, dark night skies, an untrammelled landscape, and the necessity of self-reliance are among the most important elements of the wilderness experience

VV1000 - Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities

Concern ID: 32717
CONCERN Stewardship plans that protect wilderness areas improve visitor opportunities and enjoyment of these areas. Commenters valued stewardship of the wilderness.
STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 672 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 224878 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: It is important to me that people have the freedom and space to use the wilderness for wilderness use and recreation but also use it in a sustainable and environmentally conscious way. It is also very important that people do not participate in recreation that harms the wilderness and the natural habitat that many animals and plants use for living.
Corr. ID: 686 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 225022 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Hiking, educating and experiencing the wonder of the national parks should be encouraged. All persons should be allowed to visit and enjoy the national parks.

Plants and animals should be allowed to live and grow naturally.

Corr. ID: 838 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230277 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Having visited the unique and unparalleled areas such as Evolution Basin, Dusy Basin, Upper Basin, Rae Lakes Basin, Big Horn Plateau, and parts of Mineral King to name a few, over the past four decades repeatedly, I find that these areas have remained virtually the same - reinforcing the stewardship plan of protecting these areas and preserving their wilderness character. Well done NPS!

Concern ID:	32718
CONCERN STATEMENT:	Non-motorized boat opportunities for visitors in the park and wilderness areas are important. Natural rivers with little development, particularly hydropower development, allow for primitive recreational experiences for visitors, which allows for a connection to nature. Paddling the river is a powerful means for the public to use and enjoy the scenic rivers of the park.
Representative Quote(s):	<p>Corr. ID: 831 Organization: American Whitewater</p> <p>Comment ID: 230242 Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation</p> <p>Representative Quote: With over 800,000 acres of wilderness, we write to highlight the importance of human-powered boating opportunities on the rivers within the Parks and related Wilderness Areas.</p> <p>Corr. ID: 831 Organization: American Whitewater</p> <p>Comment ID: 230254 Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation</p> <p>Representative Quote: Exploring the rivers in Sequoia-Kings National Park and their related Wilderness Areas by hand-powered craft affords visitors with a unique opportunity to experience park resources, enjoy the river and riparian landscape, and provides inspirational opportunities to experience wild rivers. We ask that you value this experience equally with the experiences sought by other Park visitors. The core element of paddling is experiencing a place through interaction with moving water, going with the natural flow and experiencing the landscape from the river's perspective.</p> <p>Corr. ID: 831 Organization: American Whitewater</p> <p>Comment ID: 230245 Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation</p> <p>Representative Quote: Our members regularly enjoy a number of rivers within the Parks and their related Wilderness Areas. Unlike nearby rivers in the Sierra Nevadas, which are heavily impacted by hydropower operations, the rivers in the Parks offer unparalleled and unique opportunities for wilderness exploration. They allow for primitive and unconfined recreation, where individuals have freedom to explore, can practice self-sufficiency, and engage in a direct experience with the natural environment. The paddling experience on each one of these rivers offers a unique experience and opportunity for boaters to develop a strong connection with the Sequoia-Kings Parks and related Wilderness Area.</p>
Concern ID:	32719
CONCERN STATEMENT:	Non-motorized recreation is an historic use at the park.
Representative Quote(s):	<p>Corr. ID: 831 Organization: American Whitewater</p> <p>Comment ID: 230252 Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation</p> <p>Representative Quote: Floating down a river is likely the most ancient form of travel and exploration aside from walking. Paddling is human-powered, place-based, low-impact, quiet, non-consumptive, skill-based, and Wilderness-compliant. In fact, prohibiting the activity from a Wilderness area is inconsistent with the Wilderness Act.</p> <p>Corr. ID: 831 Organization: American Whitewater</p> <p>Comment ID: 230248 Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation</p> <p>Representative Quote: Paddlers who have enjoyed the wilderness rivers of the Park for the past several decades have developed a deep appreciation for the unique resources these rivers provide. The wilderness setting and diversity of these rivers allows individuals to find solitude and explore areas of the park where one can find new adventures and rivers to explore.</p>
Concern ID:	32720
CONCERN	Commenters stated that the plan needs to include a policy for permitting angling.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 25 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 211125 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The plan needs to have appropriate policies for permitting angling while protecting natural resources.

Concern ID: 35938

CONCERN Recreation is inappropriate when it adversely impacts habitat or wildlife.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 797 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 257001 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Low impact recreation is appropriate when it introduces people to Wilderness in a way that invokes their care and protection. recreation of any kind is inappropriate when it adversely impacts habitat and / or species.

Concern ID: 35940

CONCERN Paddling should be allowed in the wilderness since it does not interfere with the public enjoyment of rivers.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 831 **Organization:** American Whitewater
Comment ID: 230256 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation
Representative Quote: In many cases paddling is recognized as an ORV, or as an integral component of a more general "recreation" ORV. On these rivers, paddling is protected and enhanced under the first part of Section 1281 .. On Wild and Scenic Rivers where paddling is not specifically recognized as an ORV, agencies support paddling because paddling does not "substantially interfere" with public enjoyment of rivers. Far from substantially interfering, paddling itself is a powerful means for the public to use and enjoy Wild and Scenic Rivers. Paddling is protected and enhanced on these rivers under the second part of Section 1281. For these reasons the public is generally encouraged to enjoy Wild and Scenic Rivers in canoes, kayaks and rafts.

Corr. ID: 831 **Organization:** American Whitewater

Comment ID: 230249 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: We note, however, that there is a ban on all watercraft on the Wild and Scenic South Fork of the Kings River between its confluence with Bubbs Creek and the Kings Canyon National Park border. This reach flows in part through the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness Area. American Whitewater respectfully requests that a fresh look be taken at this closure in the management and planning process and that lifting the ban be considered in the EIS as an alternative.

Corr. ID: 831 **Organization:** American Whitewater

Comment ID: 230255 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Paddling meets with the Park Service's 2006 Management Policy 6.4.3, which pertains to Wilderness and requires that "recreational uses of wilderness will be of a type and nature that ensures that its use and enjoyment (1) will leave it unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness; (2) provides for the protection of the area as wilderness, and (3) provides for the preservation of wilderness character."

VW1000 - Values: Value the Wilderness Experience

Concern ID: 32827

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having solitude and untouched wilderness was something that many commenters noted as being important to their experience of the wilderness in the parks. Visitors wanted to have an experience that did not include visible impacts from other users, or motorized equipment.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 183

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222207

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Wilderness is extremely important as an invaluable source of wildlife habitat, biological diversity, high water quality and numerous other values found nowhere else. Wilderness is also important to me as a place to experience nature and the peace and quiet found there.

Corr. ID: 398

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223290

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is very important for me to be able to experience nature and wilderness areas without so many modern day distractions. I think it is also important that wilderness areas remain wild and that they are not overcrowded with people, but that people who wish to use the areas may do so with care.

Corr. ID: 704

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 225119

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is important to me that I have a wilderness experience when I am in a wilderness area. That I enjoy the sounds of nature and not of the urban area. That I can hike among the trees and beauty of the wilderness with no disruption. Going to the wilderness is where I experience God. Keep it quite and natural.

Corr. ID: 803

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226808

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The value of the wilderness experience resides largely in experiencing the alpine environment in a condition where it has not been strongly impacted by human activities. Hence a measure of solitude (small group size), (natural) quiet conditions and untrammelled spaces. This means no bells on animals.

Concern ID:

32830

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Manmade noise sources, such as electronic devices and aircraft traffic significantly detract from the feeling of wilderness in the parks. Efforts should be made to eliminate these manmade noise sources.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 122

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219422

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Peace, quiet, and NO pollution. No noise pollution from helicopters or radios, and no pollution from over-exploitation.

Corr. ID: 482

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223726

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I enjoy visiting natural places and camping. It is important to me that I sleep when the sun goes down and that I awaken to the sun. It is also important that I have the opportunity to listen to the natural sounds of the environment and not to be disturbed by the sounds of man made devices.

Corr. ID: 834

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228147

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One of the biggest changes I have noticed in the last decade is the dramatic increase in jet airplane traffic over the Sierra both commercial and military. The noise pollution from these aircraft has moved beyond annoyance to a threat to the nature of this wilderness. The Park Service cannot ignore this pervasive annoyance. Some standard for noise must be adopted so that there will be a tool to reduce this inescapable impact.

WL1000 - Comment Addresses Day and Overnight Use

Concern ID: 32259

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Overnight use should be prohibited from high use areas and fragile ecosystems, like meadows, riparian areas, and lakeshores. Prohibited areas in SEKI include Heather Lake and Bull Frog Lake, which should set examples for other similar areas. If overnight use occurs, a limit to the number of nights should be implemented.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 866

Organization: Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats
Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230404

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Management of areas with high visitor use will be an important issue for you to consider in your plan. Obviously wilderness near entry points at trail heads and popular destinations will receive the most impact from human use. We feel strongly that the use of "zoning" with the goal of applying different standards of management to portions of a Wilderness area is inappropriate. A system of zoning creates the possibility for allowing undesirable degradation and possibly illegal uses in less strictly regulated zones. We urge you to consider other options to deal with this problem.

You may even need to prohibit overnight use in some intensely used and environmentally sensitive areas like you do at Heather Lake and Bull Frog Lake. Zoning Wilderness to allow less restrictive management near high impact and sensitive areas is a mistake. Wilderness is Wilderness. The Wilderness Act does not make exceptions for different levels of management to deal with high use areas.

Corr. ID: 866

Organization: Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats
Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230422

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: In some high use areas designated camp sites may be needed. Some areas, such as Frog Lake in Kings Canyon National Park, may need to be permanently off limits to overnight camping. Other locations may need to have a limit of one or two nights stay as you do at Rae Lakes. Sensitive wet areas like meadows, riparian areas and lake shores may need to be permanently off limits to overnight camping. Wilderness Rangers can be invaluable in helping visitors understand the necessity of minimizing impacts at camp sites by making contacts with visitors and explaining the problems of inappropriately located campsites.

Concern ID:

32263

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commenters stated that day and overnight use should be continued within the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 583

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229915

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: day and overnight use
Continue both.

Concern ID:

32264

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Day rides should be eliminated within the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 837

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228161

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: eliminate "day rides" in SEKI

WL1100 - Comment Addresses Wilderness Permitting

Concern ID: 32521

CONCERN There should be a single system for users to compete for limited wilderness permits.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 780

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 255883

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the necessity of limiting permits (trailhead quotas) and access to protect wilderness values, but such limits should never favor certain groups over others.

Yosemite has an excellent system: individuals must compete for limited permits, and then select a pack outfit, if needed.

Corr. ID: 901

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 255882

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: The Wilderness Permit System - As I understand it, the purpose of the Wilderness Permit System is to prevent overcrowding in the back country and to minimize damage to trails and sensitive areas. On that basis, the logical and fair way to give out permits is by means of a single system, not a dual system as presently exists.

Corr. ID: 905

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 255881

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The number one thing that galls me as a private foot hiker is that I have to compete with hundreds or thousands of other private hikers for the limited number of backcountry permits for popular trailheads for the key summer weeks in August, trying to plan this months and months in advance (e.g., making plans in March for trips to happen in August), oftentimes finding certain trails unavailable to me due to the quotas.

Concern ID: 32529

CONCERN Commenters felt that wilderness use and ethics information should be provided when a permit is issued, as well as Leave-No-Trace practices and safety rules.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 209

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 222314

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Permits required, rangers meet with people going into the wilderness to make sure they can comply with safety rules, require itinerary registered at ranger station, heavy fines for breaking safety rules re: fires etc.

Corr. ID: 530

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 255884

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Overnight permits should be required and those obtaining permits should be informed about LNT. Furthermore, obvious violations of LNT should be fined heavily, with the money going to clean-up and conservation efforts.

Corr. ID: 866

Organization: Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats
Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230409

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: All Wilderness permit holders should receive information before entering Wilderness about proper wilderness use and ethics. The information should at the very least accompany the permit when it is issued. The internet can be used for this purpose for those who get their permit ahead of time. Permit applicants could be required to complete an on line program to demonstrate their knowledge about impacts. Wilderness Rangers can make contacts to educate visitors near trail heads as much as possible.

Concern ID: 32530
CONCERN STATEMENT: Permits must be easy to obtain. Some commenters noted that the closing time of the Roads End permit station makes it very difficult for weekend users to pick up their permits. Commenters also felt that wilderness permits should not have time of entry limits.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 11 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 211062 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Are you going to change access at trailheads? How you get in...permit pick-up affects timing...limits trip options - can't start at night.
Corr. ID: 508 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 223871 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Make sure wilderness permits are easily obtained, preferably at the trailhead.
Corr. ID: 823 **Organization:** Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club
Comment ID: 230225 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The Wilderness permit needs to be flexible enough to allow entry at any time of the day or night. Do not try to cubbyhole the wilderness user. The majority may leave at 6:00 to 10:00 A.M. given the choice. But there are others visitors who prefer very early morning, evening, or walking with the moon and stars (and fewer mosquitos). It is also a wilderness access issue for those with health issues.
Corr. ID: 826 **Organization:** Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club
Comment ID: 226941 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I have serious problem with some of the current permit regulations. Specifically, that Roads End users must pick up their permits at the trailhead the day before, and that the permit station closes at 3:00 PM. This makes it extremely difficult for weekend users who work until 5:00 on Friday. There is no possibility to get a very early start on Saturday if you have to wait around until 7:00 AM.

Concern ID: 32531
CONCERN STATEMENT: Current quotas are acceptable and should not be raised.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 162 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 228906 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Do not apply trail head quotas to off trail travel.
Corr. ID: 519 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 229593 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Quotas that are in place now are acceptable. No more though.

Concern ID: 32532
CONCERN STATEMENT: There should be limits on the number of permits issued to users, based on carrying capacity, and impact on the environment of various users. Large groups should be issued special permits, and would need to be more closely policed. Commenters suggested large groups should purchase additional campsite and fire permits.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 262 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 229227 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I think large gatherings should require special permits, and be policed to avoid bothering others.
Corr. ID: 289 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229289 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Party/group size should be small enough that the traces they leave are minimal, but I don't know what the number would be. There should also be a limit on the total number of people receiving wilderness permits for the same purpose

Corr. ID: 478 **Organization:** TAXPAYER

Comment ID: 223698 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I don't think a group of people over 15 should be allow camping permits. Unless they want to purchase another camp site and permits for camp fires strictly enforced for all camp sites.

Corr. ID: 856 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228390 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Low Impact Rules Should Apply to All. Many times I have defended the quota system and strict regulation of access for light-footed hikers, only to see the heaviest impact users of all waltz in with no restrictions. This is unfair and completely counter-productive to a healthy wilderness environment. Quotas and access rules should be based on real impact, with rules for all that bear some resemblance to the extent of that impact. Packers shouldn't have pre-guarantees for permits.

Concern ID: 32536

CONCERN STATEMENT: The park should balance how the permits are issued to hikers, equestrians, long distance trail users, etc.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 23 **Organization:** Pacific Crest Trail Association

Comment ID: 210995 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We are concerned that the number of commercial permits issued for wilderness activities may limit the number of permits issued by the PCTA or the Parks for individual hikers and equestrians. Through coordination with the PCTA and other organizations issuing wilderness and trail permits, we recommend the WSP/EIS insure a balance of permits issued, and special consideration for those users served by multi agency trailwide long distance permits in particular.

WL1200 - Comment Addresses Use of Campfires

Concern ID: 32681

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the current campfire restriction(s) or policies in place at SEKI.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 780 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230247 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfires: present policy is good: prohibit fires where natural generation of dead wood is less than campfires would consume. Absolutely no importation of wood for fires in otherwise no-fire areas.

Corr. ID: 885 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230884 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The current campfire restrictions should remain in place. I have not built a campfire in the backcountry for many years, even at lower elevations where they are permitted. The large, elaborate fireplaces that remain in legal fire areas should be knocked down and rebuilt to a smaller size. Anyone found constructing a fireplace should be dealt with harshly, including a hefty fine.

Concern ID: 32682

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Campfires should be prohibited at SEKI or campfire-free zones should be established, such as in sensitive areas or backcountry areas.

Corr. ID: 404

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229314

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfire-Free zones in ecologically sensitive areas.

Corr. ID: 772

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230220

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfires should be prohibited; gas stoves only.

Campfires encourage scavenging for wood and that wood is useful to the forest for its inhabitants' environment.

Corr. ID: 795

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230299

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No campfires anywhere in the backcountry at any elevation.

Concern ID:

32684

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Commenters felt that importing or collecting/consuming firewood should be prohibited.

Corr. ID: 458

Organization: Home

Comment ID: 229503

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfire sites are the most visible human impacts in the backcountry and the consumption of firewood must be prohibited where it is in short supply (the high country).

Corr. ID: 866

Organization: Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats
Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230405

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Campfires in areas where wood is scarce can result in serious degradation of ground cover. You have already designated areas where no campfires are permitted. We urge you to retain that restriction. Monitoring will be necessary to consider changes in those rules as time passes. Allowing wood to be packed in would make it difficult to enforce the rules for all visitors. Please consider prohibiting the use of imported fire wood for all users, commercial and private parties, in all areas where camp fires are prohibited.

Concern ID:

32685

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Campfires should only be allowed if certain conditions are met, such as when fire pits are available, under certain elevations, size is controlled, in areas/seasons with limited fire risk, if firewood is available, if extinguished at certain times, if a water supply is nearby, and when resource damage would not occur.

Corr. ID: 406

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229321

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfires should be enjoyed in small groups but need to be closed down by 10 PM each night.

Corr. ID: 760

Organization: Sierra Club, Green Peace

Comment ID: 230179

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfires should be allowed in areas provided fire risks are limited.

Corr. ID: 799

Organization: Sempervirens, Save the Redwoods and
Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230325

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No campfires unless in wet and already professionally built fire pits - certainly not anywhere that there is not a close and accessible supply of

water

Corr. ID: 814

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226876

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that campfires are unnecessary and inappropriate above 8000', due to the fragile balance of life at the higher elevation. They should not be permitted.

Concern ID:

32686

CONCERN

Commenters believe that campfires detract from the wilderness experience.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 441

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223520

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The serenity of the space should be protected. We could do without campfires.

Corr. ID: 788

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230264

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I never have campfires in the wilderness areas of the high Sierra because I know how short the growing season is for trees, and I know that having a campfire is not necessary and even detracts from enjoying an evening in the backcountry. I have observed countless stumps in SEKI where unscrupulous visitors have cut down live or dead portions of trees for fires. I have counted the number of rings on many, and been amazed that a four-inch diameter stump is often on the order of 50 years old. Campfires tend to detract from the wilderness experience because they draw one's attention to the fire, not to the surrounding wilderness. They obstruct one's ability to hear and see the surrounding wilderness. They are no longer necessary or desirable for cooking food with the advent of lightweight cooking gear. They also detract from solitude because I can observe and smell other visitors when they have fires nearby, when otherwise I would not be able to detect their presence.

Concern ID:

32687

CONCERN

Commenters believe that campfires add to the wilderness experience of SEKI.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 704

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229978

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think that a campfire is part of the wilderness experience but should be confined to tent sites and in appropriate constructed enclosures.

Corr. ID: 843

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230161

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fishing is important for people to be able to have the experience of catching your dinner and cooking it over the campfire. It is just not camping with out having a campfire to sit around and talk in the evening.

Concern ID:

32688

CONCERN

There is a health concern associated with smoke from campfires.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 426

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229351

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Campfire use needs to be determined by what is healthy for the wilderness and those who are breathing in the air of the wilderness. If too many campers build too many fires to the point of choking off clean air, this needs to be prohibited.

Corr. ID: 826 **Organization:** Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club
Comment ID: 226939 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Personally, I would like to see an end to campfires in wilderness. I have health issues with wood smoke. If another party builds a fire in the area, I am forced to flee my camp. Can I be the only one with this problem?

Concern ID: 32689
CONCERN STATEMENT: Fire permits should be issued for campfires and/or citations should be given if fire safety is not observed.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 209 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 229157 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fire permits have to be issued and citations should be given if fire safety is not observed: again, it's a matter of educating the users.
Corr. ID: 387 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 223222 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Campfires can be given on a permit basis in safe areas. If found with fires outside these areas and/or without permit, heavy fines must be imposed as well as liability to any fires caused by an illegal fire.

WL1300 - Comment Addresses Wildlife and Proper Food Storage

Concern ID: 32730
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters stated that food storage lockers should be removed from the park.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 194665 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: With the advent of relatively light weight bear canisters, I think the bear boxes can be removed. This would also put SKC on the same basis as Yosemite NP.
Corr. ID: 822 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 255746 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am very concerned about food storage and feel that more bear boxes need to be put in heavily used areas, both in the backcountry and in places closer to trailheads. Those already there need to be checked and repaired when needed. Canisters often aren't big enough and are bulky to fit into backpacks. I'm sure that this inevitably deters people from using them.
Corr. ID: 849 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 228262 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: SEKI began airlifting large bear- proof food lockers into its wilderness in the 1980s before portable canisters are widely available, SEKI should stop installing these permanent improvements and remove the existing lockers by primitive methods.
Corr. ID: 906 **Organization:** Wilderness Watch
Comment ID: 230457 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation
Representative Quote: Food lockers are an example of structures that are no longer necessary. Portable bear- proof canisters are now available for visitor use. They not only eliminate the need for permanent food locker structures, they enhance the self-reliance component of a wilderness experience for visitors. Moreover, food lockers tend to congregate use causing biophysical impacts and loss of solitude in the areas where lockers have been placed. The wilderness stewardship plan presents an excellent opportunity to reduce the administrative footprint in the Wilderness by requiring the removal of food lockers.

Concern ID: 32732

CONCERN STATEMENT: Food storage lockers are appropriate in certain areas of the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 241 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 229181 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I think the park should provide secure food protection bins for campers that campers are required to use.
Corr. ID: 519 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 229594 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Bear boxes should be required in established campgrounds.
Corr. ID: 788 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 256844 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am disappointed that the Park Service has installed large, metal food lockers throughout the SEKI wildernesses. Not only are these an eyesore that detract from solitude and wilderness character whenever they are encountered, they concentrate use and camping around them, and detract from the need for self-reliance and planning by visitors. No doubt they also require the use of helicopters to transport them into wilderness, which is not permitted under the Wilderness Act. Certainly, these lockers are not the minimum tool, nor necessary, to preserve wilderness character and protect bear populations from human encroachment. The Park Service should disclose and analyze the impacts from using food storage lockers in the Park wilderness.
Corr. ID: 838 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230284 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: If possible, designated campsites with bear boxes should be in place in popular areas; otherwise, common sense of storing food out of reach of critters is a must Bear-proof canisters should be mandatory for all hikers carrying food.

Concern ID: 32734

CONCERN STATEMENT: Education and/or enforcement regarding wildlife and proper food storage needs to occur at SEKI.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 426 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 229353 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Food storage requirements should be established to prohibit wild life from obtaining the food. These requirements should be sent with the camping reservations, posted at the check in and firmly enforced.
Corr. ID: 523 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 256836 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Perhaps some education could be available about minimal resources within the area which could be used for food, such as berries, fish.

Concern ID: 32735

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters prefer bear-proof canisters over food storage lockers.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 251 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 229195 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Bear proof cannisters should be required of all visitors
Corr. ID: 523 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 223960 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Food storage practices should be in accordance with the bear-proof containers they use in Yosemite and anything carried in should also be carried out.

Corr. ID: 788

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230262

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ever since the adjoining national forests began requiring backpackers to carry food canisters, I have happily done so and I have never had an issue with bears getting to my food, although they have visited my campsites. The Park should require all visitors to carry proper food storage equipment, and should vigorously enforce policies to protect bears from humans.

Concern ID:

32736

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Visitors should be allowed to hang food in trees in appropriate locations at SEKI.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 171

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228939

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Hanging of food should continue to be allowed as an alternative to bear canisters. For camping in areas above treeline where bears do not travel, bear cans should NOT be required.

Corr. ID: 796

Organization: I can not uncheck Member on this form

Comment ID: 226478

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The URSACK should be legal.

WL1400 - Comment Addresses Party Size

Concern ID:

32667

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The number of stock animals per group should be reduced, and pack animals should only be used to support required gear, not luxury items.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 811

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226865

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One thing i definitely want to put on the table is you should have (in addition to, over & above any other rules), a maximum ratio of horses to people per group. I hear a mule can carry 150 lbs (or more), and nobody needs more than 50 lbs to enjoy the wilderness, so how about a MAXIMUM of 1 animal per 3 people (ratio 1:3). Why not?

Corr. ID: 863

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230336

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: SEKI's limit on the number of stock animals per group should be reduced from the current 20 animals/party to 10 or fewer animals/group. Because parties using stock are known to cause more than ten times the impact of foot travelers, stock users should be required to minimize the number of animals, and to leave unnecessary and luxury items at home. This can be effectively accomplished in part via smaller group size limits. Large groups are also known to have substantial adverse effects on the experience of other wilderness visitors.

Corr. ID: 869

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 255935

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the following steps to protect the SEKI wilderness regarding group size limits:

- Hikers and stock-users alike should be limited to no more than 10 heartbeats (i.e., people and stock combined). Although this does not completely remedy the disproportionate impact caused by stock, it does at least improve the equity among

users. It also places on the onus on stock users to reduce the number of unnecessary luxury items (and hence the need for more mules) that they bring into the backcountry so that they can maximize the number of people in a party.

- Groups traveling cross-country should be limited to no more than 6 persons. One of the primary motivations for traveling cross-country is to find solitude. Large parties ruin those opportunities for solitude.

Concern ID:

32668

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

There should be no reduction in party or group size at SEKI and the park should enforce current party size requirements.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 583

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229920

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been camping in the park for about fifteen years. I have noticed that the party size is not being enforced. Campsites will have 8+ people in one camp site plus three huge tents and a trailer. I do not think the party size needs to change. However, I do think enforcement of the party size needs stricter enforcement.

Corr. ID: 760

Organization: Sierra Club, Green Peace

Comment ID: 230177

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Party/group size should not be restricted as long as their impacts are nullified, ie take out what was taken in.

Corr. ID: 794

Organization: Rainbow Pack Outfitters

Comment ID: 226354

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Party and group sizes should not be reduced further, as it eliminates a segment of the population that wish to enjoy the back country.

Concern ID:

32671

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

The appropriate party/group size (people and/or stock animals) should be determined on a case-by-case basis using specified methodologies and/or may change based upon certain factors, such as season and fire danger.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 7

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228803

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: capacity - need adequate monitoring data to assess visitor impacts and make decisions about use levels

Corr. ID: 12

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228806

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Group size - you must have reasonable logical reasons (science-based) to limit / decrease group size

Corr. ID: 199

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 222276

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Group size depends on method of travel (foot or bicycle vs. horse, mule or motor-powered)--can permit larger of the former, but more limited of the latter.

Corr. ID: 487

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 229544

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Party/group size: decided by local rangers given the nature of specific wilderness. Might appropriately change with season, fire danger, etc.

Concern ID:

32672

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commenters suggest that party/group sizes be established for certain groups or areas of the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 235

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 229177 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In established campgrounds, I feel that groups are appropriate. Backpacking should be restricted to smaller groups
Corr. ID: 258 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229218 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Party size is not much of a concern in separate group campgrounds, but should be limited at other campgrounds to avoid noise pollution for others.
Corr. ID: 587 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229935 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Trails should be off-limits for groups of 12 or more people. Picnic areas should be limited to groups with less than 24 people. Busloads of people should be split at the bus parking lot in smaller groups.
Corr. ID: 832 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228124 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I also have a suggestion for the maximum group size for backpackers, as group size for everyone is an important issue in the parks. I would suggest that backpacking groups be restricted to a maximum of 8 people. Any more than that is too large an impact on campsites and their camping neighbors.

Concern ID: 32673
CONCERN STATEMENT: Large groups should be allowed at SEKI, but they need to be permitted and regulated.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 596 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 224425 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Large groups should be permitted, but carefully regulated.

Concern ID: 32674
CONCERN STATEMENT: Wilderness areas at SEKI should be undisturbed by groups.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 476 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 223685 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Groups should not be allowed to disturb the quiet of the wilderness.

WL1500 - Comment Addresses Camping and Campsites

Concern ID: 32377
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters felt that some of the campgrounds and campsites are overused.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 176 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 228961 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The back country camps - like at Bearpaw or Vogelsang (I know that's Yosemite) - are an abomination. They are horrible. I have had to hike through these areas to get to somewhere else. Bearpaw, in particular is dusty, over-used, trashed. The area is spectacular. Nine Lakes basins and the Kaweah basin are some of the best areas to visit. To get there you have to walk by (and camp) at Bearpaw.
Corr. ID: 866 **Organization:** Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats Campaign for the Sierra Club
Comment ID: 231505 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Heavily used camp sites are a problem in many areas. All visitors should attempt to minimize impacts at campsites. Knowledge of Leave-No-Trace methods should be used as much as possible.

Concern ID:

32380

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Large groups with unnecessary items such as radios, excess gear, alcohol, and other luxury items diminish the wilderness experience for others.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 847

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228219

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Because of such large groups being "packed" into the back country with all their unnecessary gear it takes away from my wilderness experience. Where I hike into an area with only my backpack and get to a lake where there are huge tarps, tents, "shower areas", "bathrooms", "kitchens", fire pits, ice chests and coolers etc. set up by an outfitter for their group it detracts from my experience.

Corr. ID: 860

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230303

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Often we have noticed that astounding numbers of animals are being used, not only to transport people, but to lavishly furnish their encampments with brightly decorated tables, chairs, extended kitchens, huge tents, inflatable boats, steak dinners, and even tiki torches on one occasion, arranged in front of each enormous tent! This type of encampment is sometimes hauled in and set up, at which time the horses depart, returning days later to collect everything and everyone. Thus they have actually made two round trips on the trails to allow a fairly small group of campers a bit of time "away from civilization", while being well supplied with a great many of the comforts of home. This sort of practice is destructive beyond all reason and it ruins the very Simplicity and solitude for which so many of us venture into the wilderness.

Corr. ID: 904

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230426

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I invest good money in lightweight gear and freeze-dried meals. When in camp, I sit on a log or rock and enjoy a Spartan meal cooked over a small flame. However, the situation is very different at my neighbor's camp. Their camp is cluttered with bulky ice chests, hefty pots & pans, unneeded chairs and tables, cases of beer, bottles of spirits, and even blaring radios. From the look of their gear, my neighbors might be at a parking lot tailgate party instead of deep within the wilderness.

Concern ID:

32444

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Group size at campsites should be limited.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 433

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229373

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Groups no larger than 12, and no loud, raucous behavior and drinking, and no loud music to disturb the peace of others. There should be a curfew of 9:00pm on noise.

Corr. ID: 869

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230451

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Human Limits

Large groups, both backpackers and stock users, seriously detract from the wilderness experience and do serious damage to the wilderness environment. There is nothing more disheartening than spending a long day on the trail and arriving at

your destination only to find that there is a group of 15 people camped there. Even more frustrating is when this occurs in off-trail portions of the wilderness.

Concern ID: 32450

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters felt that there should be restrictions on noise at campgrounds.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 111 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 255781 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Noise should be kept to an absolute minimum i.e., no radios, televisions or other noise-emitting devices should be permitted except within vehicles and then only at low levels. Those who cannot or will not abide by these rules should be ejected immediately and permission to use the campgrounds revoked.

Concern ID: 32453

CONCERN STATEMENT: No new campsites should be created, and camping should only be allowed in certain designated areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 111 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219369 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Again, minimally invasive is key. Small groups in designated areas should be permissible, as long as they obey campground rules on safe food storage and place waste in appropriate receptacles.

Corr. ID: 195 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 222253 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Camping on perimeter areas only. I do not think we need access to all areas of the wilderness.

Corr. ID: 271 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229264 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think that creating new campsites should be discouraged via marketing, however many locations require this.

Corr. ID: 866 **Organization:** Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 255782 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Designating campsites as you already do for example at Pear Lake is another method you have available.

Concern ID: 32455

CONCERN STATEMENT: Vegetation near campsites needs to be thinned or cleared for fire and other safety reasons.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 440 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223516 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Cut down dangerous trees near trails and campgrounds. Clear dry grass near campgrounds to prevent fire spread. Explain w/ signs and verbal warnings of park hazards.

Corr. ID: 710 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 225160 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Anywhere near campsites brush should be thinned.

Concern ID: 32507

CONCERN STATEMENT: Campsites need to be monitored to assure that permits and regulations are being followed in the backcountry.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 755 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 225608 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Not only limiting party sizes would be helpful, but actually monitoring the campsites in the field to be sure that permits are being followed and that back country rules are being complied with. We often found many rules being violated, such as washing with shampoo in the lake and staying beyond the established number of days allowed (Hamilton Lake).

Concern ID: 36719
CONCERN STATEMENT: [There are concerns that large groups adversely impact the environment.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 183 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 228988 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Please evaluate the impact of heavily used campsites, campfires, stock use and other visitor impact to the natural resources of the wilderness.
Corr. ID: 869 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 256856 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Large groups also do considerable damage to the wilderness landscape. First, many logical camping destinations in SEKI have only a handful of suitable and "hardened" campsites where pitching a tent is possible. When a small group arrives at a lake, they typically gravitate toward these previously used sites as they have usually been cleared of rocks, pine cones, and other debris that is likely to cause discomfort while sleeping. A large group arriving at the same site, however, has no other choice than to clear new sleeping areas. Subsequent campers will then continue to use these "new" sites; thus, large groups cause a proliferation of hardened sites. It is well established in the scientific literature that most of the soil compaction and vegetation damage occur in the first few uses of a site, and that it often takes years or even decades for natural processes to reverse these effects.
Large groups also lead to much more rapid "trails of use" between campsites and water sources, around the perimeters of lakes, and on cross-country routes.

WL1600 - Comment Addresses Human Waste Management

Concern ID: 32270
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Many commenters feel that it is not right that humans have to pack out their own waste when livestock is not required to do so. Commenters also feel that the impact of human waste on the environment is much less compared to recreational livestock.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 869 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230493 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Recommendation
The Park Service consider alternatives that abandoned the requirement that people pack out soiled toilet paper and instead promote education of proper disposal practices.
Corr. ID: 869 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230477 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Hikers are required to carry out their soiled toilet paper, but a horse or mule will deposit 25 lbs of fecal matter per day pretty much wherever it decides to relieve itself, which is often either near water or on trails where the runoff eventually ends up in the nearest stream.

SEKI policies, which continue to place more and more constraints on backpackers while at the same time casting a blind eye toward the impacts of recreational livestock, which are far more detrimental to the wilderness ecosystem.

Concern ID: 32271

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Leave-No-Trace principles should be practiced throughout the wilderness to address human waste issues.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 535 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 224032 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Our visits to California's gorgeous parks frequently include us filling the bag we've brought to take our own refuse out in with that of other, less respectful park visitors, and it is always so sad to see such beautiful places treated like garbage dumps.

Corr. ID: 882 **Organization:** Southern Sierra Climbers Association and The Access Fund

Comment ID: 230929 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Human waste can be a significant issue at areas that are popular climbing locations. The SEKI Wilderness Plan should consider signage educating climbers regarding Leave No Trace principles posted at parking lots and trailheads to effectively inform recreational users as to acceptable human waste disposal practices. Our experience is that the best way to address human waste issues in climbing areas is to inform climbers of their proven, documented impacts, and suggest alternative conduct that can ameliorate the problem.

Concern ID: 32272

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters feel that human waste is an issue at the park.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 18 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 211059 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Human waste in the backcountry is an ongoing education problem. Would an annual mandatory class in "cat hole" construction and necessity be possible? Summary execution of backcountry violators of waste management practices would be fine with me.

Corr. ID: 869 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230475 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Even worse, the result of this concentration of use was that human waste was a substantial problem. When it came time to "do my business," virtually every available place to dig a cat hole had already been used, and as a result, people had taken to climbing the hillside and turning over rocks to move their bowels in the resulting hole. I literally saw evidence of 8-10 "deposits" in the single night I spent there.

The result is not more composting toilets in the woods. The solution is to rely on bear canisters so that use once again becomes more dispersed.

Concern ID: 32273

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters want toilets to be installed in high traffic areas.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 583 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 229922 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I like the flush toilets but am concerned too many people are wasting water or if more facilities are built people will come to expect this as "the norm". On the other hand, I do not want people "going" in the woods if flush

toilets not provided. The pit toilets are generally very good. High traffic areas need to be pumped out or flush toilets installed. (

Corr. ID: 776

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230234

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Solar composting toilets at all base camps..

WL1700 - Comment Addresses Stock Use

Concern ID:

32915

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commenters noted that stock use should continue to be allowed in wilderness areas. Current regulations and policies were put in place to regulate stock use, and have done so effectively. There should not be any changes to the current regulations.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 20

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

Comment ID: 211070

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial and recreational stock users should be allowed access to the Wilderness Areas, the National Parks, and all Public Lands.

Corr. ID: 24

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 211081

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Over the last half century, policies regarding the use of stock animals in the backcountry have been established to minimize the effects of the animals. These regulations (i.e. numbers of animals allowed in a group, grazing regulations in meadows, etc.) have had a significant and positive impact on the health of wilderness areas. Given the historical use of stock animals in the backcountry, it would be foolish to suggest, as some have done, that horse users be barred from the wilderness. Rather, continued use of effective policies - and additional ones if needed - to minimize impacts should be maintained.

Corr. ID: 821

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226915

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Plan should continue to allow for commercial and private stock to use historical routes and places in the Park. In 1986, the Park recognized historical use for many trails and cross country travel.

Corr. ID: 899

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 256999

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The ability to rent and ride pack animals (horses, mules, and burros) is an important, even fundamental and necessary part of the wilderness experience. Some reasons include: riding a stock animal gives people with physical limitations the same ability to enjoy the wilderness as other people. Stock animals are a much cheaper and less polluting method of sustaining wilderness ranger stations and trail crew camps than helicopters. It is a thrill to see a pack string wending its way over the trails. Of course, one can cover a lot more ground in a day, riding rather than walking.

Concern ID:

32916

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Stock use is part of the historic recreation in the park and should continue, as it is protected in the Wilderness Act. Wilderness areas should include recreational activities that were historically allowed in the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 21

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California--
High Sierra Unit

Comment ID: 211071

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think you need to assess a couple of things in making this decision. The first obvious one is what is the historic root of the use of stock in the

backcountry? And I'm afraid that's obvious. The parks would not be here without stock use.

Corr. ID: 836

Organization: High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California

Comment ID: 230259

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Specifically and as discussed below, NPS cannot, as a matter of law, consider any alternative in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Sequoia-Kings Canyon Wilderness and John Krebs Wilderness Stewardship Plan that bans the use of stock in these areas.

In addition, all such alternatives must be consistent with the protection and preservation of historical stock activity which is set out in the laws that pertain to these areas.

Corr. ID: 900

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California, Public Lands Committee, High Sierra Unit

Comment ID: 230513

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Pack and saddle stock use pre-dates the formation of both Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. First stock use by Euro-Americans was in the late 1850's. In 1861 horse use and trail building took place in Log Meadow. In 1890 Sequoia National Park was formed and the 4th United States Cavalry conducted its first administrative patrols in 1891. In 1902, a contract was awarded for commercial transportation with horses and mules (wagons, pack-trains, etc.).

SEKI needs to confront the challenge posed to it by the HSHA and the back packer community through education and educate other user groups that stock use is a historic and traditional use that will be continued.

Concern ID:

32917

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters suggested changing restrictions to increase or facilitate stock use.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 821

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 256902

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial use should be studied and allowed in the Darwin Bench. Not having access to grazing at Evolution Lake is ok?however, historically the Darwin Bench was used for camping for hiking and pack supported trips and should be allowed.

Corr. ID: 859

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230292

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: After WWII, with the advent of light weight materials and freeze dried food, back packing became popular, but two pack stations continued as a form of recreation Between 1996 and 2002, there was only one--not because of lack of public interest but because of too many restrictions from the Park--primarily, no day rides. How can a station operator survive a short season without day rides, his major source of income. He can tolerate all of the other restrictions, but he must be permitted to give day rides. The infrastructure of the old station is still there and in fair condition. If no operators are available in California, advertise in other states, making it clear that day rides are permitted. Let packers take in supplies to trail crews--not helicopters. (Use helicopters only for emergency purposes. Their noise is certainly disruptive to a wilderness experience)/ Make running a pack station more attractive to an operator.

Corr. ID: 900

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California, Public Lands Committee, High Sierra Unit

Comment ID: 230529

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Increase private and commercial stock use. It is clear that the parks' capacity to handle more stock use is far greater than current use levels. It

is therefore our contention and our recommendation that private and commercial stock use be increased and use areas expanded (trails, corrals, overnight facilities, hitch rails, bear boxes, etc.).

Reestablish the commercial pack station operations in Wolverton and Mineral King, Establish facilities that can provide services for day rides and overnight trips. Include facilities and services for persons with disabilities. Include overnight corrals and facilities for private stock users. Include camping sites for stock users for both short' term (1 night) and longer term (14 nights). Continue to allow commercial pack stations to enter from surrounding national forests. Allow commercial pack stations to issue wilderness permits to stock parties.

The Park Service should move forward with ifs promise to relocate and re-establish the pack station in the Wolverton area, and should re-establish the pack station at Mineral King. The General Management Plan calls for commercial packing at these locations.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

32919

Stock use should be eliminated or severely limited in the park. Commenters felt that the negative impacts to other visitors and the environment make it reasonable to remove this form of recreation from the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 665

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 224826

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preservation and protection of these vital wilderness areas are of utmost importance, even if it means restricting and or limiting access to them. I would like to see a limit or even end to livestock and pack animal grazing in these areas.

Corr. ID: 802

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 229984

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe stock grazing to be very harmful to park resources; allowing non native animals to graze any park meadows seems to stand in glaring contrast to the park service mission. Stock animals trample our meadows and pollute our water as well as polluting the life in and around these waters, they leave non native seeds in their excrement and trample park trails. While traveling through Sugar loaf valley and Cloud Canyon I noticed some of the water (even after being filtered) didn't taste like the fresh mountain water I had grown accustomed too, It had more then a hint of the taste of horse poop. I understand that back country rangers need to eat but maybe there is another way to bring them food. Or maybe we can limit the use of stock animals to just bringing rangers food? I also understand back country trail crews use these animals for work, but is there not a better way to accomplish trail maintenance? I believe the negatives associated with stock use to out way the positives.

Corr. ID: 809

Organization: Friends of the International Center

Comment ID: 229995

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Wilderness Act allows commercial activities in the wilderness only "to the extent necessary." I have witnessed first-hand the degradation that comes from large commercial pack groups' impact on fragile meadows and steep inclines and their fouling of campsites, trails, and of streams and lakes. Commercial outfitters should be held to the same rules and standards as I am, as to group size limits, camp facilities and equipment caches in the wilderness. The number of stock and the amount of equipment hauled into the wilderness should be limited to the bare minimum.

Corr. ID: 850

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228311

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Not only did they (commercial stock group) have no respect for their animals but they cut the switch backs all the way down the pass. They tore up what the volunteers and rangers worked so hard on last summer.(The Commercial stock outfits pay about \$200 a year and only do trail maintenance if it benefits their cause).

Corr. ID: 857

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230165

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Current stock use in the reflects a 19th century approach that was consistent with the resource utilization paradigm of the time. However, our current understanding of adverse environmental impacts on a limited and fragile ecosystem necessitates a new approach. This new approach should gradually reduce stock use in the Sierra towards an eventual cessation of overnight stock trips. During the transition towards this long-term goal, stock use should be restricted to select trails, feed should be packed-in and certified weed-free, and manure catchers need to be mandated.

Concern ID:

32920

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that stock parties cause significant environmental degradation of park areas, particularly meadows, water sources, and trails. Stock animals leave waste that litter trails and run off into water sources causing contamination. They also trample fragile meadow areas and destroy trails.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 162

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228905

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Horse packs tear up trails, cut across switchbacks, pollute rivers and lakes, generate dust around them, and trample fragile alpine meadows. I would advocate greatly limiting the number of horse packs allowed into the wilderness and also greatly limiting their range. I would also recommend very strict enforcement to keep them away from lakes and meadows.

Corr. ID: 788

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230266

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Just about every observable impact to the SEKI wilderness can be attributed to commercial stock use. The trails in SEKI where commercial stock do not go are generally in great shape with no signs of erosion or even maintenance, whereas every trail where stock is allowed have huge structures to construct the tread and are often 3-foot deep troughs with exposed tree roots and erosion into nearby water. I know from the published research of Dr. Derlet and others that commercial stock and associated grazing is responsible for polluting wilderness waters and making it unsafe to drink, whereas I can, and have for decades, freely drink from Wilderness streams and lakes where no stock ever visit. I have observed that locations where commercial stock parties camp are almost always sacrifice zones within the Wilderness of SEKI. The ground is bare of vegetation, tree roots are exposed from erosion, visitors flatten the ground for tent sites dig trenches around them, visitors cut stumps and drag logs and rocks from all over to make convenient seats, campfire rings are enormous and full of trash. I have observed that meadows and stream banks get trashed wherever stock are permitted to graze - I have yet to see a backpacker eat grass or hoof-punch a meadow and stream bank incessantly. I hope that the Park Service will honestly disclose and evaluate the impacts from pack stock use and grazing in the SEKI Wildernesses, including impacts to trails, campsites, streams and lakes, and wilderness character.

Corr. ID: 814

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226872

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My primary concern is the impact of stock usage in the wilderness areas of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park. Specifically, the environmental damage caused by the presence of stock (overgrazing and trampling,

trail erosion, spreading of non-native plants, fouling of water with urine and feces, providing host and habitat for biting flies, etc.) and the associated diminishing of aesthetic enjoyment of the wilderness area (excessive trail grading, repair, and damage due to stock impact, plumes of dust, the visual impact of feces and fences, noise from bells, etc.).

Corr. ID: 901 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230373 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: When stock animals are released to graze in areas with low soil strength - such as is found throughout much of the SEKI high country - these high pressures can result in numerous deep hoofprints, broken sod, plant pedestalling, increased erosion, shifts in species composition, and even lowering of water tables.

Stock animals pollute water. Your EIS must evaluate this issue and alternatives for addressing it, and your WSP should incorporate meaningful measures needed to protect SEKI's water resources from contamination due to livestock wastes. Horses and mules produce about 33 pounds of manure and 18 pounds of urine per animal per-day (Lawrence et al. 2003).

Livestock manure pollutes water with pathogens such as Giardia, Campylobacter, Cryptosporidium, and other disease-causing organisms.[27] A study in 2002 by scientists from the U.C. Davis School of Medicine found that about 20 percent of packstock manure samples collected along the John Muir Trail contained pathogenic organisms.[28]

Concern ID:

32923

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters stated that commercial pack stock help to keep the trails open for all users.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 181

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228982

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Enter my request to 'allow riding animals and pack stock into the back country and permit grazing in the meadows'. These trails would not be available for the 'High Sierra Hikers' use if it were not for the 'stock' they dislike so much. The packers and trail crews keep the trails open for all of us

Concern ID:

32926

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The impacts of stock on the trails and other resources in the park result in negative experiences for other visitors. Stock use impacts the aesthetics of the area, the feeling of wilderness, and the hiking experience for visitors.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 165

Organization: private citizen

Comment ID: 220783

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a backpacker walking in sandy and excrement-infested pack animal trails the experience REALLY detracts from the wilderness. As a guide it has left me in the awkward position of having to diplomatically explain that use of pack animals is considered an historic activity and is also VERY useful, etc.. As a private citizen it's really unpleasant and sometimes unsafe to travel on pack trails; they become dangerously slippery or erode trails to the point of height exposure.

All that said, I would also be at fault if I did not remark that I really appreciate that there is still a place for pack use and the almost frontier-like experience that has long disappeared in modern America.

Corr. ID: 786

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 226265

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do have to plan my trips to avoid trails that are so beat up by stock animals that they are dangerous to walk on. I do avoid lakes where horse are allowed to graze, because they turn that nice green color of a well fertilized city lake. Likewise, meadows that are turned to to extraordinary mush.

Corr. ID: 851

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228085

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We need to limit the pack string sizes and the damage the animals do along with too large of parties for the sites. I know we aren't yet to the point of eliminating the outfits completely. We see that the majority of the large parties do not understand the fragile environment and the packers are not going to act like sheriffs with paying customers. They also need to have more designated stock trails. I know that they generate needed money in these lean times but to have the outdoor experience of a small number of pack trip customers ruin the experience for the thousands of us on foot is not right.

Concern ID:

32927

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Stock should be allowed in the park, but only for use by those people who are physically unable to enter the wilderness without assistance.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 21

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California--
High Sierra Unit

Comment ID: 256905

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: By prohibiting stock use you will deny me and other disabled Americans like me any access to the backcountry. I think the Americans With Disabilities Act prohibits you from taking this stance.

Corr. ID: 517

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223913

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These services are ok but should be limited in size and subject to the same permit process as individual users. Stock trips should be more limited as they have a heavier impact. I think stock trips should be allowed only to people who are physically in need of help for access to the wilderness. Able bodies should carry their own weight and perhaps arrange for food drops to minimize impact.

Corr. ID: 839

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228171

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The use of pack animals should be limited to providing access for people who are physically unable to use the resource on foot and carry a pack. The number of animals per party should be reduced to a maximum of 10, and ideally, the ratio of pack animals to people should small enough to support carriage of only required ,gear and food, and not luxury items.

Concern ID:

32928

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that areas and trails where stock is allowed should be limited.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 26

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 211151

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is appropriate, where stock use is permitted, to construct hitching rails and other very limited improvements.

Corr. ID: 163

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220240

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: stock animals they need to be limited in number and the trails they are allowed to use needs to be restricted. This would allow park service personnel to inspect and enforce regulations more easily (as there will be something defined and measurable to enforce).

Corr. ID: 500 **Organization:** Vulgarian Ramblers Mountaineering Club

Comment ID: 229558 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However, stock still have a much larger impact on the environment than do hikers (even when their impact is well-managed, which is not always the case). I would therefore favor limiting stock access each year to a smaller set of trails than is currently allowed, and then to rotate this set of trails throughout appropriate areas within the trail system (potentially even opening some areas currently closed to stock use). In this way, impacted areas would have time to recover from stock use without permanently closing them to stock users. Other wilderness users could also plan their trips for years when no stock would be present. Hiker quota reductions could also be made on such trails during stock access years.

Corr. ID: 888 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230200 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are only a few lesser known places one can hike without piles of horse manure, files and dust, there should be more, and could be if we could limit horse use to only a few trails and have some for hikers only. It would be welcomed by all foot traffic if one member of the pack team would be last with a shovel to toss the horse poop off the trail. Packers should be limited just as hikers in the permitting system, even if it is a short season. No more letting them write their own permits.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

32930

Stock should not be allowed to travel off-trail or cross-country in the park. Stock groups have impacts on many areas, including riparian zones, and keeping stock on the trails would minimize these impacts.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 171 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 255937 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Some trails should be marked as closed to stock, and stock should be required to travel only on trails open to horses (and not cross-country).

Corr. ID: 797 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230313 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Prohibit stock animals from any & all off-trail travel!

Corr. ID: 869 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230473 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Cross country travel by stock in SEKI is inappropriate. Such use results in a proliferation of trails-of-use and other ecological damage. The EIS should consider alternatives in which the current ban on cross-country travel by stock in most areas of the SEKI wilderness is expanded to include all areas of the park, including those areas where such use is currently allowed.

Corr. ID: 880 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230873 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding Stock Animals On The Trail -- It is quite a disturbing thing to be hiking in a remote, tranquil area and be overtaken by a long string of stock animals with their noisy bells, choking trail dust, stinking manure, etc. Here's my recommendation require stock animals to stay on maintained trails at all times. Prohibit off-trail travel by stock animals.

Corr. ID: 902 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230395 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: SEKI's magnificent alpine lake basins should be protected from the ravages of stock use. A prohibition against off-trail travel by stock animals, and an appropriate network of foot-travel-only trails, then SEKI's high-elevation lake basins could be adequately protected by those measures.

Corr. ID: 902

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230390

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Off-trail travel by stock should be prohibited. Horses and mules should be required to stay on designated trails that have been located, designed, constructed, and maintained to withstand their enormous impacts

Concern ID:

32931

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters had many suggestions on the issue of stock waste, including that stock should wear manure catchers, stock staff should clean up any manure piles and dispose of the waste off-trail or pack out the manure, as hikers are required to do.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 171

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 221639

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Require stock users to either collect manure in diapers or dismount and clean it up on the spot. Manure must be disposed of at least 100 feet from trails and 6" under ground. It is ludicrous to tell hikers that they must carry out their used toilet paper, while stock users are allowed to abandon excrement in the middle of the trail!

Corr. ID: 805

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 226828

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Stock create huge problems with their waste. Its not just eyesore (and nose-sore) on the trail but they pollute water sources; especially near frequented campsites. There is no reason stock should not have to pack out their waste. In fact I believe there are bags made just for that purpose. I have seen them on the horses in New York City.

Corr. ID: 891

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230210

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Consider requesting stock users to wear "manure catchers", or cleaned up by their owners. It should be packed out or at least buried away from water sources

Concern ID:

32932

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Stock grazing should not be allowed to continue in the park. Commenters noted that grazing is particularly detrimental in fragile alpine environments, which may not be able to recover from grazing impacts.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 26

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 211150

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is time to bring an end to stock grazing in the SEKI wilderness. Nearly every other wilderness area with the national park system requires that stock groups carry food for their animals. It is time to make this shift at SEKI.

Corr. ID: 803

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 226807

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No grazing should be allowed at all. It is almost impossible to ensure that the alpine environment is not irreparably damaged by grazing activities, especially sensitive wet lands and river banks. Stock use should be limited in scope.

Corr. ID: 835

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 228150

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In order to protect the environment, stock should be prohibited from grazing at high elevation, required to have weed free feed and strictly limited to 10 animals. Abuse of stock limits and grazing reached the absurd on one trip when my party passed a group of people who had 60 animals and were headed to a pristine 10,000 ft. lake. When we asked about their group size, they explained that they had three permits and had met up in the wilderness.

Concern ID: 32933

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters feel that grazing is an essential element of allowing stock use in the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 821

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230071

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Grazing is essential along the Pacific Crest Trail. While some advocate eliminating sub-alpine grazing?.to do so will eliminate the traditional activity of mule supported trips. The Parks were setup to allow people to travel with livestock. To eliminate grazing at high altitude will essentially eliminate stock travel in the Park along the PCT.

Concern ID:

32936

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Stock animals introduce invasive weed species into the wilderness. Commenters suggested that stock be fed a weed-free feed for a period of time before entering the park, and that stock should be inspected for invasive species seeds on their coats and hooves.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 120

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219386

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There should be strict prevention measures to minimize the introduction and spread of invasive weeds. It is known that stock animals are responsible for introducing and spreading invasive weeds from viable seeds both in their manure and on their hooves and coats.

Corr. ID: 130

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219461

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Require that all stock animals be provided weed-free feed for two weeks before and during park visit. Require that they be thoroughly cleaned and inspected by rangers before being allowed to enter the park.

Corr. ID: 823

Organization: Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230229

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Grazing within the Park should be eliminated with stock required to carry weed free feed. Other mitigation options to reduce stock impacts should be considered within the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. Per person equipment weight limits and stock to individual ratios are possible mitigation methods.

Concern ID:

32940

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters noted that the traditional pack stations in the park, particularly at Mineral King, should be reopened, as these stations provide an entry into the park for those users who may require the assistance of stock.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 859

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230294

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To test the strength of that interest, a friend and I took a petition through the campground, and in two weekends gathered over three hundred signatures from people who would like to have a pack station -some who had come to Mineral King specifically, because they thought that there were still horses to rent. Without the provision for a pack station, the WSP discriminates against the

needs of the elderly, the handicapped, and the small children who very much want to ride a real horse. The wilderness becomes completely inaccessible for these groups.

Corr. ID: 899

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230559

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: - Mineral King needs a full service pack station for day rides, spot packing, and extended trips into the back country.

Concern ID:

32948

CONCERN

Commenters were concerned for the welfare of animals kept by packers.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228310

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Around 10 years back my husband and I saw a packer and spoke to him as we were hiking in and he was heading out with a large string of horses and mules. We were on the top of the pass. He was clearly rushing to get them out before dark. When hiking out 4 days later the pretty dappled grey Arabian on the end of the packer's string was down in the boulders at the top of the east side of the pass dead. The entire string of pack animals went over the cliff.

Concern ID:

33717

CONCERN

Commenters noted that the traditional pack stations in the park, particularly at Mineral King, should be not reopened because of the impact of stock activities on hikers.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 26

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 211153

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not support reopening pack stations at either Wolverton or Mineral King. In both cases, access to appropriate destinations for stock use was very limited and impact on hikers was very high.

Corr. ID: 863

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230347

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The former commercial pack station buildings at Mineral King should be removed, and not be replaced. The long-defunct commercial pack station at Mineral King is an eyesore that should be removed, and the site naturalized. The NPS should not relocate or reopen the pack station, as some commercial and pro-stock interests are now advocating. The areas accessed via Mineral King Valley are too high in elevation, too wet, and too fragile to support commercial packstock activities without causing substantial harm to natural resources and the experience of park visitors.

Corr. ID: 869

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230505

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The idle Mineral King Pack station is an eyesore that ought to have been removed when the pack station was closed. The EIS should consider alternatives that remove all traces of the Mineral King Pack Station and restore the area to its natural condition.

Concern ID:

35956

CONCERN

Commenters noted experiences of being awakened or disturbed by grazing pack animals with bells, or by wranglers trying to herd pack animals at night.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 803

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226812

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Remove bells from animals in the back country.

Corr. ID: 811 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 231518 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Do whatever you must to keep the horses from running freely thru people's camps at night. Make them carry pellets and keep them tied up at night.
Corr. ID: 853 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 228316 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: On one occasion I was camped off trail and during the night a bunch of pack animals with bells blazing come right throw my camp site.
Corr. ID: 860 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230304 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Of course the horses don't always leave the scene, and on several occasions we have listened all night to the bells of horses approaching in the dark, eventually arriving in our camp to mill around our tiny tent. This is not merely unpleasant, but quite unsafe. After chasing horses from my camp, and getting back to sleep, I have been awakened again in the early morning darkness, by the wranglers tearing off on horseback to find the wandering herd, later chasing them back along the trail in front of my tent. This is a ridiculous amount of chaos and disruption for people wanting a little peace and quiet.
Corr. ID: 896 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230564 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I was dead tired having come from a week's hike and a night on Whitney, and had mules & horses walking around all night, their bells jangling, further upstream where I camped. The next day this party was resupplied with stock over Shephard's Pass and I spent a dusty, noisy night at Anvil Camp on its east side also surrounded by that stock.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

36037
Although some stock users argue that commercial stock is a historical use in the park, there are too many negative impacts to allow it to continue.
Corr. ID: 802 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 255780 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: It seems part of the reason we continue to use these animals is because of tradition, it is a "historic" aspect of the park. There are many traditions we've had to abandon in these parks, I believe the negatives associated with stock use to out way the positives.
Corr. ID: 819 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 226900 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The impact of grazing and pack animals on trails and the environment. I never filter water, except when there is any evidence of stock in the area. And usually this evidence is a trail beat into 6 inches of dust (especially on the west side), horse manure, lots of flies, and deep mud ruts anywhere around water. I understand the historical aspects of stock animals in the Sierras. I also know that whatever they're paying in fees, it's not compensating for trail destruction and a serious loss of the wilderness experience for hikers.
Corr. ID: 894 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230917 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Commercial pack-stock operations are not a necessity. They are a privilege, and the privilege should be weighed against the costs. (The historical usage argument is very weak - conditions change, CA has 35 million citizens, rules must change too.) If I had my way I would ban commercial pack-stock trips in SEKI. Pack-stock use would be limited to necessary resupply/maintenance of backcountry ranger stations and medical emergencies.

Concern ID: 36048
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters are concerned about "current levels" of stock use.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 901 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association
Comment ID: 230351 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups
Representative Quote: The WSP's "No Action" alternative must articulate and evaluate a proper and coherent baseline for stock uses. SEKI's disputed 2007 GMP/ROD states that stock uses would be allowed up to then-" current levels," but it nowhere defines or quantifies those levels. Despite repeated requests that it do so, the NPS has dodged and never answered the obvious questions: "What does SEKI mean by 'current levels,' and what are the current levels?" It is entirely disingenuous for the NPS to claim that it is capping stock use at II current levels" when it has not defined or quantified those levels. Going forward, in order to properly articulate and evaluate a baseline No Action alternative for the WSP, the NPS must first define and quantify the "current levels" of stock uses that existed at the time the GMP was adopted.

WL1800 - Comment Addresses Meadow Management

Concern ID: 32375
CONCERN STATEMENT: There is concern that the meadows are being trampled by stock use and horses and that the hooves of the animals are impacting the meadow soils.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 834 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 228140 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In meadows where stock are allowed to graze the impact is blatantly evident. I have seen hooves puncture the soil 6 to 10 inches. In damp conditions, meadows can be ruined in this way
Corr. ID: 838 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 230285 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The most fragile areas of the wilderness are those areas that have lush, moist meadows and the fragile shorelines around the alpine lakes. No one should be allowed to camp in meadows or closer than 100 feet of the lake's edge. Other than this, all wilderness areas are special and need to be protected in an equal manner.
Corr. ID: 901 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association
Comment ID: 230376 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups
Representative Quote: Stock animals harm wetlands. High-elevation meadows, due to their characteristic short growing seasons, saturated conditions from snowmelt, high ground water tables, and wetland-dependent plant communities, often meet the definition of jurisdictional wetlands. Unfortunately, the hundreds of meadows in the SEKI high country that qualify as jurisdictional wetlands have never been adequately disclosed or protected from the adverse impacts of stock trampling.

Concern ID: 32379
CONCERN STATEMENT: Grazing of pack and saddle stock in meadows needs to be restricted.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 904 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 230429 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I understand park rules concerning disturbing the fauna and flora. Therefore, I do not pick flowers or harm butterflies. But when twenty

hoofed, half-ton animals are set loose to graze in meadows, they trample fragile wetlands, eat flowers, and defecate & urinate on whatever hapless creatures are below. I suggest wranglers carry food for their animals and restrain them at night.

Concern ID: 32381

CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters believe that there is no negative effect of grazing by cattle or horses on the meadows or other vegetation.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 859 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230291 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a member of CNPS, I am very familiar with native plant life. After over a hundred years of stock usage in the Mineral King valley and surrounding "wilderness" area (cattle and horse grazing), I see no negative effect on the meadows or other vegetation.

WL1900 - Comment Addresses Research Activities

Concern ID: 32369

CONCERN STATEMENT: Research activities can benefit pack stations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 900 **Organization:** Backcountry Horsemen of California, Public Lands Committee, High Sierra Unit

Comment ID: 230545 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Researchers contract with pack stations to provide trip support for personnel and equipment to collect data from field monitoring locations.

Concern ID: 32371

CONCERN STATEMENT: More research should be conducted on the impacts from stock groups and humans on the environment.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 780 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226173 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Decades of my own observations and results of SEKIs own research show that pack stock are far more destructive of both the wilderness environment and wilderness values than is foot travel. Stock numbers must be limited, they must not graze, and they should be limited to a minimum number of arterial trails. There should be an extensive network of paths on which stock are prohibited.

Corr. ID: 834 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228145 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: An analysis should be made for implementing an elevation-based restriction on camping by stock groups. The high alpine environment is the most vulnerable to degradation by stock related impacts and should have strong protection. I recommend no stock camps above 9,000 feet.

Corr. ID: 863 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230349 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The NPS needs to undertake a scientifically based monitoring program for assessing and redressing negative impacts from packstock grazing to both ground and surface waters, as well as the associated riparian corridors to avoid future degradation of these critical upstream tributaries.

Concern ID: 32372

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters are concerned the new management plan will place more restrictions on research within the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 81 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 217481 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am concerned that the management plan will so place so many barriers in the way of researchers that the park will not be in compliance with the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 which states, "The Secretary is authorized and directed to assure that management of units of the National Park System is enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality science and information." For example, a ban on permanent monitoring equipment in wilderness areas will severely limit the long-term monitoring of park resources, such as water levels and chemistry, which will negatively impact management decisions.
Corr. ID: 824 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 226922 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The 1964 Wilderness Act is much more restrictive of modes of research that it allows; some might say it is hostile to science for science's sake, and allows research only if that research will improve wilderness management practices or enhance the wilderness experience. I'm concerned that the emerging management practices with respect to scientific research at SEKI will be so much more restrictive that much of the value of SEKI as a potential natural laboratory in the future will be irreparably compromised or lost.
Corr. ID: 824 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 226925 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a professional researcher, I value the opportunity that SEKI has traditionally afforded to conduct well-designed research projects for the sake of science. I'm concerned that new management's policies will unduly impact the scope and quality of research at SEKI to the detriment of the resource and ultimately our society.

Concern ID: 32374
CONCERN STATEMENT: *The WSP should include low impact research and monitoring, but only if the scientist produces minimal impact on the wilderness.*
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 368 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 255771 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Minimal impact scientific research appropriate.
Corr. ID: 797 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 226502 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Low impact science / research is appropriate when its goal is to better conserve habitat and species.

Concern ID: 32461
CONCERN STATEMENT: *Concern is raised over the effects of scientific research on the critically endangered Sierra Nevada bighorn.*
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 38 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 228030 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: my concerns include the following:

2) lack of evidence the tagging/collaring of sheep is necessary to meet minimum requirements to preserve the area as wilderness; 3) even if the project were necessary to preserve wilderness, the proposed actions do not seem to be the "minimum tool" for achieving the project's objectives, and therefore are inconsistent with the requirements of the Wilderness Act;
4) direct injury to critically endangered Sierra Nevada bighorn, including the death

of at least some individuals will result from this action; and
5) significant adverse sub-lethal and/or indirect effects such as decreased long-term survival of captured animals, behavioral changes such as avoidance of key winter range, etc. will be inflicted on Sierra Nevada bighorn, and other native wildlife.

Concern ID: 33760

CONCERN STATEMENT: The WSP should include research and monitoring of climate change.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 866 **Organization:** Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats Campaign for the Sierra Club

Comment ID: 230402 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Monitoring will be critical to detect climate change impacts. Monitoring is particularly important if adaptive management is used. If a solution to a problem is implemented then monitoring is critical so the results can be assessed. Too often monitoring is not adequately funded which undermines the entire premise of adaptive management. We urge you to assure there is adequate funding available for monitoring.

Corr. ID: 906 **Organization:** Wilderness Watch

Comment ID: 230464 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: One of the scientific benefits of Wilderness is as a "control" to study how nature responds to dynamic natural processes without direct human interference. In an age of climate change, the value of Wilderness to provide a baseline to compare areas that are largely wild to those with active management will be greater than ever. The stewardship plan should incorporate a rigorous monitoring program and a non-interventionist stewardship approach to study how conditions within the SEKI Wilderness respond to a changing climate

WL2000 - Comment Addresses Wildlife Management in Wilderness

Concern ID: 32459

CONCERN STATEMENT: Wilderness should be managed on an ecosystem level (through protection of wildlife corridors, migration corridors and/or future habitat) and access to wildlife should be controlled.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 141 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 219526 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Yes, those areas that are so sensitive that even foot traffic can harm them.

Any area that is sustaining wildlife and especially those creatures, large and small, who are endangered or in low numbers. Also, any wildlife corridors that exist between parks needs protection since wildlife do not know our boundaries, and these areas are crucial to their survival.

Corr. ID: 865 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 230389 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Controlling access to wilderness. Overuse will impair the wilderness for future use and enjoyment. Protect wildlife corridors, migration corridors, future places for plants and animals to move as foothills and mountains get warmer and drier by keeping trails away from them. Manage wilderness on an ecosystem level. Manage for adaptation to climate change. Resource protection and management are more important than recreation and visitor experience.

Concern ID: 32467

CONCERN Wildlife management should include provisions from the Wilderness Act of 1964.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 183 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 229154 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Careful and thoughtful wilderness management according to the provisions of the Wilderness Act of 1964 will assure that the wilderness resource is perpetuated for future generations.

Reducing other threats to wildlife and wilderness, such as pollution and invasive species, will be increasingly important.

Concern ID:

32468

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters feel that wildlife management should include visitor education and/or adaptive management.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 480 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 223710 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Wilderness management as well as a great deal of education will ensure protection. In wilderness management, natural ecological processes should be allowed to operate freely to the maximum extent feasible to promote, perpetuate, and, where necessary, restore the wilderness character of the land. Education will help with community understanding, because if we don't understand and appreciate something, how can we protect it?
Corr. ID: 574 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 224262 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Wildlife habitat must be protected and adaptive management strategies developed to ensure survival of native species.

Concern ID:

32469

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Wildlife management should include protections for bears.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 120 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 219391 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: NPS needs to act quickly to stop people from entering areas where bears are known to be present. And, I think it is shameful how many bears are killed after encounters with humans. If the bear isn't safe where it lives then where is the bear safe? It is tragic when humans are killed or injured by wildlife but we are entering their territory.

WL2200 - Comment Addresses Maintenance of Trails, Bridges, or Other Infrastructure

Concern ID:

32722

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Maintenance of trails and bridges should continue for the safety of appropriate recreational uses and to protect sensitive areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 194668 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I believe only the main trails should be maintained in the future. This includes the Muir, High Sierra, and tributary trails. No new trails are needed. In some locations, trail rerouting is still needed to protect meadows or wet areas. Also, something needs to be done about Sawtooth Pass at Mineral King. Perhaps a formal route using Glacier Pass could be devised to avoid the erosion problems of multiple pathways on the "granite sand" at the top. No trail reconstruction should be undertaken only to lessen grades. Most trails have too many switchbacks as it is.

Corr. ID: 23 **Organization:** Pacific Crest Trail Association
Comment ID: 210998 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Use and maintenance of the PCNST - The PCNST is a national recreation treasure. When considering the range of alternatives and activities, the WSP/EIS should insure the protection and maintenance of the PCNST, while providing a full range of viable alternatives.
Corr. ID: 822 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 232040 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: It is important that the trails, signs, and bridges are adequately maintained. Additional bridges should be added where needed, such as at the lower Franklin Creek crossing in Mineral King.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

32725
A trail system should be established to designate foot travel trails and stock use trails.
Corr. ID: 26 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 211144 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The trail system at SEKI should be analyzed and zoned into at least three categories. These would include (1) appropriate for stock use, (2) appropriate for limited (small-party-only) stock use, (3) not appropriate for stock use. This zoning would be based on the character of the trail and its ability to sustain the passage of stock without incurring damage that makes the trails hard to walk safely upon. Engineered, well-graded trails with good grades and water-diversion bars would generally fall into category 1. Lightly built trails that nevertheless have easy grades and good drainage would fall into category 2. All other trails would fall into category 3. This last category would include all steep, poorly engineered trails as well as trails passing through meadows or other areas that cannot sustain the physical impact of stock. These marginal types of trails should be limited to foot use. only
Corr. ID: 818 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230048 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: some trails that are not built heavily enough for stock use should be restricted from stock use, particularly where good alternatives exist. Trail condition, such as soft or muddy areas should be considered and fragile sections of trail closed to stock use. Stock are particularly indiscriminate in treading over damp or wet trails, whereas hikers generally avoid such segments by going around them.
Use should be spread over a greater area to lower impact by creating a network of foot-travel-only trails.
Corr. ID: 830 **Organization:** University of Florida
Comment ID: 228116 **Organization Type:** University/Professional Society
Representative Quote: Ideally, in the SEKI-as on the Appalachian trail corridor- there should be a sharp differentiation between paths for hikers on foot and paths for stock animals,. Where there already exist fire roads, old jeep roads, etc. (i.e. that are NOT part of major hiking trails.), stock animals should be compelled to use them instead of hiking trails.
Corr. ID: 869 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230468 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: A network of foot travel only trails would also substantially reduce trail maintenance costs. On a recent trip to the Evolution Lakes area, I was astonished at the extent of highly engineered trail sections. All of this excess construction was simply to accommodate stock use. In fact, in one area, a rock "causeway" some 5-6 feet wide and perhaps 100-150 feet long was built

directly on top of a large granite slab. This structure was built solely for the convenience of stock users, as a hiker would have had no problem crossing this very modest slope of granite.

My point is thllt if a trail requires such Herculean efforts to make them meet "stock standards" then the trail should be considered for designation as "foot-travel only." I recognize that some of the more obvious candidates originate on Forest Service lands outside of SEKI (e.g., Shepherd, Baxter, Sawmill, Taboose). However, by designating those trails as foot-travel only, the Park Service could effectively halt any Forest Service plans to upgrade these trails (as was unsuccessfully done to Sheperd Pass trail and was proposed back for Taboose back in the 1990s).

Concern ID:

32727

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters feel that the wilderness should be made natural again by the removal of all non-natural structures, including bridges, fences and trail signs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 812

Organization: NSS

Comment ID: 230010

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To carry a point to its logic extreme, the requirement of "no human encroachment" within a wilderness would require: Such items as bridges across streams should be removed as these are not natural. Such items as trail signs should also be removed. The next step would be to eliminate trailhead parking as this further aids human encroachment into wilderness. Eliminate trail maintenance such as fallen trees as this modifies the natural environment.

Corr. ID: 863

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230337

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fences ruin the scenery, giving the SEKI wilderness the look and feel of someone's private ranch. The many "drift fences" that currently exist throughout the SEKI backcountry were constructed primarily for the convenience of stock users. Hikers (the vast majority of users) and wildlife are substantially inconvenienced (and injured) by clumsy gates and rusty wire, for the sole benefit of a small handful of stock users. Some stock users and NPS personnel claim that the fences are needed for "resource protection. " Other methods (such as tie & feed, hobbles, and/or portable solar-electric fences) can be used to restrain animals, and stock users should be responsible for their own animals rather than the NPS constructing ugly, permanent fences across the landscape.

WL2300 - Comment Addresses Commercial Services

Concern ID:

32699

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that commercial services are an appropriate use of the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 22

Organization: National Speleological Society

Comment ID: 198059

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial services could be appropriate if they are managed appropriately and the commercial operations observe and are held to all the mandates that public users are.

Corr. ID: 498

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223816

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Such activities are fine, so long as the services are properly licensed and taxed to ensure that the cost of managing their activities in the wilderness is paid for AND a portion of their profits is shared with the wilderness management authority. It is vital to appreciate that allowing commercial services in our parks and wilderness should be taxed in a manner that results in more than a

"break-even" situation -- the parks/wilderness must profit and be enhanced by such activities or they should not be allowed.

Corr. ID: 672

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 224881

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think that these activities are very appropriate and that they should continue to happen and thrive. I think that they are a great way of introducing people to the natural habitat and the natural environment. I also think that they are a great way of educating people about the different plants and the different animals that thrive in sequoia and kings canyon.

Corr. ID: 821

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230072

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial Packers make it possible for those that aren't rich enough to own their own livestock to travel in the Park. It allows many in the public to enjoy their Parks. There are those that enjoy a livestock supported trip. And, there are those that can not enjoy the wilderness without the help of a commercial outfitter. Both types of livestock users should be allowed the opportunity to use commercial services.

Regulations should be minimal to allow a person traveling in the Park to enjoy the freedom of travel in the wilderness. In recent years, there is the tendency to regulate every aspect of travel in the Park. It takes away from the enjoyment of those entering in the Park. There is an acceptable amount of resource impact from all users. The planning process should recognize that impacts will occur from humans and livestock.

Concern ID:

32700

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commercial services should be regulated and required to pay fees or have their permits revoked if violations occur.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 82

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 217538

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think commercial services allow a larger number of people to experience the wilderness, but all companies must be held to strict standards of stewardship. Commercial services that don't hold to these standards need to lose the privilege of offering such services in our wilderness areas.

Corr. ID: 174

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 221919

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial services are acceptable as long as they do not take away from permit quotas from people independently visiting the wilderness. The servicing firms must meet criteria to demonstrate their ability to ensure their clients behave safely and appropriately. Commercial services should contribute significantly to the maintenance of the wilderness through appropriate fees.

Corr. ID: 212

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222335

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Corporations that profit from our parks must pay a fair share for the use of the parks. Discounted group rates should be examined in the face of potential budget cuts to make sure that groups are paying for their impact and to make sure they are not getting a "free lunch" or almost a "free Pass"!

Corr. ID: 551

Organization: California Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 224125

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in support of limited commercial use for low-impact recreational activities, as long as the vendors pay an appropriate fee and are monitored to ensure they follow good practices in wilderness areas. I think permits should be revocable if terms are violated.

Corr. ID: 685 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 225017 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: they need to be regulated and they need to be small groups. I think participants on these trips need to know their responsibilities and they will be legally and monetarily liable for their behavior and actions. Participants need to understand the dangers involved that could result in grave harm and possible death to themselves and/or others. And they need to sign waivers.

Corr. ID: 785 **Organization:** Retired CA State Parks Civil Engineer
Comment ID: 226245 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I believe some people are only comfortable with guided hiking, climbing and mountaineering so I believe one concessionaire should be allowed through a bidding process (for specified contract time like 5 years or ?) to provide these services with strict regulations and specified fees which go directly to the Parks. If regulations are broken, the concessionaire's contract should be voided, and they should be excluded from future commercial use of the area. The numbers of commercial users should also be limited in number (let's say 10% of the carrying capacity).

Corr. ID: 865 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 231645 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Stock use must be held to performance standards. Meaningful sanctions must be applied in a timely manner when infractions occur. This applies to packing outfits and Sierra Club backcountry trips alike. Some packing outfits have repeatedly violated wilderness rules. Why are they reissued permits?

Concern ID: 32701
CONCERN
STATEMENT: Commenters felt that there needs to be an equitable distribution of preferred sites and between commercial and private users in respect to fees, quotas, and campsites.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 903 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230420 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: commercial packers and have ended up having more say in resource use than individuals. Commercial interests can afford to lobby for more use permits, cheaper fees, exclusive use of desirable sites, and fewer limitations. They can gain undue influence. An example of a concessionaire having such a privilege is the exclusion of campers from the Bear Paw Meadow in Sequoia National Park, forcing them to use a dark, ugly, distant and unpleasant campground far, far away from the lovely view and even the main trail. This is truly unfair. A new Wilderness Stewardship Plan needs to find a more equitable balance of power between individual and commercial users than now exists.

Concern ID: 32703
CONCERN
STATEMENT: Commercial services in the park provide users with education, increased safety, and responsible use practices.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 32 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 211490 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Experienced commercial guides are an important low impact commercial activity that has many benefits, such as: reduce risk to park goers, increase education, insure responsible use and maximize the overall experience.

Corr. ID: 275 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 222650 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: They can be good if they are kept to small groups and frequencies and are given by ecologically educated and conscious outfits whose

aim is to educate participants in the least destructive ways to enjoy our wilderness areas. Groups that are only out to make money with no care for the wilderness they are exploiting should not be acceptable.

Corr. ID: 338

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222990

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Guided trips are good, in my opinion, when they educate the clients in wilderness preservation and quiet enjoyment. If they simply make it easier for folks to bring noisy or boisterous habits gained at home into an environment where they don't belong, then they are not so good. Unfortunately commercial ventures tend to go first where the money is and pay attention to wilderness values only secondarily. There's little worse than hiking 20 miles into a beautiful basin only to have a large and boisterous group set up camp nearby. Careful screening of operators, incentives for wilderness values education of clients, and establishing an online rating system whereby other users of the area as well as clients can post feedback on wilderness behavior might help enormously. A requirement that commercial groups be easily identified by other wilderness users (placards? logos?) might help too.

Corr. ID: 530

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 224007

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Each guiding company should be required to follow LNT. In fact, I think guided trips are a great place to teach the public about responsible and safe use of the land. Guides should be required to be LNT instructor certified and to teach LNT on the outings. Group sizes should be kept small.

Corr. ID: 859

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230293

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The valley and the wilderness area surrounding it should be accessible to stock usage, but for safety reasons, if for no other reason, it should be guided--unless the stock is private. Both guided and private users of the trail would need to abide by those rules and regulations which are currently in place for back country trips--please, no new rules or regulations. What exists is adequate.

Concern ID:

32704

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters suggested limiting commercial services in size, supplies, seasonal trips, and/or areas of the park where they are allowed.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 163

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220235

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Limit and minimize the size of commercial groups. I have seen commercial groups in the sierra's that have hauled up items that are not only completely unnecessary but also leave a footprint that is destructive to the natural habitat.

Corr. ID: 445

Organization: Sierra Club & Boy Scouts

Comment ID: 223541

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The only in-situ commercial services should be non-profit with any proceeds going toward maintenance and upkeep of the park. Large groups of commercial tourists should be limited in geography. Other small group tours are OK as long as commercial interests are placed second to the citizen's rights and access to the parks.

Corr. ID: 448

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223554

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Could be permitted with strict guidelines, background check on company/guides. Limit the number per season.

Corr. ID: 609

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 224504

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Generally okay, but I think awarding concessions/permits to commercial outfits should be a competitive process where the criteria include the company's practices to reduce their footprint. The number of such companies should be strictly limited. The number and scope of outings a company can do should be strictly regulated.

Corr. ID: 770

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 225889

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The trails that stock can use should be severely limited. Supplies carried by stock should be limited to basic food and tent. I have seen stock carrying cases of liquor and many luxury reclining chairs and even beds.

Concern ID:

32705

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commercial services are an inappropriate use of the park, and should be prohibited.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 53

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 214676

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All wilderness areas should be just that wilderness. No development or any type of commercial recreation allowed.

Corr. ID: 309

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222819

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No none, not ever. Only maintenance crews to keep trails open and develop fire safe campsites. Commercial establishments can be located on the perimeter but not within the publicly owned park.

Corr. ID: 611

Organization: Sierra Club, Environmental Defense,
Natl Res Def Council

Comment ID: 224519

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am not in favor of commercial services in wilderness. Using the wilderness as a way to make a living at its expense is not honoring it. I believe human have a responsibility to first learn the skills and then go out to utilize them. Paying money to be taken into wilderness and climbing/mountaineering is just another abuse of sacrificing nature for personal gain and profit.

Corr. ID: 901

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230365

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Commercial stock services are not necessary to provide access to Mt. Whitney, and therefore should not be allowed. Under existing law, commercial services are not necessary for those seeking to circumvent trailhead quotas, or to serve persons who do not truly need commercial assistance.

Concern ID:

32706

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commercial services should only be for visitors who need assistance to enter the park. This is important as it fosters an appreciation of wilderness for those who would not otherwise be able to have this experience.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 120

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219390

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I approve of commercial services as that is the only way some people will have the opportunity to explore the wilderness area. I just think that they should strive to limit how much gear they carry as the more brought in, the more the area is damaged.

Corr. ID: 145

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219562

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Minimize the impact of commercial groups and packstock by only servicing those who absolutely require the services.

Corr. ID: 780 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230243 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Commercial operations on public lands, especially in wilderness areas, should be limited to helping citizens who need, not desire, those services in order to use the public lands. Commercial operations must be regulated in a way that is fair to all citizens.

Corr. ID: 858 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 230166 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Since there are many negative impacts associated with commercial packers, these services should not be given preferential treatment for wilderness permits and should only be allowed for people who physically cannot hike. I have been on many hikes and seen able-bodied people being transported into the wilderness along with extensive amounts of unnecessary gear. As a result, trails are covered with manure, bells interfere with natural sounds, weeds are introduced, water sources are polluted, and trails are degraded.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

32710
Commercial services provided by park staff or other government employees are appropriate, but third party groups should not be allowed to operate in the park.
Corr. ID: 196 **Organization:** MEChA
Comment ID: 222261 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Commercial services are great if provided by park rangers hired by the government. No third party people should be allowed access to make money on campers.
Corr. ID: 309 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 222820 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Guided tours by public employees, no privatizing. That would be the foot in the door for further expansion which would grow and contaminate.
Corr. ID: 322 **Organization:** Sierra Club
Comment ID: 222898 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I think commercialization of natural parks/resources is a slippery slope. I don't think it's a bad idea if it's offered through the National Park Service itself, however once you start opening up our public parks to private enterprises, this can create all kinds of competition business issues and that can bring in a whole different culture/aesthetic into our public natural places. Companies tend to have logos, lots of equipment, advertising etc - all these things greatly compromise the natural character of a place. People want to go to the forest to see nature, not to ponder Company XYZ.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

32711
Camps operated by commercial outfitters like Bearpaw should not be allowed due to overuse which detracts from the wilderness experience. Commenters suggested closing and restoring these areas.
Corr. ID: 788 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 226282 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The Park Service should consider closing the Bearpaw High Sierra Camp, and restoring the site to natural conditions. The Camp is an eyesore and is not necessary for visitors to experience and recreate in wilderness. It caters to those that can afford to pay to be catered to, and provides an experience that is available outside wilderness (i.e., one that is not wilderness-dependent).
Corr. ID: 828 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228103 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is time to consider removing the Bearpaw High Sierra Camp. This again is out of character with wilderness areas, and in its current state is selective and expensive, unattractive and generates a considerable amount of pollution in a fragile high-altitude environment.

Corr. ID: 902 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230406 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Your WSP should direct that the ugly commercial camp at Bearpaw Meadow be removed, and the site restored. The polluting camp is an affront to the national park and an intrusion on the surrounding wilderness. The camp creates adverse impacts due to sewage disposal, greywater disposal, food storage, excessive stock use, helicopter intrusions, noise, and impairment of the scenery.

Clear direction is needed to remedy this situation. Put simply, the WSP should direct that the Bearpaw camp be removed as soon as possible, and the site restored. At the absolute minimum, the WSP should require the following: 1) an independent study to document baseline conditions at the commercial Bearpaw Meadow camp, funded by the Park Service and conducted under contract by a reputable third party (such as an independent California university); 2) a provision for mandatory monitoring (of parameters to be recommended by the initial study), no less frequently than every two years (under contract as in #1 above); and 3) a provision (without loopholes) that if any adverse environmental impacts resulting from operation of the Bearpaw Meadow camp should ever increase beyond those documented in the baseline study, that the camp will be promptly removed and the area immediately recommended to the Secretary of Interior and to Congress for wilderness designation. This is the process that Congress intended to put in motion more than 25 years ago.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

32712

Guided hiking/climbing is an acceptable use in the park, but guided stock use is not.

Corr. ID: 354 **Organization:** Walker Creations

Comment ID: 223078 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Guided hiking, again, in small groups is O.K., but stock trips are anathema to the health of wilderness because of these animals heavy impact on the soil, water and foliage.

Corr. ID: 381 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 223193 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Guided trips are fine. I have gone on guided star gazing trips in the Sequoias, bird watching, and wilderness walks. I have also gone with family. Guides can be especially helpful in maintaining trails and education about the wilderness.

Corr. ID: 453 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223581 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I view wilderness as getting away and into nature. So I don't want commercial services there. Guided climbing/ mountaineering would be OK.

Corr. ID: 566 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 224231 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: guided hiking is OK guided stock trips should be avoided guided climbing and mountaineering is OK is small numbers.

Concern ID: 32713
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters felt that commercial activities should be determined by a board of scientific experts.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 593 **Organization:** NRDC, Sierra Club, CA State Parks
Comment ID: 224380 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: These activities should be limited. An advisory board of conservationists composed of scientists who expertise in forest ecology should determine the extent of these activities. The commercial outfits employed need to be supervised and provided with permits as long as they and their clients comply with park rules.
Corr. ID: 816 **Organization:** Earth Justice
Comment ID: 226888 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Guided hiking, climbing or mountaineering should be conducted according to Sierra Club guidelines.

Concern ID: 32715
CONCERN STATEMENT: Llamas or human porters, which commenters believe have less of an environmental impact, could be an option for commercial services.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 901 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association
Comment ID: 230369 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups
Representative Quote: Outfitters (such as local mountain guides and llama guides) have expressed interest in providing human-porter and llama-packing services in the High Sierra, but the commercial mule packers have a strangle-hold monopoly because the agencies discourage and/or refuse to issue permits to those who might compete with the long-entrenched mule packers. There are in fact many young, able-bodied persons who would love to have summer jobs hauling packs or dunnage to assist those genuinely not able to do so. And such services could probably be offered at lower cost to the client, and far less impact to the wilderness. This discrimination against human-powered outfits and lama packers should end. The WSP should fully explore minimum-impact means of providing assistance for those SEKI visitors who truly need it.

Concern ID: 33758
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggested changes to the current permit system such as having only one permit system for commercial and recreational users, having a lottery-based permit system, and all users should obtain a permit.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 245 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 222484 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Guided yes, but with a minimum number of persons annually. Also have some free trips each year---for example, part of the permitting for private guides could be that each give two free weekends a year, and that could be built into the price and included in the lottery. Low-income people and groups could sign up for those. The wilderness has become increasingly a place for the financially privileged.
Corr. ID: 548 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 224097 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I feel that as long as these commercial outfits aren't disrupting the natural beauty and do not construct new buildings within the parks they would be a welcome revenue source. As long as the type and number are reviewed and limited. Perhaps the permits could initially be given on a lottery.basis to make it not necessarily dependent on the highest bidder.?
Corr. ID: 780 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 230244 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial outfits, guides, and nonprofit organizations should not have any priority over citizens who do not use their services. All citizens and such groups should compete equally for limited permits or access to favored places through a common-pool arrangement.

Corr. ID: 835 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228152 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Lastly, commercial outfitters should not be allowed to write their own permits and should have strict quotas like other users do. It is the height of unfairness that the public has to compete for permits to use our public lands, when a few commercial outfitters can use and abuse these same lands for private profit with few restrictions.

Corr. ID: 880 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230874 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On that basis, the logical and fair way to give out permits is by means of a single system, not a dual system as presently exists. What's fair for the general public is also fair for the commercial users. In those areas where trail quotas are in effect, I recommend that all back country travelers be given permits on a first-come-first-served basis. After obtaining a permit, those who wish to employ a commercial service may do so. It is grossly unfair for some to be able to buy their way into the wilderness by using a commercial service having unrestricted access when independent hikers may be turned away after the trail quota has been reached.

Corr. ID: 894 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230919 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: So perhaps the Bishop Pass trail down to LeConte Canyon would have 200 PSD's per year. The pack-stock operators could then bid (\$\$) for rights for those permits. The money generated would offset the cost of the necessary backcountry PSD permit checking

Corr. ID: 901 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230354 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: All wilderness visitors should compete for wilderness permits on a level playing field, and the preferential treatment afforded to certain commercial outfits must end. The easiest and surest way to prevent this chronic problem is for all visitors to compete for wilderness permits via a single system. Then only after obtaining a permit should visitors be allowed to employ commercial services (when necessary and proper under the Wilderness Act).

The current wilderness permit system creates numerous perverse incentives. It encourages hikers who are denied a permit due to trailhead quotas to hire a commercial packer in order to gain access to the wilderness. It also encourages commercial packers to "market" the fact that they can deliver easy access-for a price-to those denied a permit from the agencies.

WL2400 - Comment Addresses Endangered Species

Concern ID: 32275

CONCERN STATEMENT: [There is concern for impacts to endangered species, including the Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep, the mountain yellow-legged frog and Yosemite toad, native songbirds, and endangered species habitat from the sedimentation of spawning gravels from packstock animals.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 902 **Organization:** High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230387 **Organization Type:** Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Stock animals harm SEKI's wildlife. Stock animals are known to harm SEKI's native wildlife in numerous ways. For example, the Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep-which is critically endangered-is known to leave key feeding sites when approached by domestic stock animals. The bighorn have been observed to avoid key feeding sites for days after encounters with domestic stock.

Domestic stock is known to trample sensitive habitats of rare amphibians such as the mountain yellow-legged frog (MYLF) and Yosemite toad (YT).[46] Both of these disappearing amphibian species are candidates for the federal list of endangered species and have been classified as "warranted" for listing as threatened or endangered species.[47]

Domestic stock attracts non-native cowbirds, which parasitize the nests of native songbirds. Accumulations of stock, and stock manure, attract cowbirds. Cowbirds are known to frequent pack stations, such as the Cedar Grove Pack Station, and significantly harm native songbird populations in the Sierra Nevada.

Concern ID:

32276

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters had general concerns for protection of endangered species. Wildlife corridors, migration corridors, and any sensitive areas containing endangered species warrant special consideration. In addition, nesting areas should be off-limits during breeding season and access to endangered species habitats should be restricted.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 609

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 224506

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Endangered species/habitats should be protected.

Corr. ID: 785

Organization: Retired CA State Parks Civil Engineer

Comment ID: 226247

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Cultural and historic sites should be protected. Nesting areas should be off-limits during breeding season. Endangered species (both flora and fauna) should be protected and their habitat be kept off-limits.

Corr. ID: 865

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230380

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Are there any areas of the wilderness that warrant special consideration?

wildlife corridors

migration corridors

any areas containing endangered species

any sensitive area

Concern ID:

32277

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The monitoring of visitor impacts should be ongoing for the protection of endangered species.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 822

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 255779

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Data collection and research should be on-going to monitor visitor impacts, the health of indicator species and endangered and threatened species, and climate change.

Concern ID:

32278

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Breeding programs for endangered species was recommended.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 627

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 224613 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Endangered plant and animal species must be identified and protected with special care. Programs to breed these creatures should be created and displayed to the public for educational purposes (with the option to donate or volunteer). Natural habitats for these organisms should be carefully identified and sectioned off from the rest of the park so that no patrons are allowed access to those areas.

Concern ID: 32901
CONCERN
STATEMENT: The plan should address listed species in relation to their habitat and the legal and policy requirements for conducting management.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 25 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 211127 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The plan needs to address the location of listed species, identify their habitat, and identify legal and policy requirements for conducting management (e.g. trail work, removal of alien plants or animals, changes in visitor management), monitoring, and research activities within those areas (e.g. Sec. 7 consultations).

WL2500 - Comment Addresses Zoning

Concern ID: 32761
CONCERN
STATEMENT: The trail system at SEKI should be divided into areas that include foot-traffic only sections and other areas that allow stock use.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 880 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 230877 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Trails For Foot-Travel Only - I recommend that SEKI establish a network of trails that are for foot-travel-only. Foot-travel-only trails will enhance the wilderness experience of hikers by allowing them to travel without being exposed to the undesirable aspects of having to share the trail with stock animals.

Concern ID: 32762
CONCERN
STATEMENT: No commercial use zones at the park should be considered in the plan.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 211021 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Zoning - There may be places where you zone for non-commercial stock or one-horse-one-rider type of zoning.

Concern ID: 32763
CONCERN
STATEMENT: The park should be divided into zones/designated areas for different park uses and/or for the protection of resources, including accessible areas set aside for the disable, elderly, and young.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 25 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 211109 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I propose that the new plan create zones reflecting different realities and opportunities, but all compatible with the existing wilderness legislation. I recommend a minimum of two zones (wilderness and pristine), but propose four. They might look something like:

A) High access wilderness - This would be the front country wilderness that is in

close proximity to developments. It would be managed in full compliance with the wilderness act.

B) High use wilderness - This would be developed travel corridors that contain trails, bridges, signs, and other improvements that are considered the minimum tool for managing concentrated public use and might include grazed meadows.

C) Natural wilderness - This would be those portions of the wilderness that lack developed trails but may contain temporary structures that are justified as the minimum tool. Those minimum tools might include scientific instruments or tools needed to manage resources such as nets to remove introduced fish or emergency use of the helicopter for fires, SAR, or medivac. This zone might exclude grazing of meadows.

D) Pristine wilderness - These would be areas in which no developments (not even a tree tag) or emergency helicopter use would be allowed for any purpose except for the minimum tools necessary to remove introduced organisms. All travel would be on foot. This would be the highest wilderness standard managed to protect and maintain areas that show the least human influence. At least one pristine zone might be designated within each major life zone.

A fifth zone might include areas that are neither designated nor recommended wilderness, but which exhibit wilderness qualities (Undesignated Wilderness). An example would be the Ash Peaks area. Ash Peaks is one of the finest areas of wilderness in the park, and such areas should be given protection from development consistent with wilderness.

Corr. ID: 73

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 217794

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There should be designated areas for people and designated areas for only wildlife. This will allow the public to enjoy what the parks have to offer while giving the animals a refuge from the stresses that can come from human interaction.

Corr. ID: 887

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230913

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However, this preservation must also recognize the needs of the handicapped, the elderly and the young. Limiting area access to only foot traffic will prevent the less physically fit of us from being able to enjoy portions of our rich environment. The continued use of stock on a daily basis and extended pack

trips will provide opportunities for the handicapped to view areas not otherwise accessible to them. The use of stock in SEKI has been an important activity since the 1800s-its use should be continued.

Concern ID:

32764

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Upper elevations at SEKI should be zoned for no stock use and no grazing.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 902

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 255929

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: While we advocate in the strongest possible terms for a prohibition of all grazing by domestic livestock at SEKI, we acknowledge your responsibility under NEP A to evaluate and consider a range of reasonable alternatives. Such alternatives must necessarily include: 1) prohibition of all grazing above 9,700 feet elevation (i.e., allowing grazing only at lower elevations); and 2) prohibition of private and commercial grazing above 9,700 feet (i.e., allowing

grazing above 9,700 feet only for essential administrative purposes).

Corr. ID: 903

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230417

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to see no pack animals at all above 8,000 feet. At the very least they should be excluded from the fragile alpine zone, i.e., kept below tree-line

Concern ID:

32767

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

The park should set aside or rotate areas for rehabilitation/regrowth/restoration to protect wilderness resources at the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 712

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 225164

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The visitor does not have to access ever area within the Parks. Various areas should be set aside for temporary rehab and regrowth. Just as we take vacations to recreate and rejuvenate ourselves; portions of our Parks need the same.

Corr. ID: 760

Organization: Sierra Club, Green Peace

Comment ID: 225814

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A possible strategy for the protection of the wilderness resources could be rotating the access to various areas. Close areas heavily traveled to allow the return of natural growth and wildlife. Once viable and thriving, reopen to the public. Establishing a rotation cycle for areas under great impact could ultimately preserve the area as a whole.

Concern ID:

32768

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

The WSP should not "zone" areas that allow activities that are inconsistent with preserving the wilderness at SEKI.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 906

Organization: Wilderness Watch

Comment ID: 230463

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: The wilderness stewardship plan must not "zone" areas to create watered-down Wilderness that allows impairment of wilderness character or allows activities otherwise inconsistent with preserving Wilderness. We recognize there are different conditions within any given Wilderness and that managers might and often should choose to put in place practices to protect the most pristine areas in their wildest condition. But in no case should areas be "zoned" to allow conditions within any area to degrade. Congress "zoned" SEKI when it designated part of the area as Wilderness and part of it as non-wilderness. Everything that is Wilderness needs to be managed in accordance with the high standards of the Wilderness Act.

WL2600 - Comment Addresses Wilderness Fees

Concern ID:

32434

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commercial stock outfits should be required to pay increased fees to cover trail maintenance/repair, habitat restoration, monitoring of impacts, invasive weed control, and/or enforcement of regulations.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 809

Organization: Friends of the International Center

Comment ID: 226854

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The fees for commercial stock packers should be raised to cover the costs of trail damage, monitoring their impact, controlling weeds and enforcing regulations. Such a policy would provide income for more rangers in the park.

Corr. ID: 840

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 228182

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Appropriate fee should be charged to commercial stock outfits-sufficient to cover the costs of repairing trail damage and enforcing regulations.

Corr. ID: 863

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 230329

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial stock outfits (and/or their clients) should be required to pay fees sufficient to defray the Park Service's costs of repairing trail damage, monitoring stock impacts, controlling weeds, and enforcing regulations. Heavy use by commercial stock outfits pulverizes and destroys trails, and the NPS spends huge sums of taxpayers' money to fix trails, monitor meadows, track stock use, and control weeds. But the outfits pay paltry fees, usually only a couple hundred dollars per year, even as they rake in hefty profits. The commercial outfits get (literally) a free ride at the expense of taxpayers and park resources.

WL2700 - Comment Addresses Extent Necessary

Concern ID:

32744

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Limits should be placed on commercial pack stock services to prohibit the hauling of unnecessary or excessive gear and/or luxury items.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 101

Organization: Wilderness Watch

Comment ID: 228053

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To minimize the size and impact of commercial groups, commercial packstock services should be strictly limited to serving only those who require their services, and commercial packing outfits should be prohibited from hauling unnecessary or excessive gear. The NPS has long ignored the Wilderness Act's legal mandate to limit commercial services to the "extent necessary." While courts have ruled that items such as camp furniture, boats, radios, ice chests, and other luxury items are unnecessary for the enjoyment of a wilderness experience (and damaging to the experience of other visitors), SEKI places no limits on commercial services, allowing commercial outfits to cater to anyone and haul anything.

Corr. ID: 528

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 229639

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As mentioned above, pack trains are known to cause a lot more damage than foot travelers, so they should be required to minimize the number of animals they bring and to leave unnecessary luxury items at home. This is consistent with the Wilderness Act's legal mandate to limit commercial services in the wilderness 'to the extent necessary.'

Concern ID:

32749

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commenters felt that power/mechanized tools could be used in some cases such as after a storm event.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 24

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 211078

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Allow the use of power/mechanized tools for a specific time period to maintain a trail if it means the difference between a trail being maintained or allowing it to deteriorate.

I believe in the wilderness philosophy that bans mechanical devices, but I am also a realist who recognizes that in some cases power tools are needed to maintain trails and access to the wilderness. A massive storm or landslide that downs dozens of

trees across a trail should not result in the trail being abandoned just because power tools cannot be used in wilderness areas and it would be impossible to clear those trees from the trail without them.

Concern ID:

36808

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters suggested criteria for determining extent necessary for commercial services.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 901

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Comment ID: 230358

Organization Type: Recreational Groups

Representative Quote: Before commercial stock services are authorized for any person in SEKI's wilderness, the NPS should apply meaningful criteria in keeping with the Act's very narrow exception for commercial services. For example, at least four criteria should be met regarding necessity:

1) the potential commercial client must be physically incapable of hiking and/or carrying a backpack on their own (i.e., not simply be "out of shape," or desiring to not hike or carry a backpack for any reason). Even those persons who are physically challenged in some way, but still able to hike and carry a pack, do not "need" stock support to enjoy a wilderness experience; 2) the potential client must need stock support to facilitate a wildernessdependent activity (Le., not simply desiring a horse ride or pack trip in a scenic setting; not seeking convenience, comfort, or luxury; not seeking to evade or circumvent trailhead quotas or other access limits; not seeking simply to save time or get a "head start" on a longer hiking trip, etc.); 3) the potential client must be willing to travel with the minimum necessary gear-that normally carried by a backpacker (i.e., approx. 50 lbs./person-any more is unnecessary for a two-week trip); and 4) the potential client must have no access to non-commercial stock animals, or be otherwise unable to pack their own stock.

It is essential to note that these are not the only criteria.

Concern ID:

36826

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commercial services should be available for people that are disabled or unable to hike or carry a backpack. Commenters believe that services like human porters and llama packing have less impact than mule packers.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 863

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 230334

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To minimize the size and impact of commercial groups, commercial packstock services should be strictly limited to serving only those persons who are truly unable to hike or carry a backpack, and commercial packing outfits should be prohibited from hauling unnecessary or excessive gear and/or luxury items. The NPS has long ignored the Wilderness Act's legal mandate to limit commercial services to the "extent necessary."

APPENDIX A. TOPIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

TQ0001 - Topic Question 1: What concerns do you have about wilderness in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks?

Wilderness needs to be preserved and protected for future generations and for the health of the land.

"I believe it is important to protect and retain the wilderness in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park because that wilderness is vital to the overall health of the park and region. Both parks are spectacular and fortunately remote, and the sequoias are incomparable."

"The back country is marvelous, and almost all of it is of wilderness quality. We have enjoyed both wilderness and non-wilderness, but feel strongly that we must preserve all possible wilderness for future generations. This will become more and more important as our population continues to expand, and as people travel more and more."

Activities should not be allowed that are degrading to the park and contribute to habitat loss and encroachment on native species. Activities like recreational fishing, and commercial activities should not be allowed in the wilderness.

"I am concerned about the impacts of recreational fishing on sensitive native wildlife, especially amphibians. I understand that trout removal plans are being carried out in certain lakes, and I commend and support these operations."

"Keeping the spirit of wilderness protected - especially when it comes to two factors often present together: Horses in the Sierra Nevada and commercial operations."

Humans leave impacts on wilderness due to overuse of campsites, campfires, party size, food storage, and stock.

"I'm concerned that tourist areas may be getting overcrowded and the impact of too many visitors on ancient groves."

"I am concerned that the government will not do enough to protect this natural and wonderful area from overuse by human activity. Including private commercial interests, but also non-commercial recreational use..."

Commenters are concerned about the impacts from climate change, air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, fires, trash and invasive species.

"I am concerned that the wilderness areas in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks are already being impacted by climate change, air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, invasive species and human overuse (exceeding the carrying capacity of the area)."

“The air quality is getting worse every year! Use to be able to see a million stars at night there now very little because of all the development around the park! More & more trash can be seen and found in and around trails and campsites!”

“I am concerned about pollution, invasive species, wildlife protection, adequate funds for national parks, and effects of frequent visits by people”

Commenters are concerned about the use of stock within the wilderness. Concerns include the impacts on trails, meadows, water quality and wilderness experiences.

“Am concerned about water pollution in streams and lakes caused by stock animals. Animals should be kept tied away from all fresh water when not traveling. Am also concerned about animals leaving their manure on trails. The stock animals should be required to wear manure catchers to prevent cluttering of trails and all animal manure must be carried back to home base, outside the park. Animals must not be allowed to graze in sensitive areas of the wilderness. In my opinion, grazing should be prohibited in the SEKI wilderness. If that is not practical, grazing should be limited to low elevation areas below 8,000 feet and weed-free feed must be carried in for the animals when they go to higher elevations.”

“A major concern of mine has been the impact of commercial stock animals in the parks. The stock animals cause many problems that I have noticed over the years. They tear up the trails and make them hard to hike on and very unpleasant because they are so dusty, they cause swarms of flies, create animal waste on trails and in campsites, use noisy bells, require fences in some areas which are unsightly, and trample wet meadows. I have had to get off the trail in dangerous areas because of large pack animal groups, I have had piles of fresh horse manure and urine in the middle of my camp site, I have seen sensitive wet meadows trampled into mud by stock animals that should not be allowed in the area.”

There is concern that management practices will become more restrictive on scientific research.

“I am concerned that the management plan will so place so many barriers in the way of researchers that the park will not be in compliance with the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 which states, "The Secretary is authorized and directed to assure that management of units of the National Park System is enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality science and information." For example, a ban on permanent monitoring equipment in wilderness areas will severely limit the long-term monitoring of park resources, such as water levels and chemistry, which will negatively impact management decisions.”

More funding is needed to support rangers to protect and maintain the wilderness. In addition, more rangers are needed throughout the park.

“I am concerned that not all backcountry ranger stations are staffed. I am concerned by the level of training and experience of some of the backcountry staff. I feel this is an incredibly important position for the safety of the public, the education of the public, and the protection of the wilderness.”

Commenters were concerned about their wilderness experiences being disrupted by over flights and helicopters. Some felt that helicopter use should be eliminated and only for emergency situations.

“I am very concerned that the wilderness experience is being ruined by unnecessary, unfettered helicopter use, and commercial outfitters dropping supplies in by helicopter.”

“My concern is significant adverse effects to wilderness character (e.g., mechanized intrusion, noise, loss of solitude) due to the use of helicopters within designated wilderness.”

TQ0002 - Topic Question 2: What are possible strategies for the protection of wilderness resources?

The wilderness should be protected and preserved.

“Leave untouched any existing wilderness and restore to wilderness any non-vital developed sites.”

“The protection and restoration of wilderness areas should be the priority in all planning. Educating the public and the agencies managing wilderness areas about the web of life in these areas and how to "leave no trace behind" is essential.”

Stock use raises many different concerns in the wilderness. Commenters are concerned about grazing, party size, invasive weeds, weed-free feed, manure and stock inspections.

“Protection strategies should: 1) prohibit open grazing of park lands and requiring stock users to use weed-free feed; 2) require that all animals be provided weed-free feed for at least two weeks before entering the parks (to allow time for the animals to excrete weed seeds before entering the parks); and 3) require all stock animal hooves & coats to be thoroughly cleaned before entering the parks and inspected by qualified rangers to ensure that this is done. (Stock users should be charged a fee to pay for the inspections.)”

- “1. Severly limit pack animal use trails to a few main arteries and much smaller numbers
2. Cut commercial guiding in the High Sierra to 1 guide and 2 clients per day per area.
3. Increase scientific inquiry through funding, education, and scholarship
4. Cease stock grazing in Parks and wilderness!!
5. Limit pack animal use per person. 3 person per 2 pack animals maximum
6. Manure catchers mandatory”

“Limit access from horses and their commercial groups as well as grazing operations. They are simply out of character for the high-altitude Sierra Nevada and do a disproportionate amount of damage to the land.”

Food lockers/bear boxes are a concern in the wilderness, and some commenters feel they should be removed to protect wilderness.

“Remove bear boxes and use an equitable quota system for packers similar to the system used for backpackers.”

“The NPS should remove the food lockers utilizing the least impact methodology possible. Limit the use of helicopters as much as possible, including, but not limited to, using helicopters for removing injured persons when it is not life threatening. Packers have been a presence in the wilderness for the 50 years I have used the SEKI back country, but their impact is far greater proportionally than other users.”

Commenters felt that protection of wilderness was adequate under the Wilderness Act of 1964, and management should reflect this.

“Continue to manage the wilderness in accordance with the provisions of the wilderness Act of 1964; allow natural ecological processes to occur without human intervention as much as possible. Monitor and protect the wilderness as much as possible from the effects of climate change.”

“The plan should ensure that adequate access, appropriate trailhead facilities, reasonable grazing practices for pack and saddle stock that ensure the sustainability of subalpine and alpine vegetation, and responsibly-maintained trails are managed for appropriate recreational uses including pack and saddle stock consistent with the Wilderness Act.”

Designated areas for wildlife and visitors and trails should be zoned in the wilderness, and there should be trails designated as foot only as much as is possible.

“There should be designated areas for people and designated areas for only wildlife. This will allow the public to enjoy what the parks have to offer while giving the animals a refuge from the stresses that can come from human interaction.”

“Restrict access to foot travel as much as possible”

Limits need to be set for the number of visitors, party size, and commercial stock permitted into wilderness. Quota systems should be enforced.

“Limit the size of parties camping in the wilderness area to no more than 20 people. Set up campsites in key areas which provide access but minimize the impact on the environment.”

“Use quotas should be enforced for all wilderness users, but more significant limits should be placed on those users who have the largest impact on the parks.”

“Limit use by commercial stock”

Some commenters noted that commercial services should be limited in the wilderness to only "extent necessary" while others think it should be stopped.

“To minimize the size and impact of commercial groups, commercial packstock services should be strictly limited to serving only those who require their services, and commercial packing outfits should be prohibited from hauling unnecessary or excessive gear. The NPS has long ignored the Wilderness Act's legal mandate to limit commercial services to the "extent necessary." While courts have ruled that items such as camp furniture, boats, radios, ice chests, and other luxury items are unnecessary for the enjoyment of a wilderness experience (and damaging to the experience of other visitors), SEKI places no limits on commercial services, allowing commercial outfits to cater to anyone and haul anything.”

Fire management in the park is important..

“Good fire management, which would include a variety of strategies. Also important is control of post-burn revegetation to prevent extensive invasion by exotics and subsequent loss of habitat.”

Commenters believe that food lockers/bear boxes are appropriate in the wilderness and should be provided in the park.

“Provide bear boxes in appropriate back country locations. Recognize that compliance with wilderness rules will require the buy in of the people using the park. By ensuring a balanced approach that facilitates visits to the wilderness, the public will support and assist the limited park service resources in preserving the wilderness. But overly prescriptive rules will result in a less supportive public.”

TQ0003 - Topic Question 3: What is important to you about wilderness use and recreation?

Many commenters noted that they visited the parks for a sense of solitude, quiet, and peace, where they could escape the signs of human civilization. Commenters sought a wilderness where they would be away from modern technology, including cell phones, motorized vehicles, and light pollution.

“Getting away from the trappings of civilization. Relying on my own knowledge and skill to travel and be safe within the wilderness. Knowing that if we plan and act carefully future generations will have the same opportunity to escape civilization and experience the natural world in the way our ancestors did. Visiting wilderness should challenge us physically, spiritually, and intellectually.”

“Freedom to travel where I wish, self-reliance, pristine areas, quiet, landscape that is not dotted with other tents and old fire rings, trails that are easily available for those who prefer to use them. Self-responsibility is important. No cell phone coverage! It is not necessary to really be alone, but the feeling of aloneness, of discovery, is important. Lack of light pollution is important, too.”

Experiences in the wilderness are crucial to good mental and physical health and wellbeing. Some commenters also noted that they gained a sense of spirituality or a renewed sense of faith from their time spent in the wilderness.

“The quiet enjoyment of our natural surroundings is essential for our mental, emotional and physical wellbeing. Over and above this is the fact that these lands are the home of members of many species with whom we share this land and without whom we would be irrevocably harmed.”

“Everything. Wilderness is where I go to recharge my spiritual battery! The solitude, the beauty, the possibility of danger, the act of working your muscles hard to get to some gorgeous lake or peak or stream or meadow. I can feel the stress and worries of city life fall away, like layers of an onion, with each step farther along a trail!”

“Wilderness use and recreation provides the only means to me to experience nature on its own terms, which helps me to keep perspective on life and serves as a reminder to re-evaluate my way of life as I live it. It refreshes and uplifts the spirit and so is more effective than anything to keep my mental and emotional health in balance. It provides peace and solitude found nowhere else. It is a window to observe living things in the wild and helps me to understand and appreciate ecosystems. Wilderness provides all these. There is no alternative. I have traveled to many places in the world. Wilderness is uncommon. We have a very precious resource. Wilderness use and recreation must not destroy the nature of the wilderness.”

Commenters felt it was important that certain activities should be limited or restricted for the benefit of wilderness, including stock use, fishing, and gun use.

“As you reevaluate how the wilderness should be used let me speak in favor of foot travel and not as much horse travel. I realize there is a place in the wilderness for horses but the pack trains that traverse the high sierra cause a great deal of damage. Minimizing their numbers will help tremendously.”

“These are exceptional areas, where man can leave the urban landscape and return to a natural world, one in its primitive state through the efforts of his own muscles. This is done via hiking and backpacking, not through mechanized means (such as mountain bikes, vehicles, or horses). We must strive to “leave no trace” of our visit on the landscape of wilderness, and minimize our impacts on it. This is critical in maintaining the nature of the wilderness.”

Commenters felt it was important that certain activities they deemed crucial to their wilderness and recreational experience be allowed to continue. These activities included stock use, fishing, hiking, climbing, backpacking, horseback riding, winter access, and exploring historic sites.

“Maintaining environmental integrity so that activities like fishing, hiking, horseback riding, can continue long into the future. Maintaining pure water and clean air. Preventing noise pollution. Education of park visitors about the environment and what they can do to protect it.”

“To be able to use my stock, and fish”

Access to the parks needs to be provided in a manner that is fair, so that all visitors are afforded equal opportunities to visit the wilderness or that access is available based on the impact of different activities. Commenters addressed this issue in regards to the permit system, quotas, and fees for use.

“That limited access (e.g., trailhead quotas) be fair for all users. Commercial and organizational uses must not be favored over individual citizens. That all recreation types that are destructive of wilderness values be either prohibited or strictly limited.”

“That the wilderness areas be preserved and used for recreation for all. To preserve the wilderness there should be limits placed on the number of permits issued but commercial stock outfits should not be guaranteed access while private (non-outfitted) hikers are turned away by trailhead quotas or other limits”

Commenters sought an experience where they felt they could experience nature in its natural or untouched form. Many expressed a desire to see wilderness as it was in the past, before human influence, or in a historical period, or to know such an area was available.

“To experience it. To use it to ‘recharge’ our batteries (so to speak). To reconnect to our planet. To see the wilderness as it was designed to be -- NOT ‘improved’ my mankind. And mostly to see it as it was, without “improvements”. There is so little of our nation where one can do that -- it’s a precious resource.”

“Whether or not I get to experience wilderness personally or not, it is fulfilling to think there are and always will be places unburdened by human activity, places which can remind us of what life was like before humans interfered with the natural process.”

Those who recreate in the park need to be educated and utilize practices that do not adversely impact the wilderness. Education, enforcement, and interpretation are crucial to aiding visitors in understanding wilderness practices and improving the experience of visitors. Programs that promote such use are also important.

“It is important that backcountry wilderness areas be managed in such a way as to allow their physical and biotic components to function in as natural a way as possible, and to restore species and ecological function when possible. When recreation activities conflict with those goals, they should be modified or simply eliminated. It is important that visitors understand their role in preserving and protecting wilderness backcountry areas (not building new fire rings, pack-it-in, pack-it-out, storing food properly to avoid conflicts with wildlife, etc.) and understand it is a joint responsibility of the visitor and the NPS. There is no substitute for the educational contacts that take place between backcountry rangers and visitors for building that sort of knowledge and understanding, so the NPS needs to reallocate human resources to the backcountry. Public access without patrol presence is a recipe for disaster, in the short- and long terms.”

“It is important to me that people have access to the park to appreciate its beauty. I think that access must come with education about how visitors must do their part to "take only pictures and leave only footprints," so that the park will remain pristine for future visitors and the animals & plants who live there.”

Commenters felt that just having these wilderness areas protected was important to them.

“What is most important to me (since I am very unlikely to be able to actually get there) is that it BE there. It matters to me that I know somewhere there is wilderness and wildness. It enriches my world even if I can't see/feel/experience it directly. It makes my world whole.”

“Just having a pristine place is important whether or not I go there.”

Wilderness and recreation must be in a careful balance that allows visitors access to appreciate wilderness areas, but does not compromise the wilderness in doing so. Some commenters favored protection over access, while others felt that access should be primary to protection, but all felt the two needed to be allowed in a balance.

“I do not recreate in parks or in wilderness. If I do it is very rare and for a very short amount of time. I think people should be limited to use wilderness areas--hence, this is why we call these areas wilderness.”

“Wilderness must be preserved and kept pristine but should be open for responsible recreational pursuits that don't hinder its preservation.”

“The most important thing is that the environment remain as wild as possible. Generally speaking, roads and services should serve to limit the impact of more casual (and numerous) tourists, as opposed to facilitating the entry of more people deeper and deeper into largely unspoiled areas.”

The parks are crucial to what defines America, and should be preserved for future generations to enjoy for recreation, wilderness experience, and scientific purposes.

“Sequoia and Kings Canyon Wilderness Areas are as much a part of America as the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. Sequoia and Kings Canyon Wilderness Areas deserve just as much protection for the benefit of present and future generations. It would be a tragedy to see them disappear.”

“I have been visiting U.S. national parks since I was a child. More recently I took a backpacking trip into the Eastern Sierras near Sequoia and Kings Canyon and was struck again by the beauty and tranquility of these wilderness areas. I want to preserve this wilderness in its natural state for my children and grandchildren.”

Commenters cited the maintenance of many ecological and environmental resources as being critical to what they think is important in the park. Such resources included clean water, giant sequoias, trails free of litter and human impact, and free from development and overuse. Additionally, wildlife and wildlife habitat should be protected to allow wildlife to thrive and to give visitors the opportunity to see wildlife.

“Wilderness is extremely important as an invaluable source of wildlife habitat, biological diversity, high water quality and numerous other values found nowhere else. Wilderness is also important to me as a place to experience nature and the peace and quiet found there.”

“Everything about this place is important not only for recreation in itself but the intrinsic beauty and magnificent splendor of these giants. They are the tallest living trees on the earth, not to mention most breath-taking.”

TQ0004 - Topic Question 4: What types of activities do you consider important and appropriate in wilderness? And inappropriate?

Low impact activities, leave no trace principles, primitive activities, historically-native activities, non-mechanized activities, or non-motorized activities are appropriate in the wilderness.

“Primitive and historically native activities are a good guideline. Foot travel and access is an example, bicycle and motorized transport is not. Horses are not native to the area and permit large numbers of people with their accompanying trash, music and alcohol to spoil areas deep in the wilderness. Horse travel also does lasting damage to trails and water sources.”

“In preparing your Wilderness Stewardship Plan, one of the guiding principles should be that horseback riding, packing and hiking are primitive, non-motorized, non-mechanized forms of travel that are appropriate uses of Wilderness Areas in accordance with the purposes and provisions of The Wilderness Act.”

Certain artistic/cultural activities including photography, painting, sketching, quiet musical activities, education, cultural programs, and preservation of cultural/historic structures/markers are appropriate in the wilderness.

“Appropriate:backpacking, bird-watching, photography/painting/sketching, writing, quiet musical explorations (flutes, violin, recorder, guitar- not electric!), observation and exploration with little to no impact on natural state. even allowing limited access for electronic transport for the physically-impaired”

“APPROPRIATE: Hiking, camping, staying in Park accommodations, rock climbing with permits in specific areas, educational and arts and cultural individual cultural pursuits and programs approved by the Park”

“Allowable: Individual and "small group" hiking (and snowshoeing), commercial assistance in planning and equipping for hiking trips but not "guides", canoeing and rafting (non-commercial), horse/mule packing (non-commercial), no-trace camping, photography, sketching, painting, subsistence fishing.”

Commenters generally agree that specified low impact recreational activities such as hiking, camping/campfires, backpacking, nature walks, running/jogging, bird watching, meditation, picnicking, foraging for edibles, wildlife viewing, rafting, kayaking, swimming, climbing, fishing, horseback riding, mountaineering, canoeing, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, and river running are appropriate in the wilderness.

“Hiking, backpacking, climbing/mountaineering, and camping I feel are the best and most appropriate ways for people to be able to enjoy these wilderness areas.”

“Hiking, cross country skiing, camping, and fishing should be acceptable.”

“Hiking, walking, observing, photographing, limited biking on paved paths, ranger talks, camping, swimming, canoeing, kayaking, rock climbing, are appropriate.”

“As frequent National Parks and wilderness visitors, my family enjoys quiet, undisturbed areas which offer pristine water, fresh air, and wonderful backcountry recreation, including hiking, wildlife and bird watching, camping, rafting, and fishing. Noninvasive activities such as these are conducive to wilderness areas, which provide an opportunity to connect with nature and a welcome relief from the sights and sounds of motorized civilization ... offering both safe harbor for vanishing and imperiled fish and wildlife species and a source of tranquility for the human spirit.”

Commenters stated that sporting activities such as frisbee, volleyball, and horseshoes are appropriate in the wilderness.

“Appropriate activities include: Exploring all of the areas of the wilderness, there should be no areas that are banned for human use that are not for restoration purposes. Scientific study and inquiry into the resources contained within the wilderness.”

“Having other areas designated for quiet activities like Frisbee throwing or volleyball or horseshoes is appropriate if space presents itself.”

Scientific research or fire management activities are appropriate in the wilderness.

“Scientific study and inquiry into the resources contained within the wilderness. Scientific study and inquiry into the impacts upon the wilderness by human activities.”

“I think permitted scientific research that has conservation applications is appropriate.”

Commenters thought that stock activities/pack animals (with numerous limitations) are appropriate in the wilderness.

“I am not opposed to horse travel and other livestock use so long as appropriate impact minimization occurs which may mean smaller numbers than other forms of travel.”

“Limited/restricted: Horseback riding, horse-packing (incl. mules, alpacas, etc.)”

Certain types of groups or parties including large groups and stock pack groups, are inappropriate in the wilderness.

“Pack animals are not a part of Wilderness and should be prohibited.”

“Inappropriate: grazing, pack trains, large organized groups”

Commenters stated that electronic devices, including televisions, radios, GPS units, cell phones, sky mobiles, and generators are inappropriate in the wilderness.

“I personally deplore the use of electronic devices such as TV, loud broadcasting of music, cellphones.”

“What's inappropriate: (1) the proliferation of electronic gizmos that people are now bringing into the wilderness”

“Noise in general should be minimized. No generators, to provide power for radios, etc.”

Unnatural noises created by humans such as air traffic, excessive partying, playing loud music, and concert equipment are inappropriate in the wilderness.

“Partying is usually inappropriate due to the inhibitions and non-attentiveness that is associated with it.”

“SEKI should stop its extensive, routine and unnecessary use of helicopters for research, fire monitoring, bighorn sheep surveys/collars, supplying trail crews, etc. Helicopters are landing almost daily in the Wilderness during summer months, and the noise from aircraft overflights is ubiquitous.”

“Inappropriate: Loud radios, music in wilderness areas”

Commenters stated that pollution, creating waste, or disturbing resources including leaving human waste or animal waste, smoking, littering, polluting waterbodies, carving/defacing vegetation or trees, and graffiti are inappropriate in the wilderness.

“Inappropriate: Reckless use of the environment, causing damage to flora, threatening and frightening away fauna, causing soil erosion, fires, and poisoning of the environment by pollution.”

Activities that provide for the convenience of visitors are inappropriate in the wilderness, including luxury items or "modern intrusions".

“The word wilderness says it all! The wilderness is a haven for people willing to make an effort to be in a serene environment. Keep it wild! All "modern" intrusions such as pack horses loaded with grills, chairs etc take away from the wilderness experience.”

“Activities that require self-reliance, humility, respect for nature, strength, planning, and perseverance are appropriate. Activities that provide for the convenience and comfort of visitors are inappropriate. Activities that infringe on opportunities for solitude or that impact wilderness character are inappropriate. Administrative activities that provide for the economy and convenience of agency staff, but that are unnecessary to protect wilderness character, are inappropriate.”

TQ0005 - Topic Question 5: What are your thoughts on party/group size, food storage practices, and campfires?

Commenters stated that party sizes for campers, horseback groups, and other groups should be small and limited in number. The numbers included for a small party ranged within the comments, and some commenters felt large groups should be limited or excluded.

“Party or group size should be considered; perhaps a limit to the number of large parties or groups on any given day, as their use of facilities is usually heavier and might be more disruptive to other visitors.”

“Party/group size should be small (ideally no larger than 5)”

“Group/party size should be limited to 20 people and the stock to support them if on horse/mules or 20 people even if back packing.”

“Backpack party size: no more than 8 in a party. Horseback party size: no more than 10 humans and 12 horses, subject to same conditions.

“Group sizes should be appropriately balanced to the impact they make upon the wilderness. Large organized hiking groups that travel together are inappropriate.”

“Ideal party size is two to four persons”

Large groups should be allowed in the park as long as their impacts are minimized. Commenters suggest there should be designated areas for large groups.

“I am generally in favor of fairly large parties, provided their impact can be minimized. I don't see much difference between one party of thirty and three parties of ten using an area.”

“Group size should be limited to 75 or less, which would allow for large family reunions & even Boy & Girl Scout troops, and other tourist groups.”

“large groups have their place in a public wilderness. There should be geographically limited areas for them.”

“Large groups with a knowledgeable guide might be preferable to small groups that are not guided or educated in the wilderness.”

Commenters felt that campfires should not be allowed in the parks.

“Campfires should not be allowed”

“Campfires are by no means necessary and in fact in many places they damage the landscape. Campfires near alpine lakes destroy vegetation and using even downed vegetation prevents future growth. Most of California is ready to burn for most of the year. Fires are dangerous, scar the landscape, and use up resources. While many argue that humans

have been lighting fires in the back country for thousands of years, never have so many humans have been traveling in such limited back country areas.”

Commenters felt that campfires should be allowed, but under conditions: it is in a designated campfire area, stone fire place or fire rings are available, site meets appropriate requirements (remove underbrush, presence of nearby water source, fuel present), there are no hazardous fire conditions, there is no heat wave or drought, it is not above 10,000 feet of elevation, and it is not a sensitive area.

“Stone fireplaces should be made in the center of any camping site - and only if well removed from any underbrush, needles, foliage, grasses, etc.”

“Campfires only where it's safe and wood gathering is not damaging to the fragile alpine environment.”

“As for the campfires, if it's high fire season then perhaps we ought to restrict them.”

“Campfires tend to lead to cutting local timber or using local downed wood; while enjoyable, their use needs to be limited to protect the environment and reduce or eliminate collecting downed wood and cutting local trees and shrubs”

“And I think campfires should be limited to provided fire pits, and even then only be allowed when weather conditions safely permit.”

A permit should be issued to have a campfire. Commenters suggest campfires should be small and there should be limits to the number of campfires per day.

“Make requirements known at the time permits are issued. Fire permits have to be issued and citations should be given if fire safety is not observed: again, it's a matter of educating the users.”

“Campfire PERMITS should only be given during the wet months or when conditions have been monitored closely by officials. And those building campfires in violation of the rules should be subject to fines.”

Bear lockers or boxes for food storage should be available and maintained regularly.

“The food storage boxes are a great convenience. It seems that when they are broken, no effort is made to repair them. It would be beneficial to keep them up and place more. I do not like the unfair rule that gives storage box priority to Muir Trail thru hikers.”

“Bear canisters are of course necessary in areas where humans have been careless and taught bears that hikers equal food. Hanging and rodent proof sacks are important nearly everywhere else.”

“NPS should provide bear proof food storage boxes in most campsites or directions on how to store food in tree's on lines out of the reach of bears.”

“We have bears - hence bear boxes should be required or provided. Those who go into the wilderness to camp should have bear proof containers or have a plan for food storage that will prevent bear access. If these items were available for rent/loan at the time of obtaining wilderness permits, it would facilitate compliance.”

Current bear lockers should be removed and visitors should bring in their own bear proof canisters.

“Food Storage: Get rid of bear lockers in the backcountry and enforce a bear-can rule everywhere. If there's one thing that doesn't belong in wilderness, it's a giant metal box.”

“SEKI began airlifting dozens of large bear-proof food lockers into its wilderness in the 1980s, before portable canisters were available. Now that portable canisters are widely available, SEKI should cease installing these permanent improvements, and remove the existing lockers by primitive methods.”

The Ursack bag should be permitted for food storage.

“The Ursack should be legal.”

“consider allowing Ursack bear bags to be used so even weight conscious users will have their food protected and allow for the possibility of bear box removal from the backcountry.”

Commenters believe the regulations restricting party size, food storage, and campfires should be enforced more strictly.

“The party size limits are over run all the time...especially closer to the trail heads, but the theory is good. Just not enough personnel to enforce the limits. Boy scout groups are usually too big. Bear Lake for example”

“Fire regulations seemed a little confusing, with different elevation cutoffs in different areas. In addition, it seems like a lot of people willfully disregard campfire restrictions. Simplify the rules and improve enforcement by getting more rangers out on the trails.”

Current regulations regarding party size, food storage, and campfires are appropriate.

“When I've camped at Sequoia and Kings Canyon the rules for food storage practices and campfires was reasonable considering the environment.”

“Present party size is adequate and the bear boxes should remain along with campfires as permitted”

Campers should be instructed on regulations relevant to campfires, food storage, and party size upon entering the parks. Some commenters suggested that visitors should be fined and/or asked to leave the parks for not following appropriate regulations.

“Responsible use would require that everyone should receive information before entering wilderness about proper wilderness use and ethics, including the concept of “Leave-No-Trace”. It is not necessarily the size of the group but the behaviors of the group, larger groups (more than 6) should be held to accountable standards.”

“I think large groups can be advised about appropriate behavior as it affects other patrons of the park, again with ranger oversight. Park usage should be spelled out in brochures handed out at entry points.”

“Other, more dense areas should be without and anyone who gets a camping permit should be informed that an illegal campfire or a campfire that is not properly extinguished will result in a very large fine or possible jail time if set illegally.”

“Campers should not be restricted to size but must be permitted and uphold the highest standards of respect and appreciation for the parks and land. Heavily fine and even arrest those that blatantly violate the laws.”

Commenters felt that all visitors should compete for wilderness permits evenly.

“All visitors to the SEKI wilderness should compete for wilderness permits on a level playing field. Where the general public is limited by trailhead quotas or other restrictions, commercial uses should be strictly limited or eliminated. Clients of high-impact commercial stock outfits should not be guaranteed access while private (non-outfitted) hikers are turned away by trailhead quotas or other limits. All users should compete for wilderness permits via a single system, and then--only after obtaining a permit--should visitors be allowed to employ commercial services as needed to facilitate their trip. Clients of commercial outfits should not be allowed to “buy” access when others are being turned away”

TQ0006 - Topic Question 6: What are your thoughts on commercial services in wilderness, such as guided hiking, guided stock trips, and guided climbing/mountaineering?

Commenters supported commercial services in the park. They felt that such services were important to the visitor experience for those who were either unable or uncomfortable entering the park without a guide. This access fosters a sense of wilderness appreciation, and having a guide improves safety and limits the impact of these groups.

“I think commercial services allow a larger number of people to experience the wilderness, but all companies must be held to strict standards of stewardship. Commercial services that don't hold to these standards need to lose the privilege of offering such services in our wilderness areas.”

“Subject to volume/number restrictions, I feel that guided wilderness experiences are an excellent use of national parks and wilderness areas. Guides are, in general, more knowledgeable and respectful of the resources from which they derive their livelihood. They allow people who might not be able or willing to backpack to have a wilderness experience which has been shown to lead to greater desire to protect and appreciate the forests and mountains.”

“Guided trips are an excellent way for people who have little experience in the wilderness to visit these places with relative safety, and those kinds of services should be provided, so long as the organizations that provide them have respect for the wilderness and minimize their own impacts. They should be subject to Park Service oversight and rules, to insure that their activities and any facilities they have in the parks are in keeping with the nature of a wilderness area.”

Some commenters suggested that commercial services should not be allowed in the park. Commercial use is inconsistent with the values of the wilderness as these groups care about profits above all else, and detract from the visitor experience of other visitors.

“I am against large commercial services because it paves the way for even bigger endeavors and tampering with the wilderness. Raise fees and provide park services the manpower to provide these events. Once private companies enter the woods, bigger companies follow which leads to more human trampling of the wilderness. Wilderness means wilderness, natural, nature not commercial human activity.”

“I believe commercial services should be prohibited as, by their nature, they encourage over-use of the wilderness for profit. It's wilderness and should be kept wild.”

“I think all that commercial stuff should be banned. Join the Sierra Club if you don't know how to backpack and don't let horses anywhere near national parks”

Commenters support commercial activities, including hiking, fishing, climbing, education, research, and conservation work.

“I would like to see a quota system for fly fishing guiding in the wilderness areas. At this time there is no access to streams or rivers that are in the wilderness. I have the first permit for guided fly fishing in the park, that I know of, and it

would be good to allow some access to the back country. I believe in regulating some usage, and a quota system might be a good way to have access.”

“I think guided hiking, stock trips and mountain climbing are great ideas”

“501c3 non-profits / educators / conservation scientists and anyone else forwarding the health of wildlife habitat and the importance of conservation deserve to use wilderness.”

Commercial services should be allowed in the park, but tighter restrictions are needed on party size, permits, actions, and access. Other commenters noted suggestions including that commercial services should be run by the parks or share profits with the parks, or that these services must have a primary focus in education and conservation.

“Anytime commercial services move into protected areas, there is potential for damage. These sorts of activities would be better conducted by specialists working for the parks rather than by outsiders. The parks' best interests would then be better maintained and the parks could also be benefiting from the profits that currently go to outsiders.”

“I think guided trips are fine (and horseback riding is a great way to get out there, but has its own problems - manure, trail erosion, sometimes hiker/rider safety) but again it should be done in such a way to minimize the impact on the environment. The group number should be small (this also increases the ability of the group to interact with the guide) and 'leave no trace' practices required.”

“Guided hikes, trail rides, birding or climbing trips must be limited in size and if as a commercial service, all guides must be certified or licensed by the park and should carry indemnity for those taking advantage of the service against injury or damage to park lands. Groups should be limited per the above guidelines as should be any camping, fires or food. The guide must be responsible for maintaining the land used and that the group uses approved food storage methods and leaves the park as it was, taking out all litter and garbage with them.”

TQ0007 - Topic Question 7: What are your thoughts on appropriate management activities and techniques in wilderness (Minimum requirements)?

Management activities need to be based on research and scientific study.

“Activities and techniques should be based on thorough research and scientific study.”

“I think wilderness management should be based on the results of sound scientific research, including controlled experiments, whenever possible, and that the NPS should devote more funds to such research.”

“Wilderness management based on scientific evaluations by ecosystem experts.”

Parklands and trails should be maintained and managed in the wilderness for the safety of visitors and basic minimal needs.

“Appropriate management activities must consist of maintenance of the lands in good condition; that is, maintenance of trees in good health and removal of those which are diseased or otherwise of negative impact to these lands. Guardianship of the other species, i.e., community relations experts' responding to human/wildlife conflicts and resolution thereof, must also be maintained.”

“Things like trail maintenance is of course also important to prevent erosion problems, etc.”

Commenters felt that maintenance of wilderness areas, including wildlife, should be kept at a minimum.

“We interfere too much in forest "management" to the detriment of the wildlife and the forest itself. Small fires become huge fires because we don't let the small ones burn as they would naturally. We need to support state and federal parks that are large enough to accommodate all of the species that naturally live in the area, including large predators.”

“Minimal management, a few back country rangers in case folks have problems. No controlled burns. Let nature take care of things in its own way.”

“Keep it simple -- don't spend much time "helping" mother nature. She's quite capable without our help. Indeed, she's done well for the past few thousands of years. The NPS must consider wildfire and how to deal with it and wild species support ... those are the sorts of management issues the administration needs to deal with. Forget the commercialization and development 'stuff'.”

Fire management is important to commenters. Management of fires should be used, not fire suppression. Controlled burns provide benefits for fire management.

“Continue controled burns. 40+ years of limbs and duff have left forests in a scary condition through the old style of forest fire "mismanagement".”

“Controlled burns make a lot of sense, despite what I grew up with about all forest fires being bad”

“We need fire management not fire suppression either.”

“I would prefer that wildfires are left to burn naturally except in cases of imminent danger to humans (controlled burns in wilderness probably aren't a logistical possibility).”

The introduction and spread of invasive weeds should be managed. There should be no open grazing and weed-free seeds should be given to stock animals to minimize spread of invasives. Chemical herbicides should not be used within the wilderness to control plants.

“Require strict prevention measures to minimize the introduction & spread of invasive weeds. Nix livestock/(toxic)chemical herbicides. Prohibit open grazing of parkland. Require: Stock users to use weed-free seed for 2 weeks prior to park entry, All stock animals hooves/coat to be thoroughly cleaned/inspected by rangers before park entry (& stock owners charged a fee for inspections). Prevention is much cheaper, eco-friendly & effective.”

“Regular biological inventory surveys. Removal of non-native species. Trail and campsite maintenance.”

Some commenters feel power tools should be used, but helicopters should only be used to resupply ranger stations.

“Using hand tools might be excused if chain saw noise significantly impacted some resource in limited areas.”

“I favor one week of helicopter resupply in October of back-country ranger stations, trail crew sites, and the like rather than use of pack stock for these tasks throughout the season of use.”

Power tools are a concern in the wilderness, and commenters want no motorized equipment.

“no helicopters or motorized equipment; no new permanent structures”

“no chainsaws.”

TQ0008 - Topic Question 8: Are there any areas of the wilderness or wilderness resources that warrant special consideration?

Many commenters suggested that all wilderness areas warranted special protection.

“I think all areas of the wilderness warrant special consideration in the sense that they need to be protected from outside influences to change their environments to something other than what they are meant for: quiet enjoyment.”

“All areas of wilderness and their resources warrant special consideration: it takes very specific characteristics for an area to qualify as wilderness.”

“All areas and resources of wilderness areas warrant special consideration due to the fact that wilderness areas are vanishing at an alarming rate.”

Endangered species and their habitats, as well as unique habitats or biomes, should have additional protections, including the giant sequoias and bighorn sheep.

“Any particular area that is threatened with extinction of species or habitat due to over use or predatory use should be supervised by our National Park and Forest and Monument Service to maintain the highest compliance with our goal of stewardship of these priceless treasures that must be preserved for our enjoyment, education and ability to honor all life to pass on to our grandchildren and great grandchildren”

“Current roadless areas. Areas where breeding of threatened or endangered species occurs. Wildlife corridors.”

“Protection of endangered species is also paramount, especially amphibians.”

Watershed areas, old-growth areas, tracts with no roads, alpine meadows, and vegetation are some of the terrestrial resources that commenters felt deserved additional consideration.

“Delicate watershed areas need special protection as do the forest and its trees”

““Areas that hold our water supply year round, areas that are known to be habitat for rare and endangered species, areas that have been unscathed by road building.”

“Old growth areas are especially important”

Wildlife and wildlife habitat need to be given special consideration, especially areas important to wildlife species, like habitat, breeding areas, and migration corridors need to be given special consideration.

“Any sensitive breeding or delicate environmental areas.”

“I think nesting sites should be off limits always.”

“Wildlife, especially the Bears and Cougars and other species who need large areas. Some areas should be only for wildlife - no people.”

“Natural migratory paths, corridors and wetlands.”

Caves are fragile ecosystems that require special consideration. There are many important and unique cave resources to be preserved in the parks. Additionally, caves provide recreational values, which should be given special consideration.

“Cave and karst resources require special consideration. SEKI is blessed with extensive karst and cave resources. These resources provide unique opportunities to study geology, hydrology, biology, and climatology in situations that could never be duplicated in a laboratory or in a simulation model. Indeed, the observations in Lilburn Cave have impacted hydrological models.”

“caves may need to be fenced off since one person can erase what nature has taken years to create.”

Many water resources are fragile and need to be better protected and given special consideration. Some resources mentioned by commenters included riparian areas, streams, rivers, wetlands, wet meadows, and alpine lakes.

“Riparian areas should be given special consideration.”

“I just guess that in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks wetlands, meadows (particularly wet meadows) and alpine zone warrant special consideration...”

Archeological, historical, and cultural sites should be considered for warranting special consideration, so that these resources are not harmed or lost. Important landscapes and vistas should also be included.

“There are the wonderful historic tree carvings done by shepherds in the Roaring River area that should be documented (if they are not) and protected if possible from incoming wild fires.”

“Cultural and historic sites should be protected.”

“Definitely sites that are irreplaceable. People are not always known to be respectful of sites that have petroglyphs or "potholes". Again, I think the sites should be open to the public but with an educational component.”

“Historic structures and trails also deserve special consideration because they are the story that remains that will help inform the future as well as generate conversation in the present.”

Areas that are being degraded by human use or are in proximity to recreational areas should have additional consideration. Additionally, areas that are dangerous for visitors or already off-limits need to be given special consideration.

“Those that face overuse. Which is a real problem, as you know, in some parks. It's sad when visitation must be limited ... but limit it you must to save it. Such is the situation when this sort of resource is so limited and so many wish to "use" it.”

“Any site that attracts large number of tourists/visitors needs special attention and management.”

“The highest impacted wilderness areas are those closest to trail heads and parking lots. The next highest impacted areas are those on the very popular trails such as the Mount Whitney and John Muir trails. These areas need the most management oversight to protect the wilderness environment.”

Some commenters discussed locations within or near the parks that they felt deserved additional consideration. Examples included Sawtooth Pass, Mineral King, off-trail areas, drought areas, and areas that adjoin the parks.

“Areas under drought, areas used as breeding or hibernation sites that are used by animals in the wilderness areas.”

“Mineral King is a high altitude fragile area that cannot support the activity that a commercial pack station generates”

“the area adjoining Sequoia and Kings Canyon national parks, should be managed as closely to the national parks as possible.”

Special areas do warrant special protection, but the park also needs to provide education about these areas so park visitors understand where these areas are, and why they need this protection. Commenters indicated that research activities in these areas should also be given more consideration.

“Special protection for "special" areas should be established if it is deemed that the area is being damaged or abused. But if established rules are published or circulated enough throughout the park then one should be able to assume the wilderness will be properly protected.”

“If areas of special concern (rare species, unsafe zones, etc.) need to be restricted, take care to include visitors in their preservation. Have volunteer personnel on hand to tell folks what's going on, take them on tours of border areas (or into restricted areas as possible) so that visitors are enlisted as allies in preservation rather than feeling they are part of the problem.”

APPENDIX B: CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS

Note: In many instances, the organization type was not defined by the commenter; therefore, organizations were listed as “Unaffiliated Individuals”.

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
University/Professional Society			
830	No	Goodwin, James	University of Florida
Recreational Groups			
897	No	Dailey, Dennis	Back Country horsemen of America and the Wilderness Society
900	No	Cochran, Richard H	Backcountry Horsemen of California, Public Lands Committee, High Sierra Unit
78	No	Browning, Peter	High Sierra Hikers Association
868	No	Browning, Peter	High Sierra Hikers Association
901	No	Browning, Peter	High Sierra Hikers Association
902	No	Browning, Peter	High Sierra Hikers Association
836	No	Garden, Kevin	High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California
877	No	Dailey, Bart Koehler and Dennis	The Wilderness Society; Back Country Horsemen of America
Unaffiliated Individual			
624	No	Kept Private	AARP
412	Yes (600808)	Brown, Tamzin S	Actress
659	No	Brutsche, Albert g	American citizen
242	No	Kept Private	Audubon Society, Sierra Club, Save the Bay, Bat Conservation Int'l
80	No	Kept Private	Backcountry High Sierra, ETI Corral 22 and 99
20	No	Kept Private	Backcountry Horsemen of California
21	No	Kept Private	Backcountry Horsemen of California--High Sierra Unit
529	No	Sidbury, Mercy	Bodywise Pilates Studio
257	No	Kept Private	California Native Plant Society
551	No	Kept Private	California Native Plant Society
324	No	Kept Private	CALM
307	No	Kept Private	Care2
808	No	Kept Private	Cave Research Foundation
334	No	Kept Private	College of the Redwoods
227	No	Kept Private	Crossroads
225	No	Angle , Roger R	Democratic Party, MoveOne.org, The Sierra Club
816	No	Collins, Gerry	Earth Justice
579	No	Burks, Paul D	EarthLight Magazine
390	No	Kept Private	Escondido Democratic Club
135	No	Kept Private	Felician Sisters
664	No	Cooper, Sheri	Fifth Plane Associates
320	No	Peard, Christine E	Former Montecito-Sequoia Lodge Staff
809	No	Kept Private	Friends of the International Center

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
48	No	Faegre, Dirk	Greater Yellowstone Coalition
644	No	Alper, Daniel F	Greenpeace
355	No	Kept Private	HasselgrenGardens
179	No	Kept Private	High Sierra Hikers Association
180	No	Kept Private	High Sierra Hikers Association
458	Yes (600808)	Benedict, Douglas M	Home
326	Yes (600808)	Henning, Linda	Human Beings
796	No	Kept Private	I can not uncheck Member on this form
49	No	Naples, Jean M	Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
598	No	Kept Private	Kern-Kaweah Chapter, Sierra Club
196	No	Metz, Michael	MEChA
600	No	Kinchen, Harold I	Merced College
568	No	Kept Private	N/A
240	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	N/A (Sierra club member)
59	No	Kept Private	NPCA
315	Yes (600808)	White, Vilma	NPCA
198	No	N/A, N/A	NPS
328	No	Kept Private	NPS
678	No	Kept Private	NRDC
593	No	Kept Private	NRDC, Sierra Club, CA State Parks
182	No	Kept Private	NSS
812	No	Mathey, Thomas	NSS
197	No	Nemeth, Valerie A	National Park Service
543	No	Kept Private	National Park Service
106	Yes (571497)	Kept Private	National Parks Conservation Association
267	No	DiMatteo, Richard	National Parks Conservation Center
22	No	Kept Private	National Speleological Society
820	No	Kept Private	National Speleological Society and the Cave Research Foundation
800	No	Le Fevre , Dale	New Games
727	Yes (600808)	Spencer, Jeffrey	Niles Congregational Church, UCC
23	No	Dawson, Mike	Pacific Crest Trail Association
172	No	Vancura, Vlado	PAN Parks Foundation
564	No	Murray, Lynn J	Placerville Spinal Cord Injury Support Group
224	No	Kept Private	Preserve the Kern River Valley
694	No	N/A, N/A	Private citizen
738	No	Kept Private	Public user
794	No	Allen, Ruby S	Rainbow Pack Outfitters
817	No	Allen, Greg	Rainbow PackOutfitters
427	Master (601063)	Kept Private	Retired

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
428	Yes (601063)	Kept Private	Retired
785	No	Kept Private	Retired CA State Parks Civil Engineer
323	No	DeBruton, sdb, Bro. Noel C	Saint John Bosco HS
768	No	conover, mark	San Francisco Bay Chapter of the NSS
799	No	Kept Private	Sempervirens, Save the Redwoods and Sierra Club
801	No	Kept Private	Sequoia Natural History Association, Sierra Club, Audubon, Society for Conservation Biology,
67	No	Bennett, Virginia H	Sierra Club
195	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
204	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
209	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
211	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
217	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
221	Yes (600808)	Oman, J. W	Sierra Club
229	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
232	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
233	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
241	Yes (600808)	Lyon, Jennifer	Sierra Club
249	No	Fisher, Glenn	Sierra Club
250	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
262	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
268	Yes (600808)	Nudelman, Betty	Sierra Club
273	Yes (600808)	N/A, N/A	Sierra Club
278	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
280	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
281	No	Mosesman, Michael	Sierra Club
282	Yes (600808)	Wilson, Rick	Sierra Club
287	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
291	No	Mayer, Richard	Sierra Club
293	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
301	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
302	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
305	No	Vipond, Mathew	Sierra Club
311	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
317	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
318	Yes	Ranz, Lauren	Sierra Club

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
	(600808)		
322	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
335	No	Morgan, Joan	Sierra Club
340	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
345	No	kroell, paul g	sierra club
348	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
352	No	Conrad, Jack	Sierra Club
358	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
361	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
366	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
370	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
375	Yes (600808)	Le Pouvoir, John R	Sierra Club
381	Yes (600808)	Syed, Linda J	Sierra Club
397	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
401	Yes (600808)	Lorenz, Kathryn	Sierra Club
405	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
407	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
414	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
417	No	Kept Private	SIERRA CLUB
420	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
422	Yes (600808)	Teevan, John P	Sierra Club
425	No	Payne, Richard K	Sierra Club
430	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
434	No	Kept Private	sierra club
436	No	Kept Private	Sierra club
442	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
450	No	N/A, N/A	Sierra Club
451	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
460	No	Pratt, L. D	Sierra Club
467	Yes (600808)	Graybill, Christina E	Sierra Club
490	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
494	No	N/A, N/A	Sierra Club
499	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
505	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	sierra club
507	No	sandlin, john c	sierra club
511	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
513	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
514	Yes (600808)	Wilmot, Erik	Sierra Club
519	No	West, Mike	Sierra Club
525	Yes (600808)	LeBlanc, Jeffry L	Sierra Club
527	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
530	No	Lempart, Lukasz R	Sierra Club
532	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	sierra club
533	No	Brouwer, Froukje	Sierra Club
544	Yes (600808)	Dutson, doug	Sierra Club
545	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
547	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
557	Yes (600808)	Davis, N/A	Sierra Club
560	Yes (600808)	Noon, Gail M	Sierra Club
574	No	Lee, Vicki	Sierra Club
578	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
581	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
583	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
587	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
590	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
596	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
599	Yes (600808)	Miller, Karen L	Sierra Club
609	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
610	No	Gibble, Joia	Sierra Club
616	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
619	Yes (600808)	N/A, N/A	Sierra Club
622	No	Haberer, Kathleen E	Sierra Club
623	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
626	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
628	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
641	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
648	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
650	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
662	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
665	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
667	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
685	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
687	No	WILLIAMS, ANGIE L	Sierra Club
695	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
697	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
701	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
708	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
710	No	Craig, Ella M	Sierra Club
714	No	Ferguson, Virginia W	Sierra Club
720	Yes (600808)	Mach, Susan	Sierra Club
723	No	Clark, Leigh W	Sierra Club
732	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
742	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
748	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club
752	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
756	No	McDonough, Rebecca	Sierra Club
757	Yes (600808)	Gorman, Elaine	Sierra Club
762	No	Kept Private	sierra club
766	No	White, James & Rosalia	Sierra Club
777	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	sierra club
782	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
798	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	Sierra Club
749	No	Kept Private	SIERRA CLUB, NPCA
445	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club & Boy Scouts
761	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club, Audubon
435	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club, Campaign for Common Ground
611	No	Manoogian, Jone A	Sierra Club, Environmental Defense, Natl Res Def Council
760	Yes (600808)	Cardinale, Ryan S	Sierra Club, Green Peace
602	No	Goldman, Jane	Sierra Club, NRDC
640	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club, REI
722	No	Donaldson, John R	Sierra Club, Wilderness Soc, Natural Resourced Defense
382	No	Kept Private	Sierra Club, and Thorium Energy Alliance
612	No	Orr, Nicholas R	Sierra Club-Mother Lode Chapter
604	No	Bresee, John	Sierra club member
804	No	Allen, Dennis Q	Sierra club Member
478	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	TAXPAYER

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
823	No	Rasmussen, John M	Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club
826	No	Rasmussen, Marcia	Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club
299	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	The Sierra Club
731	No	Kept Private	Union of Concerned Scientists
706	No	Kept Private	United Educators of San Francisco
740	No	Kept Private	United Nations Association of San Francisco
500	No	Kept Private	Vulgarian Ramblers Mountaineering Club
354	No	Kept Private	Walker Creations
126	Yes (571497)	Behrens, Joanna	Wilderness Society
895	Yes (571497)	Morris, Alexis	Wilderness Watch
42	No	Lackey, Mercedes R	Wilderness Watch
101	Master (571497)	Graver, Charles E	Wilderness Watch
117	Yes (571497)	Lackey, Mercedes R	Wilderness Watch
119	Yes (571497)	Kept Private	Wilderness Watch
125	No	Kovalicky, tom	Wilderness Watch and Wilderness resource Consultant
331	No	Williams, Daryl G	Williams Family
86	No	davis, phillip m	central sierra fly fishing adventures guide service
775	Yes (600808)	N/A, N/A	citizen
582	No	Kept Private	human race
815	No	Brown, Pam A	member
745	No	Kept Private	n/a
718	No	Coburn, Laura J	non member member checked in error
44	No	Alaimo, Julie	none
90	No	Carroll, Linda L	none
266	Yes (600808)	Kept Private	none
692	No	Kept Private	none
52	No	Troup, Brenda P	nps
537	No	Frank, Randall	npssc
85	No	Kept Private	private citizen
165	No	Kept Private	private citizen
363	No	Allen, Arden W	self
584	No	Kept Private	self
789	No	Kept Private	sfsu
565	No	N/A, N/A	sierra club, nps supporter, pcta, wilderness society
Civic Groups			
870	No	Cochran, Richard H	The Irascible Order of Soararsis
Conservation/Preservation			
831	No	Steindorf, Dave	American Whitewater

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Name	Organization
866	No	Fontaine, Joe	Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats Campaign for the Sierra Club
882	No	Ivanic, Torey	Southern Sierra Climbers Association and The Access Fund
906	No	Nickas, George	Wilderness Watch
912	No	Nickas, George	Wilderness Watch
913	No	McKee, Kaitlyn	Wilderness Watch

APPENDIX C. INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE

Note: N/A represents individuals who did not submit their first or last name.

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
1	No		McLaughlin, Robert J
2	No		Kept Private
3	No		N/A, N/A
4	No		N/A, N/A
5	No		N/A, N/A
6	No		N/A, N/A
7	No		N/A, N/A
8	No		N/A, N/A
9	No		N/A, N/A
10	No		N/A, N/A
11	No		N/A, N/A
12	No		N/A, N/A
13	No		N/A, N/A
14	No		N/A, N/A
15	No		N/A, N/A
16	No		N/A, N/A
17	No		N/A, N/A
18	No		Redmon, Floyd M
19	No		Kept Private
20	No	Backcountry Horsemen of California	Kept Private
21	No	Backcountry Horsemen of California-- High Sierra Unit	Kept Private
22	No	National Speleological Society	Kept Private
23	No	Pacific Crest Trail Association	Dawson, Mike
24	No		Terkelsen, Lee A
25	No		Kept Private
26	No		N/A, N/A
27	No		Silcott, Bobbie
28	No		Greenleaf, Susan
29	No		Hack, Nadine
30	No		N/A, N/A
31	No		Shuster, M
32	No		Vairo, Pasquale
33	No		Esposito, Dan J
34	No		N/A, N/A
35	No		N/A, N/A
36	No		Kept Private
37	No		Brister, Bob
38	No		Kept Private
39	No		Brandt, Vicky L
40	No		Van Wicklen, Betty J
41	No		N/A, N/A
42	No	Wilderness Watch	Lackey, Mercedes R
43	No		Fotos, Janet E
44	No	none	Alaimo, Julie
45	No		Cornelia, Jared

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
46	No		Montapert, Anthony
47	No		N/A, N/A
48	No	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	Faegre, Dirk
49	No	Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health	Naples, Jean M
50	No		Kept Private
51	Master (528955)		Kept Private
52	No	nps	Troup, Brenda P
53	No		Brumleve, Charles
54	No		Black, Angela
55	No		german, dennis
56	Yes (528955)		Kept Private
57	No		doherty , pat
58	No		Walters, Sandra F
59	No	NPCA	Kept Private
60	No		Kept Private
61	No		Kept Private
62	No		Koch, S A
63	No		Rosenblum, Stephen
64	No		Borchers, Margie j
65	No		Kept Private
66	No		Valentine, Jennifer
67	No	Sierra Club	Bennett, Virginia H
68	No		Kept Private
69	No		Gayden, Jim P
70	No		Kept Private
71	No		Schacht, Timothy A
72	No		hibben, walker
73	No		Kept Private
74	No		Kept Private
75	No		Selquist, Donna J
76	No		Kept Private
77	No		Kept Private
78	No	High Sierra Hikers Association	Browning, Peter
79	No		N/A, N/A
80	No	Backcountry High Sierra, ETI Corral 22 and 99	Kept Private
81	No		Frantz, William
82	No		Kept Private
83	No		Jeffcoach, Daniel R
84	No		Freeman, Kyri
85	No	private citizen	Kept Private
86	No	central sierra fly fishing adventures guide service	davis, phillip m
87	No		Kept Private
88	No		Cobb, Janet S
89	No		McCall, Charles
90	No	none	Carroll, Linda L
91	No		Pierson, James

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
92	No		Kenny and Glover, Robert and Julia
93	No		Kept Private
94	No		Kept Private
95	No	Antietam Valley Animal Hospital	Wagner, Briana F
96	No		Kept Private
97	No		N/A, N/A
98	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
99	No		kliche, diana
100	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
101	Master (571497)	Wilderness Watch	Graver, Charles E
102	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
103	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
104	Yes (571497)		Swann, Sandra
105	Yes (571497)		Kenny and Glover, Robert and Julia
106	Yes (571497)	National Parks Conservation Association	Kept Private
107	No		Kept Private
108	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
109	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
110	Yes (571497)		Small, Sally
111	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
112	Yes (571497)		Black, Angela
113	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
114	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
115	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
116	Yes (571497)		Bechtel, Paul
117	Yes (571497)	Wilderness Watch	Lackey, Mercedes R
118	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
119	Yes (571497)	Wilderness Watch	Kept Private
120	No		N/A, N/A
121	Yes (571497)		Selquist, Donna S
122	Yes (571497)		Bales, Mark
123	No		N/A, N/A
124	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
125	No	Wilderness Watch and Wilderness resource Consultant	Kovalicky, tom
126	Yes (571497)	Wilderness Society	Behrens, Joanna
127	Yes (571497)		Weisz, Russell B
128	Yes (571497)		Jones, Allan B
129	Yes (571497)		Weil, Judith
130	No		Kept Private
131	Yes (571497)		McCoy, Kim
132	Yes (571497)		Rosenblood, Jamie
133	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
134	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
135	No	Felician Sisters	Kept Private
136	Yes (571497)		Gliva, Stephen
137	Yes (571497)		Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
138	Yes (571497)		Oswald, Sarah
139	No		N/A, N/A
140	Yes (571497)	Peace and Freedom Party	Finley, Mary L
141	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
142	Yes (571497)		Valentine, Jennifer
143	Yes (571497)		Landau, Doug
144	Yes (571497)		Dolins, Francine L
145	No		Kept Private
146	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
147	No		Neumann, David A
148	No		Walters, Sandra F
149	No		Kept Private
150	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
151	Yes (571497)		Fanning, Susan
152	No		Kept Private
153	No		Kept Private
154	No		N/A, N/A
155	Yes (571497)		Beer, Julie
156	No		Kept Private
157	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
158	No		Garvey, Lydia
159	No		Olson, Lynn
160	No		Naiman, Karen L
161	Yes (571497)		Varichak, Michael
162	No		conover, mark d
163	No		Kept Private
164	Yes (571497)		N/A, N/A
165	No	private citizen	Kept Private
166	No		Kept Private
167	Yes (571497)		Hoyer, Eric
168	Yes (571497)		Kept Private
169	No		Neumann, Nancy I
170	No		N/A, greg
171	No		Kept Private
172	No	PAN Parks Foundation	Vancura, Vlado
173	Yes (571497)		Brennan, Robert E
174	No		Kept Private
175	No		Kept Private
176	No		Kept Private
177	No		Kept Private
178	No		Kept Private
179	No	High Sierra Hikers Association	Kept Private
180	No	High Sierra Hikers Association	Kept Private
181	No		Boswell, Joanne
182	No	NSS	Kept Private
183	Master (600808)		N/A, N/A
184	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
185	Yes (600808)		Black, Angela
186	No		N/A, N/A
187	No		Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
188	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
189	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
190	No		Kept Private
191	No		Kept Private
192	Yes (600808)		Cohen, Howard C
193	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
194	No		Young, Joy E
195	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
196	No	MEChA	Metz, Michael
197	No	National Park Service	Nemeth, Valerie A
198	No	NPS	N/A, N/A
199	No		Kept Private
200	No		Massey, Eileen
201	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
202	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
203	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
204	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
205	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
206	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
207	Yes (600808)		farrell, sharon
208	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
209	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
210	No		Kept Private
211	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
212	Yes (600808)		Gerbitz, Gordon J
213	Yes (600808)		Hansen, Janet G
214	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
215	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
216	No		Kept Private
217	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
218	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
219	No		Burg, Donald L
220	No		Kept Private
221	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Oman, J. W
222	No		hitt, dan
223	No		N/A, N/A
224	No	Preserve the Kern River Valley	Kept Private
225	No	Democratic Party, MoveOne.org, The Sierra Club	Angle , Roger R
226	No		Shepard, Wiliam R
227	No	Crossroads	Kept Private
228	No		Kept Private
229	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
230	No		Kept Private
231	No		Hamilton, James
232	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
233	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
234	Yes (600808)		Kohr, Cheryl
235	No		Madrugá, Philip
236	No		Kept Private
237	No		Sheriger, Martha

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
238	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
239	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
240	Yes (600808)	N/A (Sierra club member)	Kept Private
241	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Lyon, Jennifer
242	No	Audubon Society, Sierra Club, Save the Bay, Bat Conservation Int'l	Kept Private
243	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
244	No		N/A, N/A
245	No		Fischer, Courtney C
246	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
247	Yes (600808)	retired	Kirks, James H
248	No		shipper, sander
249	No	Sierra Club	Fisher, Glenn
250	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
251	Yes (600808)		Burk, Joyce
252	No		Kept Private
253	No		N/A, N/A
254	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
255	No		Kept Private
256	Yes (600808)		Knittel, Brian
257	No	California Native Plant Society	Kept Private
258	No		N/A, N/A
259	No		Urban, Anne U
260	Yes (600808)		Mattes, Dale B
261	No		Kept Private
262	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
263	Yes (600808)		Kessman, Daniel
264	No		Kept Private
265	No		Feves, Angene
266	Yes (600808)	none	Kept Private
267	No	National Parks Conservation Center	DiMatteo, Richard
268	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Nudelman, Betty
269	No		Avery, George P
270	Yes (600808)		Wolney, Kathleen M
271	No		sheahan, steven j
272	No		Kept Private
273	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	N/A, N/A
274	No		Prichard, Roses
275	No		Cohn, Barbara M
276	Yes (600808)		Fritz, Annabelle C
277	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
278	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
279	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
280	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
281	No	Sierra Club	Mosesman, Michael
282	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Wilson, Rick
283	No		Kept Private
284	Yes (600808)		Weeden, Noreen
285	No		Kept Private
286	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
287	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
288	No		Kept Private
289	Yes (600808)		Smith, Pat
290	No		Kept Private
291	No	Sierra Club	Mayer, Richard
292	No		Kao, James
293	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
294	No		N/A, N/A
295	No		Kept Private
296	No		N/A, N/A
297	No		Scripps, Keith
298	No		N/A, N/A
299	Yes (600808)	The Sierra Club	Kept Private
300	No		N/A, N/A
301	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
302	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
303	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
304	Yes (600808)		Bechtel, Paul
305	No	Sierra Club	Vipond, Mathew
306	No		Kept Private
307	No	Care2	Kept Private
308	No		N/A, N/A
309	No		Kept Private
310	No		Ralston, Valerie A
311	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
312	No		Thomas, Leonard
313	Yes (600808)		Standard, Steven W
314	No		Kept Private
315	Yes (600808)	NPCA	White, Vilma
316	No		N/A, N/A
317	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
318	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Ranz, Lauren
319	No		Kept Private
320	No	Former Montecito-Sequoia Lodge Staff	Peard, Christine E
321	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
322	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
323	No	Saint John Bosco HS	DeBruton, sdb, Bro. Noel C
324	No	CALM	Kept Private
325	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
326	Yes (600808)	Human Beings	Henning, Linda
327	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
328	No	NPS	Kept Private
329	No		de la Giroday, Francois
330	No		Kept Private
331	No	Williams Family	Williams, Daryl G
332	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
333	No		O'Neill, Cara
334	No	College of the Redwoods	Kept Private
335	No	Sierra Club	Morgan, Joan
336	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
337	No		Kept Private
338	No		Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
339	No		Melchor, Sandra
340	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
341	No		Visscher, William A
342	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
343	No		Kept Private
344	No		Holmer, Rich
345	No	sierra club	kroell, paul g
346	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
347	No		Kept Private
348	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
349	No		Hunt, Lesley
350	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
351	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
352	No	Sierra Club	Conrad, Jack
353	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
354	No	Walker Creations	Kept Private
355	No	HasselgrenGardens	Kept Private
356	No		Lacy, Nellie
357	No		Hanks, Kim
358	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
359	No		Kept Private
360	No		Kept Private
361	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
362	No		Newman, Hudelle
363	No	self	Allen, Arden W
364	No		Conforti, Susan S
365	No		N/A, N/A
366	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
367	No		Kept Private
368	No		Kept Private
369	Yes (600808)		Maloney, Marc
370	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
371	No		Hendrix, Wanda D
372	No		Kept Private
373	No		N/A, N/A
374	No		Weiner, Nona
375	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Le Pouvoir, John R
376	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
377	No		Johnson, Robert
378	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
379	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
380	No		N/A, N/A
381	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Syed, Linda J
382	No	Sierra Club, and Thorium Energy Alliance	Kept Private
383	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
384	No		N/A, N/A
385	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
386	No		Kept Private
387	No		Christianson, Mathew
388	Yes (600808)		Brueder, Wendy

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
389	No		Kept Private
390	No	Escondido Democratic Club	Kept Private
391	No		Marzich, John N
392	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
393	No		Kept Private
394	No		Heymann, Ralph
395	No		Goodno, Catherine
396	No		N/A, N/A
397	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
398	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
399	No		Isaacs, Ed
400	No		N/A, N/A
401	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Lorenz, Kathryn
402	Yes (600808)		MacKay, Leslie
403	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
404	No		HOELKE, STEVEN
405	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
406	No		Kept Private
407	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
408	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
409	No		Kept Private
410	No		Kept Private
411	No		Paudler, Gary M
412	Yes (600808)	Actress	Brown, Tamzin S
413	No		Lidgett, Sierra
414	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
415	No		Schmale, Peter C
416	No		weaverPreservation, marjorie a
417	No	SIERRA CLUB	Kept Private
418	Yes (600808)		Raider, Philip
419	No		Kept Private
420	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
421	No		Chan, S
422	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Teevan, John P
423	No		N/A, N/A
424	No		Smith, Julie
425	No	Sierra Club	Payne, Richard K
426	No		Kept Private
427	Master (601063)	Retired	Kept Private
428	Yes (601063)	Retired	Kept Private
429	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
430	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
431	No		Kept Private
432	Yes (600808)		N/A, Ruth
433	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
434	No	sierra club	Kept Private
435	No	Sierra Club, Campaign for Common Ground	Kept Private
436	No	Sierra club	Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
437	No		Kept Private
438	No		Bogios, Constantine
439	No		Slate, Robert
440	No		Kept Private
441	No		N/A, N/A
442	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
443	No		N/A, Tim
444	No		Asbury, Luther S
445	No	Sierra Club & Boy Scouts	Kept Private
446	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
447	No		N/A, N/A
448	No		Kept Private
449	No		Kept Private
450	No	Sierra Club	N/A, N/A
451	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
452	Yes (600808)		Steven, L
453	No		Crandall-Bear, Jpamme
454	No		, M
455	No		Kept Private
456	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
457	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
458	Yes (600808)	Home	Benedict, Douglas M
459	No		Kept Private
460	No	Sierra Club	Pratt, L. D
461	No		Kept Private
462	No		White, Julie A
463	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
464	No		McCarron, Patti
465	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
466	No		Forbes Sr., Chatham H
467	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Graybill, Christina E
468	No		McLaughlin, Sigrid
469	No		Kept Private
470	No		Kept Private
471	No		Kept Private
472	Yes (600808)		gold, carol g
473	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
474	No		Kept Private
475	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
476	No		Kept Private
477	No		Kept Private
478	Yes (600808)	TAXPAYER	Kept Private
479	No		Sheldon, Sher
480	No		Obester, Alyssa
481	No		Warren, Maurice A
482	No		Easterling, Alyce A
483	No		Kept Private
484	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
485	No		STAFFORD, SUSAN
486	No		N/A, N/A
487	No		N/A, N/A

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
488	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
489	No		Kept Private
490	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
491	Yes (600808)		Grether, Gregory F
492	No		Kept Private
493	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
494	No	Sierra Club	N/A, N/A
495	No		Shorr, Victoria I
496	No		Peterson, Sandra L
497	No		Kept Private
498	No		Kept Private
499	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
500	No	Vulgarian Ramblers Mountaineering Club	Kept Private
501	No		Cole, Dennis
502	Yes (600808)		Burkhart, Jens N
503	No		N/A, N/A
504	Yes (600808)		Roberto, Robert
505	Yes (600808)	sierra club	Kept Private
506	No		Ramos, Paul D
507	No	sierra club	sandlin, john c
508	No		Ball, Jeff
509	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
510	Yes (600808)		Davis, Emily L
511	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
512	No		Duke, Marianne
513	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
514	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Wilmot, Erik
515	No		Kept Private
516	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
517	No		Kept Private
518	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
519	No	Sierra Club	West, Mike
520	No		Kept Private
521	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
522	No		Guevara, Peggy D
523	Yes (600808)		Fuller, Julia
524	Yes (600808)		Ayala, Elizabeth A
525	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	LeBlanc, Jeffry L
526	Yes (600808)		phillips, john
527	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
528	No		Campbell, Heather
529	No	Bodywise Pilates Studio	Sidbury, Mercy
530	No	Sierra Club	Lempart, Lukasz R
531	No		SPENCER, JILL
532	Yes (600808)	sierra club	Kept Private
533	No	Sierra Club	Brouwer, Froukje
534	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
535	Yes (600808)		deManda, Janine M
536	Yes (600808)		Peralta, Llauren
537	No	npssc	Frank, Randall

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
538	No		Root, Jessie R
539	No		Frank, Diane
540	No		WALLOF, HUNTER
541	No		Patton, James J
542	No		Kept Private
543	No	National Park Service	Kept Private
544	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Dutson, doug
545	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
546	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
547	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
548	No		Silvia, Trista
549	No		Kept Private
550	No		Kept Private
551	No	California Native Plant Society	Kept Private
552	No		moffat, robert j
553	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
554	No		Gregorich, Bob
555	Yes (600808)		Riblett, Mary
556	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
557	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Davis, N/A
558	Yes (600808)		Corvalan, Maria C
559	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
560	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Noon, Gail M
561	No		Kept Private
562	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
563	No		N/A, N/A
564	No	Placerville Spinal Cord Injury Support Group	Murray, Lynn J
565	No	sierra club, nps supporter, pcta, wilderness society	N/A, N/A
566	No		Long, Jeffrey
567	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
568	No	N/A	Kept Private
569	No		Kept Private
570	No		Counseller, Erik D
571	No		Bowman, Heidi
572	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
573	No		nielsen brito, leonor
574	No	Sierra Club	Lee, Vicki
575	Yes (600808)		Tomczyszyn, Michael
576	No		Kept Private
577	Yes (600808)		Roggow, Philip
578	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
579	No	EarthLight Magazine	Burks, Paul D
580	Yes (600808)		Nichols, Randy
581	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
582	No	human race	Kept Private
583	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
584	No	self	Kept Private
585	No		Kept Private
586	No		Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
587	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
588	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
589	No		Kept Private
590	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
591	No		Kept Private
592	Yes (600808)		Childs, Nat
593	No	NRDC, Sierra Club, CA State Parks	Kept Private
594	No		Kept Private
595	Yes (600808)		Witt, Rose Ann H
596	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
597	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
598	No	Kern-Kaweah Chapter, Sierra Club	Kept Private
599	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Miller, Karen L
600	No	Merced College	Kinchen, Harold I
601	No		Fox, Roger E
602	No	Sierra Club, NRDC	Goldman, Jane
603	No		Kept Private
604	No	Sierra club member	Bresee, John
605	Yes (600808)		Mehrotra, Siddharth
606	No		Stott, John
607	No		Bernard, William J
608	No		Yang, Pai C
609	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
610	No	Sierra Club	Gibble, Joia
611	No	Sierra Club, Environmental Defense, Natl Res Def Council	Manoogian, Jone A
612	No	Sierra Club-Mother Lode Chapter	Orr, Nicholas R
613	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
614	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
615	No		Spiegel, Karen E
616	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
617	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
618	No		Meyers, Franklin J
619	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	N/A, N/A
620	No		Gray, Jimmie O
621	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
622	No	Sierra Club	Haberer, Kathleen E
623	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
624	No	AARP	Kept Private
625	Yes (600808)		Morgan, Linda M
626	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
627	No		Kept Private
628	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
629	Yes (600808)		Petitt, Denis R
630	No		N/A, N/A
631	No		Kept Private
632	No		Kept Private
633	No		Kept Private
634	No		Cleese, Cynthia C
635	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
636	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
637	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
638	Yes (600808)		Sivesind, Torunn
639	No		West, Jack
640	No	Sierra Club, REI	Kept Private
641	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
642	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
643	No		N/A, N/A
644	No	Greenpeace	Alper, Daniel F
645	No		Kept Private
646	Yes (600808)		Hall, Diana F
647	No		simon, Philip
648	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
649	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
650	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
651	No		Kept Private
652	Yes (600808)		Lombard, Ruth
653	Yes (600808)		TOOBERT, MICHAEL A
654	No		N/A, N/A
655	Yes (600808)		Redish, Maryellen
656	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
657	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
658	Yes (600808)		Carlton, Alan
659	No	American citizen	Brutsche, Albert g
660	No		N/A, N/A
661	Yes (600808)		Scheuermann, Karen
662	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
663	No		hauber, mike h
664	No	Fifth Plane Associates	Cooper, Sheri
665	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
666	No		Kept Private
667	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
668	Yes (600808)		Yee, Peter
669	Yes (600808)		Gottschalk, Takana
670	No		Aarset, Cathy L
671	No		Kept Private
672	No		Kept Private
673	Yes (600808)		Forman, Donald
674	No		Kept Private
675	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
676	No		Hardin, Joseph
677	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
678	No	NRDC	Kept Private
679	No		Kept Private
680	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
681	No		Cox, Joseph S
682	No		Lowe, Margot
683	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
684	No		N/A, N/A
685	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
686	No		Reilly, Stephen C
687	No	Sierra Club	WILLIAMS, ANGIE L

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
688	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
689	No		Kept Private
690	No		Kept Private
691	No		Rios-Sotelo, Gabriela E
692	No	none	Kept Private
693	No		Salopek, Carrie
694	No	Private citizen	N/A, N/A
695	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
696	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
697	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
698	Yes (600808)		Priskich, Fiona
699	Yes (600808)		Casarez, Donna
700	No		Hartman, Randall
701	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
702	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
703	No		Kramer, Bob & Dee
704	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
705	No		Roth, Charles M
706	No	United Educators of San Francisco	Kept Private
707	No		N/A, N/A
708	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
709	No		schultz, michael r
710	No	Sierra Club	Craig, Ella M
711	No		evans, jean
712	No		Kept Private
713	No		Kept Private
714	No	Sierra Club	Ferguson, Virginia W
715	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
716	Yes (600808)		De Goff and Family, Victoria
717	Yes (600808)		Sherman and Family, Richard
718	No	non member member checked in error	Coburn, Laura J
719	No		Kept Private
720	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Mach, Susan
721	No		Kept Private
722	No	Sierra Club, Wilderness Soc, Natural Resourced Defense	Donaldson, John R
723	No	Sierra Club	Clark, Leigh W
724	Yes (600808)		Hudak, Lesley A
725	No		Kept Private
726	No		Kept Private
727	Yes (600808)	Niles Congregational Church, UCC	Spencer, Jeffrey
728	No		Price, James
729	No		Kept Private
730	No		Kept Private
731	No	Union of Concerned Scientists	Kept Private
732	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
733	No		Johnson, Ralph W
734	No		Kept Private
735	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
736	No		Kept Private
737	No		Kept Private
738	No	Public user	Kept Private
739	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
740	No	United Nations Association of San Francisco	Kept Private
741	No		Kept Private
742	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
743	No		Charvat, Jan
744	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
745	No	n/a	Kept Private
746	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
747	Yes (600808)		Kreider, Alison
748	No	Sierra Club	Kept Private
749	No	SIERRA CLUB, NPCA	Kept Private
750	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
751	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
752	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
753	No		Kept Private
754	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
755	No		Kept Private
756	No	Sierra Club	McDonough, Rebecca
757	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Gorman, Elaine
758	No		N/A, N/A
759	No		Kept Private
760	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club, Green Peace	Cardinale, Ryan S
761	No	Sierra Club, Audubon	Kept Private
762	No	sierra club	Kept Private
763	Yes (600808)		Michaels, Dana J
764	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
765	Yes (600808)		Benson, Steven
766	No	Sierra Club	White, James & Rosalia
767	No		Anderson, Steven A
768	No	San Francisco Bay Chapter of the NSS	conover, mark
769	No		Kept Private
770	No		clohessy, thomas
771	No		Kept Private
772	Yes (600808)		Kept Private
773	No		Kept Private
774	No		Kept Private
775	Yes (600808)	citizen	N/A, N/A
776	No		Stansfield, Tracy
777	Yes (600808)	sierra club	Kept Private
778	No		Babcock, Karen S
779	No		Ratcliff, Philip J
780	No		Kept Private
781	No		Kept Private
782	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
783	No		Jones, Allen K
784	No		Verba, Margaret L
785	No	Retired CA State Parks Civil Engineer	Kept Private

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
786	No		Childs, Robert
787	No		Kept Private
788	No		Kept Private
789	No	sfsu	Kept Private
790	No		Kept Private
791	No		Kept Private
792	No		N/A, N/A
793	Yes (600808)		N/A, N/A
794	No	Rainbow Pack Outfitters	Allen, Ruby S
795	No		Kept Private
796	No	I can not uncheck Member on this form	Kept Private
797	No		Splain, Michael S
798	Yes (600808)	Sierra Club	Kept Private
799	No	Sempervirens, Save the Redwoods and Sierra Club	Kept Private
800	No	New Games	Le Fevre , Dale
801	No	Sequoia Natural History Association, Sierra Club, Audubon, Society for Conservation Biology,	Kept Private
802	No		Springer, Michael I
803	No		Kept Private
804	No	Sierra club Member	Allen, Dennis Q
805	No		Kept Private
806	No		Kept Private
807	No		Chinn, Jason
808	No	Cave Research Foundation	Kept Private
809	No	Friends of the International Center	Kept Private
810	No		Kept Private
811	No		Carlson, Jim
812	No	NSS	Mathey, Thomas
813	No		N/A, N/A
814	No		Linstadt, John E
815	No	member	Brown, Pam A
816	No	Earth Justice	Collins, Gerry
817	No	Rainbow PackOutfitters	Allen, Greg
818	No		Kept Private
819	No		Kept Private
820	No	National Speleological Society and the Cave Research Foundation	Kept Private
821	No		Kept Private
822	No		N/A, N/A
823	No	Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club	Rasmussen, John M
824	No		Kept Private
825	No		Kept Private
826	No	Tehipite Chapter of the Sierra Club	Rasmussen, Marcia
827	No		Hadley, Mary Lou
828	No		Anthes, David
829	No		Budlong, Tom
830	No	University of Florida	Goodwin, James
831	No	American Whitewater	Steindorf, Dave
832	No		Nelson, James

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
833	No		Pennington, Paula
834	No		Braun, Jonathan
835	No		Currie, Joseph
836	No	High sierra Unit of the Back Country Horsemen of California	Garden, Kevin
837	No		Hessen, Steve
838	No		Kumano, Ralph F
839	No		Meadow, Paul
840	No		Scott, Peter
841	No		Assereto, Andy
842	No		Hirnschall, Phil
843	No		Kaiser, Bryan
844	No		Midgett, Mark
845	No		Cole, Gerald
846	No		Currie, Patricia
847	No		Felciano, Celeste
848	No		Budlong, Tom
849	No		McClatchey Jr., Walter P
850	No		Douglas, Renee
851	No		Mangels, Steve
852	No		Oakeshott, Jeanne
853	No		Gourley, A.C
854	No		Grinstead, Cathy
855	No		Schmitt, Jeff
856	No		Toldi, Francis
857	No		Hinkle, Stephen
858	No		Pisani, Mary Alice
859	No		Bissiri, Nadean
860	No		Gebhart, Ann
861	No		Greenfield, James M
862	No		Branchinelli, Pamela A
863	No		Taylor, Marcus
864	No		Holden, Ellen
865	No		Clum, Carole A
866	No	Sierra Nevada Resilient Habitats Campaign for the Sierra Club	Fontaine, Joe
867	No		Hamstro, Jacob
868	No	High Sierra Hikers Association	Browning, Peter
869	No		Spence, Brian
870	No	The Irascible Order of Soararsis	Cochran, Richard H
871	No		Wilson, Eugene R
872	No		Berg, Brian
873	No		Dunham, Don E
874	No		Junga, Frank A
875	No		Whitmore, Tasha
876	No		Sweet, Edward
877	No	The Wilderness Society; Back Country Horsemen of America	Dailey, Bart Koehler and Dennis
878	No		Young, Bradley L
879	No		Schaefer, William P
880	No		Miles, Jim

Correspondence ID	Form Letter	Organization	Name
881	No		Bogner, Jane
882	No	Southern Sierra Climbers Association and The Access Fund	Ivanic, Torey
883	No		Whitaker, Howard
884	No		Broeckel, William
885	No		Brauer, Laurence
886	No		Barnett, Teri
887	No		Bissiri, Paul
888	No		Broberg, Carol
889	No		Georgi, Maggi
890	No		Stowell, Lorenzo
891	No		Neuman, Beverly
892	No		Eaton, Perry
893	No		Helms, John F
894	No		Gibson, David
895	Yes (571497)	Wilderness Watch	Morris, Alexis
896	No		Johnson, Evan
897	No	Back Country horsemen of America and the Wilderness Society	Dailey, Dennis
898	No		Arnebold, Henry A
899	No		Reynolds, Brian A
900	No	Backcountry Horsemen of California, Public Lands Committee, High Sierra Unit	Cochran, Richard H
901	No	High Sierra Hikers Association	Browning, Peter
902	No	High Sierra Hikers Association	Browning, Peter
903	No		Horwood, Edy
904	No		Selke, Alia
905	No		Shekelle, Paul
906	No	Wilderness Watch	Nickas, George
907	No		Pottinger, Dallas
908	Yes (600808)		,
909	No		Giese, Mark M
910	No		Pennington, Gena
911	No		Tupper, M.S
912	No	Wilderness Watch	Nickas, George
913	No	Wilderness Watch	McKee, Kaitlyn