## Table 8. Preliminary Draft Alternatives by Key Topic – Other Facilities: Redwood Canyon, Pear Lake, Bearpaw Meadow High Sierra Camp and Frontcountry Facilities October 2012

Topic OTHER FACILITIES: REDWO	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.
Redwood Canyon (RC) cabin and cache The RC cabin is a structure in wilderness currently used as a cache by a non-governmental organization (NGO) to facilitate research in a nearby cave.	<ul> <li>Per NPS Management Policies (6.3.6.1): "Park Managers will work with researchers to make NPS wilderness area research a model for use of low- impact, less intrusive techniques. New technology and techniques will be encouraged if they are less intrusive and cause less impact. The goal will be for studies in National Park Service (NPS) wilderness to lead the way in 'light on the resource' techniques."</li> <li>"Devices located in wilderness will be removed when determined to be no longer essential. Permanent equipment caches are prohibited within wilderness. Temporary caches must be evaluated using the minimum requirement concept."</li> </ul>	• The RC cabin and associated infrastructure would remain in place and be operated under a Memorandum of Understanding with the NGO.	<ul> <li>The RC cabin and privy at Redwood Canyon would be retained for administrative use and would function primarily as a patrol cabin.</li> <li>The existing infrastructure, including but not limited to an electrical system, water system, radio base station, wood shed, and cave phone system would be removed, and the area rehabilitated.</li> <li>Researchers-at-large could request the use of this facility.</li> </ul>	• The RC cabin would be	<ul> <li>Use of the RC cabin by researchers would be terminated within 3 years of WSP approval.</li> <li>The cabin would be removed over a 5-year period after WSP approval.</li> <li>Future cave research activities in Redwood Canyon could continue, but without the use of the cabin or associated infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Use of the RC cabin by researchers would be terminated within 1 year of WSP approval.</li> <li>The cabin would be removed over a 3-year period after WSP approval.</li> <li>Future cave research activities in Redwood Canyon could continue, but without the use of the cabin or associated infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Use of the RC cabin by researchers would be terminated within 1 year of WSP approval.</li> <li>The cabin would be removed within 1 year of WSP approval.</li> <li>Future cave research activities in Redwood Canyon could continue, but without the use of the cabin or associated infrastructure</li> </ul>
Pear Lake – Winter Operations as a ski hut The California Wilderness Act of 1984 and its accompanying House of Representatives Committee Report 98-40 (1983) provided for the continued winter operation of the Pear Lake Ski Hut, unless this	<ul> <li>No additional ranger stations would be considered for winter recreational use.</li> </ul>	• The Pear Lake Ski Hut is currently operated as a winter ski hut by a cooperating association.	• Winter use of the Pear Lake Ski Hut would continue to be operated by a cooperating association.	• Winter use of the Pear Lake Ski Hut would continue to be operated by a cooperating association or as a concession- operated facility.	<ul> <li>Winter use of the Pear Lake Ski Hut would be converted to a warming hut operated by NPS.</li> <li>NPS would take administrative action for full wilderness designation of the area.</li> </ul>	• No winter use of the Pear Lake Ski Hut. The NPS would take administrative action for full wilderness designation of the area.	• Same as Alt 5.

## Table 8. Preliminary Draft Alternatives by Key Topic – Other Facilities: Redwood Canyon, Pear Lake, Bearpaw Meadow High Sierra Camp and Frontcountry Facilities October 2012

	1	Alternative 1 –	Alternative 2 –	Alternative 3 –	Alternative 4 –
		No Action - Current	Protect wilderness character	Protect wilderness character	Protect wilderness character
		Management Practices	while accommodating	by balancing visitor access,	and reduce need for
Торіс	Common to All Action	Continue.	increased visitor use and	development, and	development by decreasing
	Alternatives	Continue.	allowing for expanded	restrictions.	visitor access and increasing
			facilities for visitor and	restrictions.	restrictions.
			administrative support.		restrictions.
non-conforming use is deemed to					
have unacceptable wilderness					
impacts. The area is categorized as					
a Designated Potential Wilderness					
Addition (DPWA) based on the					
non-conforming use of a					
commercial enterprise (winter ski					
hut operation) in wilderness.					
-	• The Concred Monogement	• The Deermony Meedow High	• The Deermony Meedow	• Dearney Meadow High	• The Deerney Meedow
Bearpaw Meadow High Sierra	• The General Management Plan (GMP) called for the	• The Bearpaw Meadow High	The Bearpaw Meadow     High Signa Comp would	Bearpaw Meadow High     Siarra Comp would be	The Bearpaw Meadow     High Signa Comp would
Camp	consideration of a new	Sierra Camp is operated as a commercial enterprise in a	High Sierra Camp would be retained and would	Sierra Camp would be reduced in size and the	High Sierra Camp would no longer be operated as a
	commercial high sierra	Designated Potential	continue to be operated as	season of operation would	commercial enterprise.
	camp on the Hockett	Wilderness Addition	a commercial enterprise.	be shortened.	However, if determined to
	Plateau. However, this	(DPWA) per the California	a commerciar enterprise.	be shortened.	be historic, the historic
	option has been rejected	Wilderness Act (1984) and			features would be retained
	for consideration due to	. ,			
	the 2009 Omnibus Act	its accompanying House of			and options for reuse as an
		Representatives Committee			administrative facility would be considered.
	requiring the area to be managed as wilderness	Report 98-40 (1983).			<ul> <li>The National Park Service</li> </ul>
	(Public Law 111-11,				
	March 30, 2009, 123				(NPS) would take
	STAT. 991).				administrative action for
	SIAI. 991).				full wilderness designation
	The Deemery Meedery High				of the area.
	The Bearpaw Meadow High				
	Sierra Camp has been in operation since 1934.				
	<ul> <li>A cultural resource</li> </ul>				
	Determination of				
	Eligibility would be				
	necessary to determine if				
	buildings are historic and /or if the area is a cultural				
	landscape.				
	<ul> <li>Should the concessioner</li> </ul>				
	Should the concessioner     decline to operate this				
	camp, and/or it is not				
	determined economically				
	feasible, then removal				
	would be considered.				
	would be collsidered.				

1	Alternative 5 –	Alternative 6 –
	Substantially reduce	Provide for the most
	development and protect	unconstrained wilderness
	wilderness character by	experience and protect
	reducing visitor use and	wilderness character by
	increasing restrictions.	significantly reducing visitor
	mereusing restrictions.	access.
┥	• The Bearpaw Meadow	• Same as Alt 5.
	High Sierra Camp would	• Same as Art 5.
	be removed from	
	wilderness, including any	
	historic elements.	
	<ul> <li>NPS would take</li> </ul>	
	administrative action for	
	full wilderness designation	
	of the area.	
	of the area.	

## Table 8. Preliminary Draft Alternatives by Key Topic – Other Facilities: Redwood Canyon, Pear Lake, Bearpaw Meadow High Sierra Camp and Frontcountry Facilities October 2012

Торіс	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.
Frontcountry Facilities to Support Wilderness Use – The development or modification of any frontcountry facilities that may support commercial uses would be addressed after completion of an Extent Necessary Determination.	<ul> <li>A variety of frontcountry facilities to support wilderness use would be considered, including but not limited to developing or converting frontcountry campsites to support backpackers and/or stock users, developing or modifying trailhead permit stations, modifying or increasing parking facilities, and reestablishing or constructing corrals in selected areas for public or administrative uses.</li> </ul>						