

**Table 1. Preliminary Draft Alternatives by Key Topic – Zones and Permitting/Quotas
October 2012**

Topic	Common to All Action Alternatives	Alternative 1 – No Action - Current Management Practices Continue.	Alternative 2 – Protect wilderness character while accommodating increased visitor use and allowing for expanded facilities for visitor and administrative support.	Alternative 3 – Protect wilderness character by balancing visitor access, development, and restrictions.	Alternative 4 – Protect wilderness character and reduce need for development by decreasing visitor access and increasing restrictions.	Alternative 5 – Substantially reduce development and protect wilderness character by reducing visitor use and increasing restrictions.	Alternative 6 – Provide for the most unconstrained wilderness experience and protect wilderness character by significantly reducing visitor access.
ZONES AND PERMITTING/QUOTAS							
<p>General Zones –</p> <p>The Wilderness Act and National Park Service (NPS) mandates and policies provide the foundation for the management of wilderness. Zoning would not result in managing the wilderness resources below those standards, but higher standards could be applied.</p>	<p>The Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) would establish Visitor Use Management Zones within wilderness.</p> <p>NPS Management Policies (2006) states: “. . . management zoning . . . cannot and will not diminish or reduce the maximum protection to be afforded lands with wilderness values. (Sec. 6.3.4.1)</p>	<p>Zone map was developed based on the General Management Plan (GMP), Backcountry Management Plan (BMP), Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan (SUMMP), and current conditions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zones A, B, C, and D would be established. • Zones would primarily be fixed geographically, but what would be allowed and the desired conditions within each zone may change under the different alternatives. Management within zones may be adjusted for site-specific issues. • In addition to zoning, the NPS could develop regulations/restrictions specific to particular areas and/or trail segments. 				
<p>Description of Zones –</p>	<p>Descriptions of the zones may change slightly by alternative.</p>	<p>Zone A –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximate to non-wilderness areas; includes wilderness areas within 1 mile of roads and trail corridors within approx. 6 miles of trailheads. • Examples – Mist Falls Trail, Watchtower/ Heather Lake Trails, Ladybug Trail. <p>Zone B –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High use major trail corridors (Trail Class 2 and 3) and developed visitor /administrative areas such as Ranger Stations, and food storage lockers. • Highly developed and maintained trail corridors and designated campsites are in this zone. • Examples –John Muir Trail (JMT), High Sierra Trail (HST), Pacific Crest Trail (PCT). 					

**Table 1. Preliminary Draft Alternatives by Key Topic – Zones and Permitting/Quotas
October 2012**

Topic	Common to All Action Alternatives	Alternative 1 – No Action - Current Management Practices Continue.	Alternative 2 – Protect wilderness character while accommodating increased visitor use and allowing for expanded facilities for visitor and administrative support.	Alternative 3 – Protect wilderness character by balancing visitor access, development, and restrictions.	Alternative 4 – Protect wilderness character and reduce need for development by decreasing visitor access and increasing restrictions.	Alternative 5 – Substantially reduce development and protect wilderness character by reducing visitor use and increasing restrictions.	Alternative 6 – Provide for the most unconstrained wilderness experience and protect wilderness character by significantly reducing visitor access.
		<p>Zone C –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a mix of trail types (Trail Classes 1, 2, and 3) and corridors with less maintenance performed due to lower use than Zone B. • Fewer administrative and visitor development areas. • There may be recommended camp areas in this zone (e.g. Hockett). • Examples –Taboose Pass to Bench Lake, Kennedy Canyon, and Upper Ranger Meadow to Elizabeth Pass. <p>Zone D –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without maintained trails, but a few routes may be regularly used, and a few locations receive relatively high use which may appear as Class 1 trails. • Generally no administrative or visitor facilities. • Examples – Miter Basin, Lamarck Col/Darwin Canyon, Baxter Pass, and New Army Pass to Mount Langley Summit. 					

**Table 1. Preliminary Draft Alternatives by Key Topic – Zones and Permitting/Quotas
October 2012**

Topic	Common to All Action Alternatives	Alternative 1 – No Action - Current Management Practices Continue.	Alternative 2 – Protect wilderness character while accommodating increased visitor use and allowing for expanded facilities for visitor and administrative support.	Alternative 3 – Protect wilderness character by balancing visitor access, development, and restrictions.	Alternative 4 – Protect wilderness character and reduce need for development by decreasing visitor access and increasing restrictions.	Alternative 5 – Substantially reduce development and protect wilderness character by reducing visitor use and increasing restrictions.	Alternative 6 – Provide for the most unconstrained wilderness experience and protect wilderness character by significantly reducing visitor access.
<p>Permitting/Quotas – NPS would develop specific quotas based on user capacity. If, through the extent necessary determination, commercial services are shown to be necessary, alternatives could include establishing trailhead and/or destination quotas for commercial service providers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permits would be required for overnight use. Continue to work with US Forest Service (USFS) to manage and improve quota/permitting system. Trailhead quota numbers may be adjusted over time as necessary based on impacts to wilderness character, other impacts, or management need. 	<p>Common to All Zones –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most trailheads have quotas (controlled by the issuing agency) that have been established based on seasonal use levels. Continue to use trailhead quotas as currently applied. 	<p>Common to All Zones –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most trailheads have quotas (controlled by the issuing agency) that have been established based on seasonal use levels. Trailhead quotas would be increased for certain trailheads. The NPS would work with USFS to add missing trailheads to quota system (e.g., Tehipite Valley and Kern River). 	<p>Common to All Zones –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most trailheads have quotas (controlled by the issuing agency) that have been established based on seasonal use levels. Trailhead quotas would remain essentially unchanged. The NPS would work with USFS to add missing trailheads to quota system (e.g. Tehipite Valley and Kern River). 	<p>Common to All Zones –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most trailheads have quotas (controlled by the issuing agency) that have been established based on seasonal use levels. Trailhead quotas would be reduced for certain high use trailheads. The NPS would work with USFS to add missing trailheads to quota system (e.g. Tehipite Valley and Kern River). 	<p>Common to All Zones –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most trailheads have quotas (controlled by the issuing agency) that have been established based on seasonal use levels. Trailhead quotas would be reduced wilderness-wide. The NPS would work with USFS to add missing trailheads to quota system (e.g., Tehipite Valley and Kern River). 	<p>Common to All Zones –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most trailheads have quotas (controlled by the issuing agency) that have been established based on seasonal use levels. Quota numbers for all areas would be reduced substantially; there could be additional trailhead quota reductions in the future to protect wilderness character. The NPS would work with USFS to add missing trailheads to quota system (e.g. Tehipite Valley and Kern River).
		<p>Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required for all overnight users. 	<p>Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be required for all overnight users. 	<p>Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 2. 	<p>Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be required for all overnight and day users. 	<p>Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 4. 	<p>Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 4.
		<p>Day Use –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No quotas are in place for day users. 	<p>Day Use –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No quotas would be applied to day users. 	<p>Day Use –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 2. 	<p>Day Use –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate trailhead quotas would be applied to day users 	<p>Day Use –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 4. 	<p>Day Use –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 4.
		<p>Destination Quotas/Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destination quotas apply to Emerald Lake and Pear Lake. Access to Mt. Whitney from the east side is controlled by a special permit system administered by USFS. 	<p>Destination Quotas/Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing destination quotas would continue to be applied. More destination quotas could be added (e.g. at designated camp areas or to protect resources or wilderness character). 	<p>Destination Quotas/Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing destination quotas would continue to be applied. Additional destination quotas may be added (e.g. at designated camp areas or to protect resources or wilderness character). 	<p>Destination Quotas /Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing destination quotas would continue to be applied. Consider implementing destination quotas and/or permits for selected high use areas to protect resources and wilderness character. 	<p>Destination Quotas /Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider implementing destination quotas and/or permits for specific areas to protect resources and wilderness character. 	<p>Destination Quotas /Permits –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No destination quotas would be applied. Use levels would be controlled entirely through trailhead quotas.