

PUBLIC SCOPING SUMMARY

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PUBLIC SCOPING ACTIVITIES

BCMP Scoping Activities

A Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Backcountry Management Plan, Grand Canyon National Park, was published in the Federal Register Volume 76, Issue 81 (April 27, 2011) available at: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/FR-2011-04-27/2011-10118/content-detail.html>. A public scoping letter dated April 27, 2011 was mailed to members of the public identified by the NPS as those who normally receive notification of park NEPA actions. Federal, state, and local governmental agencies, also received the scoping letter. Scoping letters were posted to traditionally associated tribes on March 3, 2011.

A news release was emailed on April 27, 2011, to an NPS list of media contacts.

Scoping comments were accepted for 60 days, beginning April 27 through June 27, 2011, and accepted 1) through the NPS PEPC database at www.parkplanning.nps.gov/grca, 2) mailed to: Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, Attn: Backcountry Management Plan, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023, and/or 3) submitted in person at one of the open-house style meetings. Park staff manually entered all comments received by mail and at a public meeting verbatim into PEPC.

Open house public scoping meetings were held at three locations: Grand Canyon Village, South Rim, Arizona, on May 25, 2011; in Kanab, Utah, May 26, 2011; and in Flagstaff, Arizona, on June 1, 2011. Flip charts were available at stations for each of the three meetings to document public comment.

Press releases and information provided at the open house public meetings was posted on the PEPC website: <http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=65&projectID=22633&documentID=39899>

Scoping activities included the following question: *Public scoping is an opportunity for the public to provide ideas about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Alternatives that should be considered, in other words, the scope of the plan. In defining the scope of the Backcountry Management Plan, park planners want to capture what you consider an ideal backcountry experience and what you would like Grand Canyons backcountry and wilderness resources to look like 20 years from now. We want to know what you value about Grand Canyons proposed wilderness and non-wilderness backcountry areas (including Tuweep and the Cross-Canyon Corridor), and any issues or concerns you have regarding how these resources are used and managed. What should Grand Canyon's backcountry and wilderness look like in the future? Your comments are important to us.*

Summary Table of Comments Received

Issue Comments

Public scoping comments summarized below highlight issues to be considered in the EIS. Auto-generated numbers created in the PEPC system are retained to provide tracking. 581 correspondences were received, many covered the same ideas and many were form letters. Because public comments are not counted like votes, and because displaying all comments would cover almost 400 pages, representative comments are retained for each category. The NPS, however, read and considered each comment submitted in its entirety.

General

Current plan manages use and care of backcountry well. Some new issues to be addressed are increased demand, rim to rim runners, packraft use and permitting , solar composting toilets in more areas, possible new bridge to open south to north access in another area, and potential new trail construction into a few of the more remote areas 357 234608

Backcountry access should remain for those who have maintained good health and a sound fitness 32 230982

Shouldn't backcountry do more with ethics? Policy is for Washington 474 235298

You are doing a great job running the park. A small percentage of visitors are able to experience the backcountry, for those of us that do it is a spiritual experience I do not want to lose 60 234071

There are no glaring problems with overall backcountry management. If nothing were to change, I would continue a happy hiker. Be cautious introducing changes to a generally well-functioning management regime. Take care not to fix that which isn't broken 473 235228

Continue present resource management philosophy with adjustments to accommodate changes that further the present philosophy 127 234262

The Canyon has struck a good balance of access and restriction. The main corridor routes with mules allows a wide variety of people to access the lower reaches of the Canyon while foot traffic only routes allow those seeking more solitude to experience that. I like Canyon management as it is now. Keep it like this and in 20 years my grand kids can travel and experience the Canyon in a state as close to pristine as possible 10 230494

There isn't a lot that should be changed with backcountry and wilderness. It will always be hard to get permits for popular places like Deer Creek. The place is so beautiful it's worth the wait. There is always lots of backcountry to explore and getting permits for most of it is easy 11 230511

My only comment would be that it all seems wonderful the way it is! Don't change a thing 29 230973

I have been visiting, hiking and backpacking in Grand Canyon since 1972. The park service has done a good job of managing the backcountry system 71 234111

The park service does a great, great job at Grand Canyon, in spite of being stretched very thin 387 234931

Thank NPS in preserving GCNP with limited resources provided by the US government. The park is truly a treasure 419 234982

When no longer able to hike, we will be happy knowing the backcountry is managed in the wildest way possible. That is what the Canyon should be. That is what has drawn us to so many areas for so many years. We hope generations to come may enjoy it as we have, and may see restoration of animals and ecosystem health we have not enjoyed. Our generation should leave it better than we found it, especially with threats of drought and climate change 456 235031

NEPA

Nearly all of the park's backcountry is proposed wilderness. The plan should be primarily a wilderness management plan 481 235309

Connect other park planning efforts (overflights, Colorado River management, wilderness rules, climate change, fire management to name just a few), and fill in the gaps: the only sure way to protect natural and cultural resources 375 234747

Lead in generating park DFCs; allow AMWG be to comment (not the other way around) 578 235211

Interrelated Laws/Plans: The BMP DEIS should acknowledge all interrelated NPS and DOT laws and plans, specifically analyzing those involving or facilitating use (including that associated with externally originated auditory and visible effects) on backcountry wilderness, from motorized equipment and mechanized transport. The analysis would include laws which should hopefully constrain, if not prohibit such use (actual use, or constructive use as defined under the 1996 Department of Transportation Act, Sec. 4(f)), and as subsequent regulations and Court decisions have dictated. These laws/plans would be specified in the Backcountry DEIS as

NEPA

critical context at minimum, or as applicable authority. 1. The 1916 National Parks Organic Act, as amended in 1978 (Redwoods Act). 2. The 1964 Wilderness Act 3. The 1966 National Historic Protection Act 4. The 1966 Department of Transportation Act Sec. 4(f) 5. The 1972 Noise Control Act 6. The 1975 Grand Canyon Enlargement Act 7. The 1987 Overflights Act 8. The Grand Canyon National Park General Management Plan of 1995 9. NPS Directors Order 47 on Soundscape Management (2000) 10. The National Airspace System regulatory and management mechanisms, in place via FAA since its 1958 founding 512 235372

I didn't see a list of concerns or planned changes. Perhaps more people, including myself would provide more feedback if we knew what changes were being considered. Contacting anyone who has filed a wilderness permit in the last two years is a great place to start 44 231056

Consider impacts to the park but also to communities impacted by BMP changes. By not considering the larger community, which relies heavily on Grand Canyon for employment and income (including the village of Supai and a large part of the Flagstaff community) the EIS will be inaccurate in its assessment of impacts. Any decrease in access to CUAs for current operators would result in decreased access to livelihoods people have come to rely on and would result in a change in a strong social culture. Changing people's access to employment and income levels and changing social culture has strong links to health outcomes, both physical and mental. There have been precedents set under NEPA in Alaska where a broad examination of health is considered in the EIS process. I encourage you to include these impacts in your assessment 365 234651

Hold at least one scoping meeting in a large city, such as, to avoid the undue influence of local populations San Francisco, Phoenix, Salt Lake, or Albuquerque 70 234110

I received the postcard regarding development of a new BMP. I went to the website and found it very difficult to maneuver and overwhelming. I was expecting to answer some set questions about your concerns. The site made me not want to try to figure it all out even though Grand Canyon is very important to me 119 234232

The period of time and changes in use and conditions since the initial BMP creates a significant absence of opportunity for participation in policy and management issues. During this period, adjustment to plan has been made by various administrative rulings, which has been appropriate to the circumstances, but with less than appropriate public involvement. For this reason, GCHBA requests a 60-day extension of the current scoping process to allow opportunity to expose these issues to a range of participants and create a dialogue between different parties and different viewpoints in the backcountry user community. The current scoping is a good start to the planning process but does not facilitate dialogue between NPS and the public, or between various backcountry user sub-groups with different viewpoints 363 234620

Scope of Plan

It is important the backcountry management plan address special features of North Rim high country, set apart from the rest of the Park by enormous and seasonal access difficulties, surrounding empty deserts, open only in the warm months. Visitor experience of North Rim high country backcountry should no longer be marred by an endless parade of tour helicopters low over tree tops and impacting culminating promontories such as historic Point Sublime. The DEIS should identify Point Sublimes special status as a Register-eligible National Historic Site, subject of Sec. 106 and Sec. 110 consultations under the NHPA. Natural quiet preservation (10) in such an historical and actually naturally quiet place (profoundly so), should be an explicit DEIS goal 512 235378

DEIS should address other ethnographic resources needing special attention under law, including sub-Rim Indian granaries near Point Sublime, and Bright Angel Point and Trail ethnographic sites. Responsibilities under Sec. 106 and 110 of NHPA are unambiguous concerning need to identify, complete nomination papers, list, and protect all such historic properties to the extent already not complete or sufficient. Point Sublime especially should have its own protective plan to ensure this special, extended, culminating, solitude-inviting promontory is treated with respect in terms of visitor use improvements such as distractingly excessive or large mediation/interpretation signage, picnic tables, restrooms, campsite designations. Respect means a suitable vehicular withdrawal distance, and recognizing potential impact on the ruins. It should be treated in essence as a silent place of mystery and revelation and transcendence, as implied by its very name: Sublime 512 235379

BMP focuses greater attention on recreational components with little emphasis ecosystem preservation. Increase

Scope of Plan

focus on ecological preservation and restoration. Include educational outreach to the public and recreational community. Emphasize NPS critical role in protecting and preserving healthy ecosystems first and foremost, and then allowing recreational activities with the framework of healthy ecosystem management 513 235381

The Backcountry Management DEIS will need to deal with East End high altitude, en route jet noise at major adverse levels, based on the % Time Audible. The Zion National Park Soundscape Management Plan deemed such noise source impacting park Wilderness Zones inappropriate 512 235371

Loss of natural quiet is the consequence of accommodating aircraft overflights. Review Appropriate Use again, in light of planning efforts now underway and new information now available 512 235370

NEPA's intent was to recognize similar, connected and/or cumulative dimensions. Surely NEPA's intent is to ensure cumulative impacts on backcountry resources, or visitor experience, on the viewshed or soundscape, would thereby be adequately considered. The backcountry management plan and overflights alternatives are inextricably connected and/or similar and/or cumulative matters, in timing, purpose, or context, and appropriately addressed together under NEPA 512 235367

Disappointed Wild and Scenic River protection is considered beyond the Scope of the BMP 482 235358

The Colorado River Management Plan was limited in scope to recreation planning and identifying natural resource issues related to recreational use. We expected a subsequent plan to address the natural resource issues in an ecosystem framework. We urgently request this BMP include the river corridor and its suite of habitats, wildlife and natural processes. This includes conserving and restoring/recovering native species, removing nonnative species, conserving natural processes and recognizing potential watershed connections and impacts of activities outside the park boundaries 481 235327

The intent of the 2009 workshop dovetailed with this much earlier policy direction. It also was designed as an information session and while the participants as a group did not endorse any specific management actions, the range of suggested issues and solutions provides a basis for recommended next steps regarding management considerations for NPS, arid GRCA in particular, in maintaining and restoring natural patterns of abundance and distribution of wide ranging mammals and other native species. A comprehensive planning effort with clear implementation steps is essential to address these issues and that the Backcountry Management Plan should be an important component of that 481 235325

The 1988 BMP consists of a limited emphasis on recreational management now requiring review and updating. The 1998 Draft Wilderness Management Plan attempted to address an expanded vision including wilderness and backcountry issues in the context of the Wilderness Act, NPS Management Policies, and the 1995 General Management Plan. That document was never finalized in spite of the park's commitment to begin the backcountry wilderness management process by 2005. It should be noted that the plaintiffs requested in the 2002 Grand Canyon Private Boaters Assn. et al. v. Alston settlement agreement's side statement that the future planning process be referred to as a wilderness management plan 481 235315

As part of this effort, NPS should include educational outreach to the general public and recreational community. Outreach should emphasize the critical role NPS has in protecting and preserving healthy ecosystems first and foremost, particularly in proposed wilderness, then allowing recreational activities within the framework of healthy ecosystem management 481 235314

Consistent with previous communications, we urge NPS to enlarge the plan's scope and effectively address the urgent ecological threats confronting America's crown jewel national park. The proposed plan should answer the question posed at the open house: What should Grand Canyon's backcountry and wilderness look like in the future. The plan must also provide a credible roadmap as to how we get there 481 235313

In the Purpose and Need slideshow, several projects were identified as being outside the BMP's scope, including aircraft overflights and the CRMP. It is important all park landscapes - backcountry, forests, river, and air - be considered and integrated in this one plan. Integration of multiple landscapes will assure consistent decision making in development of DFCs for the many park resources needing attention 578 235207

While we are most concerned with the Colorado River corridor because planning impacts can affect water and hydropower resources, we also know other related plans can have indirect impacts on these resources, which our members deliver to citizens of Arizona 392 234946

Every environmental law passed since 1964, and every management plan hence, has completely failed to make

Scope of Plan

Grand Canyon the better place it deserves to be. DOI's lack of commitment to preserve our natural heritage in one of the most prized U.S. national parks will likely remain ineffective for yet another generation. We ask this self-evident stagnation toward environmental compliance end as quickly as possible 389 234936

We disagree the CRMP should be outside the scope of this plan. The 1988 BMP stated, "It is also a goal of this plan to be consistent with other park plans, such as the CRMP, to the maximum extent possible." We feel the revised BMP should maintain and honor this goal. The 1988 BMP also says additional legislation and executive orders which influence backcountry management include Public Law 100-91 of 1987 (regarding aircraft management). Protection of Grand Canyon backcountry, preservation of wilderness resources, and quality of backcountry visitor experience are intimately tied to the overflights issue and the outcome of the NEPA process regarding air tour regulation currently underway. The backcountry experience is not limited to a visual one but an auditory experience as well where natural quiet is a highly treasured value. Again, the updated BMP should retain this linkage. Piecemeal management of Grand Canyon is contradictory to the park's ultimate goal - preservation. We recommend all major plans should fully reference, inform, and relate to one other to create a cohesive whole by including them in an Interrelated Plans and Documents section 371 234680

EIS should consider not only impacts to the park but also communities at large impacted by BMP changes. By not considering the larger community, which relies heavily on GRCA for employment and income (including the village of Supai and a large part of the Flagstaff community) the EIS will be inaccurate in its assessment of impacts. Any decrease in access to CUAs for current operators would result in decreased access to livelihoods people have come to rely on and would result in a change in a strong social culture. Changing peoples' access to employment and income levels and changing social culture has strong links to health outcomes, both physical and mental. There have been precedents set under NEPA in Alaska where a broad examination of health is considered in the EIS process. Include these impacts in your assessment 365 234651

Various use categories include: dayhiking, backpacking, trail-running, canyoneering, caving, packrafting, rockclimbing. Each use category has specific techniques and technologies and a continuing evolution of knowledge, skills, and equipment. Regulation of hiker activities and equipment in general (when unrelated to resource protection) should not be included in scope of plan development. Each different category of backcountry use has significantly differing priorities, expectations and needs. The BMP must not, without specific justification (such as resource-related) either favor or impair any category of use 363 234631

The current plan does a good job of managing backcountry use and care. There are new issues to address in future plans such as increased demand, rim to rim runners, packraft use and permitting, solar composting toilets in more areas, possible new bridge to open up south to north access in another area, and potential new trail construction into a few of the more remote areas of the canyon 357 234608

Wild areas, agency designation, should be strengthened, not weakened. The areas NPS has termed wilderness should remain so, in character and in administrative decree 139 234346

Non-commercial services such as scientific research activities and park infrastructure needed to maintain such research is critical to maintaining the backcountry as wilderness 138 234332

Cultural preservation and future plans for archaeology sites as a whole community with senior staff philosophical plan 135 234312

Include sacred terminology and John Muir's visionary work in establishing quiet wilderness areas 135 234308

Extend plan for climate change possibilities for 100 years? 500 years? 135 234307

The scope of an updated BMP should include review of current backcountry use areas. Some use areas should be subdivided into multiple use areas to better serve backcountry users. One example is AK9 Clear Creek which accommodates at-large camping for 1 large and 3 small groups. Some of the four permits are often consumed by groups who go no further than Sumner Wash, because there are no permits available for Bright Angel Campground. The effect is to preclude other groups from camping at Clear Creek, the popular destination in AK9, and far removed from Sumner Wash. A second example is BQ9 South Bass which currently accommodates at-large camping for 1 large and 1 small group. BQ9 not only extends from rim to river, it also includes extensive Esplanade areas (Grand Scenic Divide, Huxley and Spencer Terraces, and the Darwin Plateau). There is a lot of space in this use area. Some backcountry users want to stay overnight on the

Scope of Plan

Esplanade. Subdividing BQ9 at the Esplanade Rim could accommodate more backcountry permits while still limiting impacts of use and dispersing parties to ensure solitude. The March 1996 Summary of Public Comment on the Backcountry Management Plan (Draft) includes comments received on Use Area Boundaries. Review the 1996 public comments on this issue. There may be worthy ideas submitted in 1996 117 234225

Put welfare of the park, its habitat, and wildlife ahead of recreational convenience of visitors. Please make sure Grand Canyon survives in something close to the splendor it should for future generations 35 231001

Purpose and Need

What should the backcountry/wilderness be like in the future? It should look no worse ecologically than it does now. It should be improved by restoration of areas affected negatively by Man, such as the Colorado River bank 524 235400

My long-term vision for the future of GRCA backcountry and wilderness is that it will be as visually beautiful and pristine as possible, with much less chronic overhead noise from commercial air tours, be ecologically healthy where natural processes can occur without human interference, where visitors are respectful of nature and each other and in small groups that leave no trace, and where Congress belatedly gives GRCA proposed wilderness its long overdue recognition by enacting it as permanent, statutory wilderness 356 234600

As a long time backpacker, I value the pristine beauty, solitude, silence, safety, and the unique opportunity to experience the natural wonder of Grand Canyon's backcountry. These should be foremost in the Management Plan since its purpose is to manage visitor use and resource protection in undeveloped areas 524 235397

The need for proper commercial services must be defined in this plan and, given the overwhelming demand for self-guided permits, commercial services defined as necessary will need to be clearly limited in size and scope 513 235382

Replace "[t]o establish a management framework that allows the public to experience Grand Canyon's unique backcountry and wilderness areas while protecting resources and values" with the GMP vision emphasizing preservation. As a place of national and global importance, GCNP is to be managed to "...preserve and protect its natural and cultural resources and ecological processes, as well as its scenic, aesthetic, and scientific values [and, if consistent with the NPS preservation mandate], provide opportunities for visitors to experience and understand the environmental interrelationships, resources, and values of the Grand Canyon without impairing the resources 481 235312

Purpose and Need descriptions for GCNP proposed Backcountry Management Plan presented at open house sessions emphasized only recreational use and significant but relatively limited impacts generated by backcountry users (Station I, Poster 2). It is useful to reiterate NPS purpose: to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations 481 235311

GRCA has significant challenges to protecting and restoring the park's natural and cultural values. Given the complexity and magnitude of ecological challenges confronting Grand Canyon, conservationists have long urged NPS to begin a resource protection planning process as soon as possible. The proposed Backcountry Plan would emphasize protection and restoration of natural and cultural values, as well as recreational opportunities. While we understand those issues can be addressed in a revision of the parks 14-year old Resource Management Plan, or as envisioned by the NPS Directors Order 2-1, A Resource Stewardship Plan, neither option appears likely in the foreseeable future. Further postponement of addressing critical issues ignores the urgency described by credible, relevant scientific research and expressed by the Director and relevant reports regarding the ecological crisis confronting our national parks and other wildlands 481 235310

Examine a larger picture that encompasses multiple states and numerous communities and disregard directives/policies that are entirely self serving 447 235020

Clearly identify the relationship between this plan and the Colorado River corridor plan the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld in the last several years and how they are intended to work together 392 234947

Integrate river and backcountry plans to address problem locations 383 234774

Purpose and Need

Integrate this proposed backcountry plan carefully and consistently with past and pending GRCA planning processes, including the current EIS and potential rules relating to commercial air tours 356 234601

Present and recommend necessary controls on numbers of people and locations for hiking corridors and overnight camping use 136 234313

Reviewing and modifying the BMP will be a futile exercise if the issue of overflights is not addressed to the degree that actual solitude and peace are re-established in all of the proposed wilderness areas 118 234231

Update the BMP in context of long-term trends in backcountry use in terms of: Number of permits issued and number of user nights in and outside the Corridor. Permit requests issued and rejected due to use limits. This information should be looked at by: a) within the Corridor vs. outside the Corridor; b) Use Area; and c) time of year The Draft Wilderness Management Plan dated April 1998 documented wilderness visitor use from 1988 to 1996. Backcountry use since 1996 needs to be considered in the current update. Evaluation of the above data will allow park planners to better develop management strategies for the backcountry 117 234224

Objectives

Revisit and address Management Objectives stated in the 1988 BCMP Appendix F. Management objectives dictate what kinds of activities can occur without creating impacts beyond a defined level. The plan should delineate specifically how these objectives will be achieved, clearly reflecting a specific social, physical, or administrative condition of the backcountry by describing a spectrum of conditions that vary from developed management zones to least developed zones to create a useable plan for these areas. Appendix F has a number of well thought out objectives and procedures that should be continued 524 235401

Consider objectives for new or green technologies in wilderness areas as appropriate in terms of power, communication, navigation, sanitation, etc. 16 230538

Include in your objectives the will, resolve and actions necessary to preserve our wilderness for generations beyond our ours 95 234162

As we look to what we want the canyon to be like in 20 years, consider the journey to the 20 years 100 234179

Review the 1988 plan's goals: (1) maintain and perpetuate natural ecosystem processes in the park; (2) protect and preserve historic and prehistoric cultural resources, and (3) provide and promote a variety of backcountry recreational opportunities for visitors compatible with resource protection and visitor safety 138 234327

There is no mention of natural quiet. Please add this as a major goal. Restore natural quiet in all GC backcountry areas 139 234345

The park is a vast wilderness and should be managed to preserve wilderness character. Collaborate with adjacent land agencies to achieve these objectives 149 234376

Focus on resource protection in the backcountry 293 234495

Ensure future generations have a quality Grand Canyon/backcountry experience much like what is available today 369 234663

According to Station 1, Poster #2, BMP purpose is to establish a management framework that allows the public to experience Grand Canyon's unique backcountry and wilderness areas while protecting resources and values. This statement suggests visitor experience is the primary concern. GRCA's first priority, in keeping the NPS conservation mission, is to protect park resources and values. The GMP provides appropriate emphasis and prioritization when it states: "As a place of national and global importance, GRCA is to be managed to preserve and protect its natural and cultural resources and ecological processes, as well as its scenic, aesthetic, and scientific values [and, if consistent with the NPS preservation mandate], provide opportunities for visitors to experience and understand the environmental interrelationships, resources, and values of the Grand Canyon without impairing the resources" 371 234675

The revised BMP should think big by incorporating: 1) preservation of natural ecosystem processes, 2) ecosystem, rather than single species, management, 3) forward thinking climate change measures, 3) improved cooperation and collaboration between management agencies and other stakeholders, 4) landscape-scale

Objectives

conservation, and 5) a strong commitment to preservation of irreplaceable and non-renewable cultural resources integral to understanding the Colorado Plateau's historic record 371 234677

Under backcountry management objectives you mention identifying types and levels of uses that will and will not be allowed in backcountry, and provide reasonable access opportunities. It is not clear what provide reasonable access opportunities means and should be footnoted in the Draft explaining its meaning. That also goes for developing tools to improve backcountry user group interactions including river, hiker, stock, and motorized and non-motorized users 380 234766

In the Purpose and Need slideshow, several projects were identified as being outside the BMP scope, including aircraft overflights and the Colorado River Management Plan. It is important all park landscapes--backcountry, forests, river, and air--be considered and integrated in this one plan. Integration of multiple landscapes will assure consistent decision making in development of desired future conditions for the many resources needing attention 388 234932

Retain the goal stated in the 1988 BMP: "It is also a goal of this plan to be consistent with other park plans, such as the Colorado River Management Plan, to the maximum extent possible" 388 234933

Support the additional goal, as stated in the scoping announcement, "to [p]rovide for public understanding and support of preserving fundamental resources and values for which GRCA was established." Education is preferable to regulation and enforcement wherever possible and is consistent with providing backcountry visitors with knowledge needed to use and enjoy the park without impairing its natural resources 388 234934

Field managers will be under ever increasing pressure to provide additional access to park resources over the next 20 years. Recreation demand in this country is up and national parks suffer twin pressures of limited funding and increased demand. Articulate how these twin pressures can be managed and what vision NPS has for dealing with these two pressures that very likely will be ongoing sources of management problems for the entire planning period 392 234948

While the park presents aircraft overflights as beyond the scope of the Backcountry Management Plan, we submit that the question posed include not only what should the backcountry experience look like, but also what should it sound like. The Backcountry Management Plan requires a visitor experience protection section articulating desired conditions, goals, and objectives for backcountry soundscape and natural quiet preservation. Natural sounds are inherent components of the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life protected by the NPS Organic Act. They are vital to the visitor experience of parks and provide valuable indicators of the health of various ecosystems. Intrusive sounds are of concern because they impede ecological function and diminish the NPS's ability to accomplish its resource protection mission 482 235361

Increasingly, even parks that appear as they did in historical context do not sound like they did. Natural sounds are masked or obscured by a wide variety of human activities. In parks, natural sounds are disappearing at such a rate that some may be gone before their existence can be documented. Consequently, soundscape preservation and noise management is a dimension of achieving the NPS mission of preserving park resources unimpaired for enjoyment of present and future generations. At a minimum, incorporate desired wilderness and backcountry conditions that reflect Zion National Park's Soundscape Management Plan objectives - The park soundscapes offer an array of rich and diverse natural sounds, as well as an environment relatively free of human-caused sound. - These soundscapes are an integral component of what makes [Grand Canyon] a unique place set aside for purposes expressed in both the NPS Organic Act and the Wilderness Act 482 235363

Interagency Coordination

NPS could add a modest charge to the gate fee to enter GCNP to benefit tribes bordering the park. The fee could be negotiated in a way to settle many open disputes 372 234692

Have better relations with neighbors; Glen Canyon, Lake Mead, Hualapai, Navajo, Havasupai, etc. Perhaps you can collect money for all parties involved and take processing fee to help increase your funds 459 235048

Work closely with BLM, USFS, and private citizens who graze cattle on federal lands to closely monitor and prevent trespass grazing. Trespass grazing can be prevented by fence maintenance or construction 375 234749

Interagency Coordination

The fate of the park's biodiversity is intimately intertwined with the ecologic integrity of surrounding lands, particularly the national forests. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, echoing Secretary Salazar's announcements, recently emphasized using a collaborative management approach for restoration by making our forests more resilient to climate change and to look across property boundaries [and] operate at a landscape-scale by taking an all-lands approach. In addition, U.S. Forest Service Chief Thomas Tidwell recently called for development of landscape conservation strategies and action plans. The Chief urged the agency do this in a coordinated way to effectively use strengths of our dispersed management system to engage our publics and partners in collective efforts to a difference. While he emphasized water should be treated as a fundamental outcome of every plan, he noted that a range of ecosystem services can be considered or even emphasized... The plans should use climate change as a theme under which to integrate and streamline existing national and regional strategies for ecological restoration, fire and fuels, forest health ... and others 481 235320

Within the Grand Canyon ecoregion particularly Grand Canyon, Bryce, Capitol Reef and Zion national parks, as well as Cedar Breaks National Monument, provide NPS with opportunity to coordinate and implement trans-boundary conservation goals through collaboration in the Forest Service current forest plan revisions for the Dixie, Kaibab and Coconino national forests. Active engagement in ongoing Forest Service planning processes allows NPS to affect outcomes of these efforts in a positive manner. In addition, NPS can integrate into the proposed Grand Canyon plan initiatives and lessons learned from such a collaboration 481 235321

Protection of wildlife habitat, migratory routes, and related corridors is an important but especially complex and sensitive issue in potential boundary adjustments. Habitat loss and fragmentation are a significant threat to the wildlife populations in parks. Without efforts to protect the natural diversity of plant and animal species, critical park resources may be damaged or lost. However, because wildlife populations may have habitat requirements or migratory patterns that extend over vast areas, boundary adjustments to protect these resources are likely to be seriously limited by feasibility considerations. Plans should consider these regional natural resource issues with special attention opportunities for addressing them in cooperation with other landowners and managers as an alternative to expanding park boundaries 481 235324

Establish an expert advisory committee to make technical and policy recommendations to the Superintendent. Such a committee was established for science-based management of Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument and can be used as a model. The committee will provide an expanded range of expertise to facilitate a more integrated watershed and landscape management approach and to counter undemocratic tendencies arising in the face of such complex environmental challenges 481 235328

Include steps to create an effective mechanism to link NPS river corridor and watershed management to the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program and the Adaptive Management Workgroup. DFC developed recently by the Adaptive Management Workgroup is available on the program website. We incorporate the scope of the DFCs into these comments by that reference. The Desired Future Conditions are intended to be in an ecosystem context versus separate multiple single species management. In addition, we incorporate addressing the 85 taxa of management concern in the Goal 3 document recently prepared by the Technical Work Group and presented to the AMWG for review 481 235330

Tribal Lands

The Havasupai must allow access to Great Thumb traditional use lands as required by the 1975 Grand Canyon National Park Enlargement Act. NPS should collect all appropriate fees for access to this area and deliver said fees to the Havasupai Tribal Council 513 235391

The Havasupai Tribe has effectively blocked access to the national park at Great Thumb Mesa. They have every right to charge an access fee. Park Service could take a more aggressive and active role in seeing access to Apache Point and Great Thumb trails is available 98 234171

The road to South Bass trailhead should be freely available without charge. Either the native Americans should not charge for travel to south Bass or Grand Canyon should reopen the park road to the trailhead 120 234239

Address South Bass Trail access which currently requires hikers to cross Havasupai Reservation land and pay a fee (\$20.00) to the Havasupai tribe. This is in addition to the fees hikers pay for the National Park permit and

Tribal Lands

entrance. Negotiate a waiver for Backcountry Permit holders so as to not pay the fee at the Havasupai Tribal Reservation Boundary OR reopen Boundary Road to Bass Camp. This is the only trail in Grand Canyon that does not have free access within the National Park 138 234325

The \$25 fee is excessive that visitors must pay to pass through a section of road that encompasses less than one mile of the total trip from the visitor center to the trailhead 283 234476

Establish a MOU with tribes so permits can be handled by the GCNP Backcountry Office 353 234596

Hikers are subject to a great deal of confusion about adjacent tribal lands, access, and permits. Access across the corner of Havasupai lands on Pasture Wash is identified as a concern to many hikers who report uncomfortable encounters with tribal agents there. Hikers who desire to access GCNP backcountry areas near Great Thumb often fail to get a requested permit or any response from tribal offices. Scheduling and obtaining multiple permits for access across Navajo tribal lands to Marble Canyon is generally successful but complex. Interpretation of tribal rules for various activities such as road use, camping, and hiking can be inconsistent with how hikers understand those activities, or even inconsistent between different encounters with tribal agencies. For hikers wishing to access areas in western GC adjacent to Hualapai lands the situation ranges from uncertain to impossible. It would be beneficial to improve information available to hikers and/or negotiate a coordinated permit process. It is understood NPS relationships with various tribes cannot always be transparent to hikers, that tribal agencies will guard their prerogative and sovereignty, that tribal priorities and policies differ significantly, and that issuing permits is a desirable source of income and employment 363 234632

Tribes should not block access to GCNP. A right of way through tribal lands should be assured with regard to cultural resources. Tribes should be paid for allowing or providing access, and tribes should have no obligation to maintain or improve dirt roads used for access 372 234681

The Navajo tribe permit program is excellent and allows hiking on tribal lands and access to GCNP. It might be an acceptable model for other tribes to consider. Encourage the Navajo Tribe to continue their current program, as discussions on expansion of other tourist operations continue 372 234683

Modestly increase the fee charged for all backcountry permits. Provide the overage to the three tribes that control access to vast parts of GCNP: Havasupai, Hualapai, Navajo. While most hikers use corridor trails and won't benefit from this fee increase, it provides a way for the tribes to have a reasonable economic basis to administer a permit program. It also creates jobs for the tribes and allows them to have visibility into who is hiking on their lands and where hikers go. The \$5 per night permit fee is low and a modest increase to benefit the tribes will not create a hardship for most Grand Canyon hikers 372 234688

Modestly raise all backcountry permit fees to benefit access to tribal lands, and NPS administer permit distribution. NPS already has infrastructure for permit distribution and management and could simply add new use areas on tribal lands 372 234690

The Hualapai tribe seems to be particularly sensitive that river runners hike on tribal lands frequently without a Hualapai permit. There is no way today to obtain a Hualapai hiking permit. NPS should charge an additional fee above the \$100 permit fee for river trip participants (private AND commercial trips) and remit that fee to the Hualapai for hiking and river-left camping access. Even a modest increase in the river permit fee would bring a substantial economic benefit to the Hualapai tribe. River trips are expensive and a \$5 increase in the permit fee is inconsequential compared to the cost of a river trip. This idea would bring roughly \$100,000 in annual income to the Hualapai Tribe. Even if the tribe insisted on a much higher fee, like the \$65 fee per person to depart at Diamond Creek, it would still only add a few percent to the cost of a river trip and would settle the issue of hiking and camping on river left 372 234691

Congress specifically created language requiring GCNP access off Great Thumb Mesa when the Havasupai acquired the right to Great Thumb in 1975. In fact, GCNP includes a ¼ mile of the rim of Great Thumb Mesa. Yet access to Great Thumb is blocked by the tribe. At times Great Thumb is patrolled by armed tribal members on horseback. At times a gate across the road on Great Thumb is locked. There is no way to get a permit to access GCNP via Great Thumb. As a result, hikers frequently sneak out on Great Thumb to access GCNP without formal tribal permission to cross tribal lands. Instances of wildlife poaching have also been reported out on Great Thumb. The tribe doesn't know if someone on tribal lands is involved in legal (hiking) or illegal (poaching) activities. A formal and mutually accepted process to carry out the Congressional access mandate is required to remove confusion and allow to tribe to better police Great Thumb from illegal activities. Here are a

Tribal Lands

few ideas: 1. The Havasupai tribe already manages a hiking and camping permit program for access to Supai campground in Havasu Canyon. They could administer a new permit for the right to drive through tribal lands to the rim of Great Thumb to access GCNP. As part of the permit process they could acquire the license plate number of the authorized vehicle to help them sort through legal vs. illegal users. 2. Policing activity on Great Thumb will incur an expense to the tribe. It's not clear how many permits would be sold for Great Thumb access. Another way to fund a Great Thumb permit program is for hiking organizations to buy blocks of permits. For example, the Grand Canyon Canyoneering Association would be willing to purchase a block of permits on a use it or lose it basis. This ensures the tribe receives meaningful income for the program without the obligation to administer it. 3. A Havasupai tribal member is often posted at the gate demarking the start of tribal lands on road 328. This road is used to access Pasture Wash and Great Thumb Mesa. The tribal member would increase gate fees if access to Great Thumb were available. Hikers that sneak on to Great Thumb already pay this gate fee; however, the volume of hikers is small due to the ambiguity of access rights. If the ambiguity were removed, gate fees would increase significantly 372 234693

Yumtheska Mesa is virtually inaccessible because the Havasupai and Hualapai tribes restrict access by virtue of providing no way for hikers to acquire a permit to legally cross their lands to GCNP. GCNP includes ¼ mile of the rim starting about 5 miles south of Flat Iron Butte and running around the rim above Yumtheska Mesa through Yumtheska Point just north of Beaver Canyon. Hiking routes off the rim to Yumtheska Mesa exist at several places between Flat Iron Butte and Yumtheska Point. A road crosses Havasupai land to Flat Iron Butte and a separate road also leads to Yumtheska Point. There should be a way to obtain legal access to these two roads which both terminate inside GCNP 372 234694

From inside Havasu Canyon on GCNP land there is no legal way to access Yumtheska Mesa to the east. This access is important to Grand Canyon thru-hikers and technical canyoneers. Beaver Canyon, on Havasuapi lands, provides a non-technical way to escape Havasu Canyon to the west. Hikers can leave Supai village (after paying the hiking fees) and walk the Redwall rim on the west side of Havasu Canyon down to Beaver Canyon, then walk the Redwall rim above Beaver Canyon to Little Coyote Canyon where a constructed trail leads up Beaver Canyon through the Supai sandstone to the rim. Hikers can stay at the Redwall level, Supai (Esplanade) level, or on the rim to contour around a short distance to access GCNP. Hikers that are good climbers can also hike directly up Beaver Canyon to the top of the Redwall to access the same areas. Without this access, thru-hikers historically would sneak across Havasupai Lands to continue their GCNP hike. To escape Havasu Canyon to the Esplanade to the east under Great Thumb Mesa there is one legal route inside GNCP below Beaver Falls, but it is a very difficult route requiring climbing skills that are beyond most hikers. An alternate, less difficult, route is up Carbonate Canyon or School House Canyon on Havasupai lands to the Redwall (or Esplanade) level allowing contouring back into GCNP. The Havasupai should allow permitted access to thru-hikers and canyoneers needing to traverse Havasu Canyon. Numerous ideas have been presented to compensate the Havasupai 372 234695

National Canyon area is particularly troublesome to access. Part of National Canyon is in GCNP and part is on Hualapai Lands. There should be an agreement between NPS and the Hualapai Tribe for National Canyon access. For example, a small strip of GCNP runs on the rim for about 5 miles south of Flat Iron Butte bordering National Canyon. The GCNP boundary runs down the middle of National Canyon as it approaches the river. Hikers should be able to depart the rim above National Canyon and use National Canyon to access the river. Technical canyoneers are particularly interested in descending the two slot canyons that originate on Yumtheska Mesa and terminate to the east and west of Pocket Point at river mile 162 and river mile 164 respectively. Neither of these canyons have names on the map. A pack raft exit is required to escape these canyons. National Canyon is the logical pack raft destination. A route up National Canyon that affords access to Yumtheska Mesa exists mostly within GCNP boundaries, but there are instances where the route through National Canyon is just inside Hualapai Land for short distances on the order of a few hundred yards 372 234696

The current proposal shows 1) the road along the rim above Scottys Hollow (K-37) as closed. Scottys Hollow is the most direct way in or out of Kanab Creek in that area and the road should remain open to allow continued backpacker access; 2) roads to Flat Iron Butte and Yumtheska Point as closed inside the GCNP boundary. These short roads inside the park to the rim should remain open, especially in light of the suggestions above to convince the tribes to provide access to the rim in this area; 3) road out on Great Thumb that dips into and out of Park lands is closed. This road should remain open. Especially in light of the suggestion above to convince

Tribal Lands

the Havasupai to provide access to the rim in this area. Currently, the Havasupai tribe uses this road and a closure is unlikely to change that fact. Many backpackers also use this road to access the rim even though access is ambiguous. Finally, Congress mandated hiker access in the 1975 deal to provide Great Thumb to the Havasupai. Closing this road violates the Congressional mandate 372 234701

Park lands blocked by native lands need a right of way 394 234956

Technical canyoneering is an appropriate resource use. Issues such as access via tribal lands to public property, pack raft use on the river, anchors, etc., should be addressed 396 234963

Where is the west boundary? What do pre-Columbian American folk have to say and do with GCNP Backcountry (policy?) 128 234271

Tribal Opportunity

Native American Indians should be equally recognized for business-related permitting or concessionaire vendor use. Native American lands are been usurped or otherwise exploited without compensation and/or equal consideration for inclusion of Native American Indian business and/or entrepreneurship. The Navajo Nation government and any other indigenous native tribes should be directly consulted and included in these related discussions. Native peoples should be sought for consideration 134 234305

I would like to see some limited form of concession-style management of the Indian Gardens camping area offered to Havasupai Tribe 319 234522

Perhaps NPS could propose an idea to the Havasupai Tribal Council that enables Havasupai youth to experience Indian Gardens as part of a summer language camp run by tribal elders. Bernadette Jones, Carletta Tolousi or even Camping Director Billy Jack might be open to the idea of setting up several week-long Havasupai youth camps at Indian Gardens in summer, with adults and older teens acting as ambassadors and supervisors while younger folk (junior-high to high-school) alternate between service projects, reading and writing Havasupai, building/rebuilding an area for farming, hiking and having team building experience (I am thinking something like low COPE course material). I suspect the best Havasupai ambassadors are likely the type of people who would serve as youth camp organizers, planners and staffers. Having Havasupai people back at Indian Gardens (in some official capacity for at least some parts of the year) could entail several positive outcomes: 1) partially address an historical injury; the circumstances of Havasupai relocation do not sit well with many Americans 2) provide the tribe with an opportunity to communicate its historical ties and interests in preservation of the Canyon to visitors 3) provide the visiting public with an opportunity to interact with cultural ambassadors from one of our most threatened indigenous groups 319 234524

The Navajo tribe has an excellent hiking permit program that allows hiking on tribal lands and access to GCNP. It might be an acceptable model for the other tribes to consider. NPS should encourage the Navajo to continue their current program as discussions on the expansion of other tourist operations continue 372 234683

Administering a hiking permit program is costly and the tribes might argue demand is too low to justify cost. Another idea is for the hiking organizations to buy an annual block of permits on a use it or lose it basis. For example, Grand Canyon Canyoneering Association could buy a block of permits from the tribes and administer permit distribution to members. If all permits are not used annually, the organization loses out. This concept could ensure there is enough money coming to the tribes to enable a hiking permit program. It also provides a way for the tribes to keep administrative costs low since organizations would have the obligation to administer the permit process. In this example, the Grand Canyon Canyoneering Association would provide the tribes with information on permits issued so they know who is on tribal lands, when they will be there, and what routes (or use areas) are being accessed 372 234689

Resource Management

Stop destructive abuse to our environments and habitats 77 234127

Protect and restore all native species and their habitats 95 234161

Resource Management

Natural resources in all respects should be primary 136 234314

The two most substantive changes are the spread of tamarisk and the increased light pollution from Las Vegas 18 230563

The 1998 Draft Wilderness Plan's Ecosystem Management chapter (pages 96-108) provides a useful (albeit outdated) outline including management objectives and goals for many relevant elements of the proposed backcountry /resource plan revision: - Protect [Natural, Biotic and Abiotic] Ecological Processes - Protect [and Restore] Native Biodiversity - Protect Genetic Integrity - Protect Rare and Listed Species - Maintain Long-term Viable [Ecologically Effective] Carnivore Populations - Restore Altered Ecosystems - Restore Natural Fire - Restore Extirpated Species [e.g., pike minnow, burrowing owl, wolf, otter] - [Eliminate or] Control Non-native Plants and Animals - Develop and Implement a Regional Wildlife Conservation Strategy Additional Examples of Goals to Restore and Maintain Vital Ecological and Natural Evolutionary Processes (biotic and abiotic): - Develop interagency conservation goals that protect park values and transcend agency boundaries - Restore natural fire regimes on an interagency, landscape scale - Restore all native species in naturally evolving patterns of abundance and distribution - Protect and restore old growth forests on an interagency, landscape scale - Restore predation on an interagency, landscape scale - Develop a gray wolf recovery strategy for Grand Canyon National Park and engage in the current Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan revision process - Restore resilient ecosystems/watersheds on an interagency, landscape scale - Develop and implement an ecosystem approach to protect and restore rare, endangered, threatened species, as well as ecologically effective populations of strongly interactive species, many of which (mountain lions, tasseled eared squirrels, goshawk) range outside the park boundaries - Identify critical wildlife linkages (inside and outside the Park) affecting Grand Canyon wildlife - Develop and implement a non-native bison hybrid removal plan - Develop and Implement a non-native elk control plan - Restore main stem Colorado River riparian habitats with an emphasis on recovering Gooddings willow and monitoring/mitigating the effects of newly arrived and eruptive tamarisk beetle on songbird populations in Grand Canyon 481 235326

Reconsider and include proposed Wild and Scenic Goals in the BMP: Approve the eligibility and suitability analyses for the Colorado River and its tributaries within the park. Determine a course of action regarding an analysis of alternatives and impacts within the Resource plans EA/EIS or separate process - Develop and implement preservation strategies for natural spring and stream flows, and water quality - Actively pursue Wild and Scenic Designation as outlined in the 1998 Draft Wilderness Plan, using recent studies on WSRs in and adjacent to the park 482 235360

Air and Water Quality

Define intrinsic values of air quality clarity over a long timeline to preserve the landscape view from South to North Rim 135 234311

Address air quality concerns to the north if Kanab builds the proposed coal gasification plant 384 234786

Air Quality: Pollution discharge from the Four Corners Power Plant should be reduced to zero and the cost added to electric bills of all who use power generated at this plant. No additional power plants should be permitted in the Grand Canyon airshed unless they meet zero emissions criteria 320 233960

Conduct research on regional aquifers and effects of groundwater pumping on the park's unique seep and spring habitats. This will assist in managing these habitats as well as informing park managers about potential effects of nearby external mining activities 375 234748

The site of a proposed wind energy project centers on Arizona's largest watershed--Havasu/Cataract Creek, which flows into Havasu/Cataract Canyon, and into Grand Canyon. The 62 turbines require 22,000 tons of concrete, from which concrete slurry containing lime would go into the watershed. Following construction, turbines are routinely power-washed with solvents and waste water to remove transformer oil, bird blood. The solvents, oil, blood, and waste water would all go into that same watershed 511 235143

Preservation of water resources, springs, aquifers is essential 135 234306

Restoration

Evaluate dismantling the highly degraded dam that forms Toroweap Lake. Evaluate restoration of the area with wet meadow habitat as a possible target 448 235021
GCWC documented locations historically or currently supporting Goodings tree willow in anticipation of introduced tamarisk defoliating beetle arrival. The beetle is now erupting throughout the river corridor with extensive defoliation as a result. At Lees Ferry, rapid defoliation is severely reducing bird habitat and shade and greatly increasing fire risk. Planting Goodings willow is urgently needed, and a long-term stepwise plan for riparian restoration along the main stem should be part of the Backcountry Plan. The beetle likely constitutes the largest, rapid, ecosystem change since tamarisk establishment. A comprehensive collaborative program to document its effects on other species and natural processes must be developed 481 235332
Establish herbivory exclosures on North and South Rim outside proposed wilderness 481 235334
Develop and implement vegetative recovery strategies for roads not designated for vehicle use, or convert them to trails as appropriate 481 235357
Increase and sustain Colorado River flows during spring runoff from Glen Canyon Dam to assure riparian areas along the Colorado River inside the park are flushed clean of human waste and debris left by camper/ hikers and Colorado River rafters each year 320 233959

Biodiversity

We remain skeptical that ecological concerns, including climate disruption adaptation, can be adequately addressed and resolved through the Climate Friendly Parks process. Addressing the larger concerns of biodiversity impairment should include explicit cooperative management actions involving other management agencies and landowners to preserve large enough ecosystems, crucial habitat, and migration corridors so plants and animals have opportunities to move and survive in transformed landscapes. Grand Canyon and its surrounding plateaus may provide a unique opportunity for species to migrate to new microclimates and find refugia from climate variations, but only if connectivity is maintained. The region is unique in hosting three of the four North American deserts and five life zones in close proximity, and several patches of remnant ecotypes. The survival of many species may depend on connectivity between GCNP and a larger network of protected lands, where migration and other movement is uninhibited 481 235317

Nonnative Species

The park has an EA for exotic plant management but other nonnative species are of concern including a nonnative ladybird beetle and Eurasian collared dove. Identify management actions to keep population levels low. Monitor birds on South Rim, in particular peregrine falcon and bald and golden eagles 481 235331

Foster continued support for volunteer coordination efforts in non-native species removal and prevention. This will allow the park to continue to leverage more than \$200,000 in matching public support 375 234751

Because American West elevated elk populations have significant adverse effects on plant communities and ecological services for maintaining sustainable and functional ecosystems, scientists recommend NPS immediately initiate a collaborative effort with the Kaibab National Forest to remove elk from the park. In collaboration with USFS, and possibly AGFD, prevent development of additional water sources on USFS lands adjacent to the park and seek removal of artificial water sources outside the park (wildlife trick tanks and livestock earthen tanks) within 1/2 mile of the NPS boundary. Outflow from the NPS sewage treatment facility along Rowe Well Road, and park sewage ponds have long been recognized as elk attractants and should be fenced. Elk can jump vertically 8 to 10 feet. Fencing the Park boundary to this height would interrupt known mule deer and mountain lion movement corridors. Effective elk-proof fencing is expensive economically precluding what is overall an ecologically undesirable option along the entire south park boundary. As is the case with the North Rim bison-hybrid problems, the cost of mitigating collateral ecological damage by state wildlife management on NPS resources is unlikely to be shouldered or even shared by AGFD 481 235338

Land Status

Define discreet management areas and emphasize ecological assessment and monitoring. Evaluate RNA options that include an array of sites representing the park's major habitats to provide monitoring sites across elevation gradients on various aspects. This would provide a clear idea of ecosystems status. Suggested sites include: Fishtail Mesa (previously proposed by NPS Resource staff), Thunder River, Deer Creek, Shinumo Creek; Caves (e.g., Vaseys Paradise, Tapeats, Bat Cave, others); Reaches of the Colorado River and portions of the Canyon key to understanding global climate change; North Rim meadows; Robbers Roost (high elevation wet meadow), Deer Creek springs, Cliff Springs hanging gardens, other springs; Desert riparian habitats, i.e., Shinumo, Nankoweap, Tapeats, Monument and Hermit Creeks, etc. Identify, monitor and mitigate recreation impacts on desert springs and streams (e.g., trailing and uninformed use) that may threaten local populations of endemic insect species; Other rare habitats, old growth forests, rim stretches with high levels of endemic species, etc.; Kaibab Squirrel Area National Natural Landmark (Forest Service and NPS portions); this would meet the RNA criteria for monitoring and research of significant genetic resources that have value for long-term observational studies or as control areas for manipulative research taking place outside the parks 481 235333

Designate the Colorado River and its tributaries part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System because of the system's prohibition of dams and the implicit requirement for minimum flows to sustain the river's outstandingly remarkable characteristics 482 235359

Special Status Species

Seek with others to protect endangered, threatened or keystone species 149 234375

Reintroduce rare and endangered animal species that have traditionally inhabited the park's wilderness areas 304 233915

Ecosystem Corridors

Protection of wildlife habitat, migratory routes, and related corridors is an important but especially complex and sensitive issue in considering potential boundary adjustments. Habitat loss and fragmentation are a significant threat to wildlife populations in many parks. Without efforts to protect plant and animal natural diversity, critical park resources may be damaged or lost. However, because wildlife populations may have habitat requirements or migratory patterns that extend over vast areas, boundary adjustments to protect these resources are likely to be seriously limited by feasibility. Plans should consider regional natural resource issues in cooperation with other landowners and managers as an alternative to expanding park boundaries 481 235324

Develop and implement interagency conservation goals to protect and restore extirpated, rare, endangered or threatened species, as well as keystone species, many of which (mountain lions, tasseled-eared squirrels, goshawk) range outside park boundaries. Identify, monitor, and prioritize protection of critical wildlife linkages of the region affecting Grand Canyon wildlife. Manage the Park in relation to its adjacent lands to include protection and restoration of all native species and their habitats 76 234125

Native species (large mammals, birds, small mammals, flora) know how to be. Allow them the space to live, hopefully, without interference and invasive management 83 234136

Interagency Resource Management

The proposed plan will require an effective implementation of a landscape-scale (interagency) conservation strategy. Additional threats posed by climate disruption prompted the Parks in Peril coalition to beseech the NPS to promote, assist, and cooperate in protection efforts beyond park boundaries to preserve large ecosystems, crucial habitat, and migration corridors so that plants and animals have opportunities to move and continue to survive in transformed landscapes. Where new, expanded, or existing parks are not adequate to ensure preservation of park resources, NPS should promote, assist, and cooperate in bringing about preservation efforts that reach beyond current boundaries 481 235318

Engage in the Southern Rockies Landscape Conservation Cooperative. One beneficial outcome of a LCC process would be that a symposium of park staff, conservationists, external scientists and other agency staff be convened to examine resource issues at Grand Canyon. As part of this process, hold a multiagency regional

Interagency Resource Management

ecosystems assessment workshop to clarify which ecosystems are at risk, where they occur (e.g., proposed Resource Natural Areas), their status, and articulate explicit conservation strategies 481 235319

In 2009, GCWC partnered with GCNP and conducted an initial assessment of the ecological significance of large, wide-ranging mammals through a two-day workshop entitled, Landscape-scale Management Strategies for Wide-ranging Mammals. The workshop involved 30 participants from the scientific community, Zion, Grand Canyon, and other large western national parks, the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Arizona Game and Fish Department. The workshop focused on a range of management options that may help the NPS identify and resolve ecologic concerns, achieve its non-impairment requirements, and restore ecosystem functions including predation. During the workshop sessions, the participants identified more than 38 separate impacts to native biodiversity, natural processes (biotic and abiotic) and experiential quality due to native and non-native herbivory in the absence of ecologically effective populations of carnivores. In addition, GRCA and adjacent forests exhibit continued herbivory-related problems highlighted by recent research and review and exacerbated by the recent arrival of non-native elk on South Rim and introduction of non-native bison-cattle hybrid on North Rim. The group identified more than 250 potential management actions for resolving or mitigating identified impacts. These actions include management strategies to improve interagency cooperation, recovery and/or reintroduction of native large carnivores, as well as other suggestions for policy changes, education/outreach, direct reduction of problem ungulates, and park specific options 481 235323

Wolf Reintroduction

Develop a wolf recovery strategy and engage in the Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan revision process 481 235339

Bring wolves to Grand Canyon but not like right now in YELL, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming. Wolves take care of deer excess. Bring wolves not to kill them. Will require rancher education 94 234159

Use your management skills to protect wolves 95 234160

Managing for a predator species should be a top priority for state and federal natural resource agencies. Actively participate in collaborative efforts with other invested agencies to manage not only for the Mexican Gray Wolf, but for all other predator species in the southwest 96 234163

Reintroduce the Mexican wolf through revision strategies that opens new territory on public lands of north rim (USFS, BLM, State G & F, and NPS) 136 234315

Designate a large viable area for this missing animal 139 234350

Wolf reintroduction is within the scope of backcountry management and overall NPS mandate. It is time this discussion is initiated and, though the Draft doesn't necessarily have to address wolf reintroduction as a goal or objective, the Draft should at least present an opening of the discussion as a goal or objective 380 234770

Don't introduce predators into Grand Canyon wilderness areas - wolves and bears. Then, I'll have to start hiking with a gun, and I don't want to have to do that! It is the law of unintended consequences 461 235067

I would like to see wolves in this area. I think it would improve your tourism rating 86 235104

The Mexican Grey Wolf is a Grand Canyon native, so they should be back in their home 488 235106

The Grey Wolf has been put back successfully into the wild in the White Mountains. It would be nice to see these animals in Grand Canyon 491 235109

Yellowstone visitation increased 25% percent when they introduced wolves. The Grand Canyon? 492 235110

Don't kill any more wolves because I want to see lots 498 235116

Wolves in Grand Canyon will help the ecosystem 502 235120

Put the Mexican Grey Wolf in the BMP. They belong in the Grand Canyon and I would like to see them here. They provide ecological balance, and financial profit from tourism 505 235123

Your original plan was to include wolves in your revival plan. Why are you leaving them out now? They are originally from here and will help the elk population. I think you should consider the help you can to this population of rare wolves 527 235156

Bison Management

Remove bison hybrids and facilitate USFS's removal of the animal from the Kaibab Plateau 481 235337

Bison didn't occur near Grand Canyon prior to introduction by cattle breeders at the turn of the century. As introduced animals, they don't belong in this scene 24 230937

Bison adversely affect plants by trampling, wallowing, and grazing. Much of the area used by bison looks like well-used ranch land, hardly what national park founders had in mind. How many rare plants have already been destroyed by bison, and how many more will we continue to lose? 24 230938

Bison impacts extend beyond the rim into Grand Canyon itself. Springs near the Coconino Sandstone--Hermit Shale contact about 1,000 feet below the rim create unusual habitat for rare plants and are highly impacted by bison trampling and browsing 24 230939

Move bison from House Rock Valley then destroy animals remaining on Kaibab Plateau 24 230940

Remove the hybrid, non-native House Rock Valley bison (beefalo) herd that roams into GRCA and causes serious resource damage (especially to natural springs and seeps) and may pose public safety risks. These beefalo violate NPS policy yet NPS has been reluctant to address this chronic problem 356 234607

We understand reasons for recommended removal of non-native species including hybrid bison/cattle. However, any removal must be humane, and ideally, would involve relocation of the animals to live-out their lives in a more suitable location 452 235027

Hybrids now graze rare intact areas around Grand Canyon that have never experienced livestock grazing, such as Powell Plateau. The plateau contains one of the southwest's last large forest and meadow complexes without a history of commercial logging or grazing, and has incredible value for scientific research and conservation. Any non-native ungulate grazing impact there is unacceptable. Bison grazing can impair the area's research control value to determine effect of various land management practices 481 235335

Aircraft Management

It is disturbing and upsetting to see/hear aircraft over the Canyon especially on Boucher Trail and the Tonto Trail connecting Boucher to Hermit. Address this issue in the revised EIS to the BCMP 524 235407

It makes little sense for a Wild or Threshold Opportunity Class backcountry use area to be as significantly impacted by an overlaid noisy, dedicated helicopter use zone, such as the longstanding situation currently, under and adjacent to the Dragon and Zuni Corridors for air tours 512 235368

Do not allow an increase in overflights. To do so will take away the park's ability to allow the public to hear natural quiet, an endangered resource in today's world 47 231065

Limit commercialization of backcountry including air tour noise, when audible at significant adverse level (<25% time audible) 128 234276

Commercial sightseeing flights should be reduced in number overall and prohibited from flying over the Corridor, Tonto Trail, and Colorado River camping areas between one hour before sundown to one hour after sunrise 320 233958

Keep the backcountry quiet. Ban all over head flights 55 234058

Expand the no-fly zone so when hiking in the backcountry, any noise from tour helicopters and/or aircraft of any sort is completely absent 59 234066

First and foremost keep the helicopters out! They run far too close to the park's southern end 60 234068

Further restrict canyon overflights. On a commercial paddle trip recently in the area of Boucher canyon, the noise especially from helicopters was very loud, and nearly all day. Fewer flights with higher altitude restrictions might help, or possibly requiring quieter aircraft 89 234149

Less traffic in Dragon Corridor, but the fact is that helicopters will always fly and they need to fly somewhere. There is just too much money invested in that sector for the government to try and shut it down completely. As

Aircraft Management

much as I dislike it I also understand for some people it is the only way they will ever see the Canyon. Keeping a cap on overflights and maybe even creating times of year when overflights are banned from certain areas so that backpackers can enjoy them in natural quiet would be a great idea. Maybe there should be two Dragon Corridors each used at different times of year so backpackers could plan accordingly 122 234246

Improve the backcountry experience. Increase the no fly zone to where helicopters cannot be heard or seen from Hermit Rapids or Hance Rapids. It takes away from the wilderness experience if they fly on the edge of the no fly zone within earshot and sight all day long 130 234281

Wilderness management should be improved by moving all air tour corridors over the BA/SK/NK trails restoring natural quiet to wilderness 137 234317

Freeze commercial flights to levels at the time the National Parks Overflight Act was passed 154 234383

Alternate west versus east flight zones. Example: Allow operation only in the west zone for certain times of year, then vice versa for the east zone 580 235220

Address before conclusion of these two interrelated planning processes: Overflights and Backcountry Management: 1. Have (or have not) specific, large parts of GCNP been dedicated for air touring, which derogates park backcountry? 2. Have specific part(s) of GCNP backcountry/wilderness been dedicated for long-term soundscape derogation and impairment of wilderness character, thereby? 3. To what extent are these (dedicated?) part(s) also those very parts that have historically long been dedicated (zoned by management) for quality backcountry ground visitor experience opportunities, such as for solitude, on East End? 512 235369

In the NPS 1994 Report to Congress on Effects of Overflights on Units of the National Park System, one finds the warning subtitled: Separation of Visitors and Overflights, Dedicating certain areas of the park for tour overflights is likely to be the first step. In so doing, Natural quiet under and to the side of corridors will be degraded (i.e., impaired?), The loss of natural quiet is the consequence of accommodating aircraft overflights. This raises immediately, and anew, the question of their appropriateness or their (impairing degree of) accommodation. In Zion National Parks recent soundscape management plan, noise in Park Wilderness, was determined simply inappropriate. To date, no such statement has been forthcoming from NPS at Grand Canyon, although in the Overflights DEIS, a table (6) is included indicating more than half of the backcountry users and river users found aircraft use inappropriate. We are anticipating NPS will review this question of Appropriate Use again, in light of both planning efforts now underway, and new information now available 512 235370

The Backcountry Management DEIS will need to update and incorporate results from further investigation as it may pertain to the East End, which currently experiences high altitude, en route jet noise at major adverse levels, based on the % Time Audible indicator 512 235371

Mining

Ban uranium mining in the vicinity of the Grand Canyon 511 235141

Mining has no place in or near the Park 10 230502

Backcountry Experience

Preservation and use can go hand and hand. Motorized vehicular use and backcountry can go hand and hand. Share this spot with as many as dare adventure to this remote area. Please don't forget location and conditions will monitor use very well. Look at the last ten years 393 234954

I value the pristine beauty, the solitude, the silence, the safety, the unique opportunity to experience the natural wonder of Grand Canyon's backcountry. These issues should be foremost in BMP since its purpose is to manage visitor use and resource protection in undeveloped areas 138 234326

The ideal backpacking trip involves a mixture of on- and off-trail hiking. Established trails are nice but the sense of adventure and accomplishment that comes from successful navigation of a seldom-used route is what I prefer. I also look forward to discovering ancient dwellings and other evidence of humanities' long connection

Backcountry Experience

to this place. Some consider artifacts from abandoned prospector enterprises a blight on the landscape, mere garbage to be hauled from the canyon. I value these relics as much as the ancestral Puebloan ruins that dot the inner gorge. Just as the Puebloan ruins reveal clues about people who lived here a thousand years ago, remains from the first decades after Powell's expedition tell the story of America's early exploration of Grand Canyon. This contemporary story is no less significant and of no less value than the ancient one 106 234190

My trip included a two night stay at Clear Creek. This was my best Canyon experience because the campsite was isolated. I would like to note that all of campers at this more remote area (compared to Bright Angel, Cottonwood or Indian Gardens) are much more aware of the impact they cause. This seems to be an area where you do not need to focus additional resources 67 234100

Our backcountry experience was great. Water at Bright Angel campground was erratic, but piped water is a luxury, so not a problem. The campground is not the wilderness experience we prefer, but to experience the bottom was worth the sacrifice 43 231052

Park Staff Availability in Backcountry

The only problem I have ever had in the backcountry is encroachment of backpackers. Perhaps more backcountry rangers patrolling would help 524 235408

Volunteers could assist the public. Overconfident hikers endanger themselves and members of their party. Kaibab Trail could use monitoring to inform and persuade or observe and report 14 230534

It was nice to see at least one ranger heading up or down the trail each day 44 231053

We were really impressed for the care that ranger showed for the campers 61 234074

The majority of BCO personnel seem very dedicated and hard-working. Sometimes backcountry rangers (law enforcement types) are a bit overzealous and abrupt; they could use some further training 84 234137

More rangers. Their permit checks in camp give us a chance to hear about the best job in the world from someone who knows what they're talking about 91 234154

There is no one way to reduce problem backcountry behavior. Despite information about proper toilet paper disposal, people still bury or burn it. Large burned inner canyon areas (Nankoweap and Bright Angel Creek) are a travesty. Increased ranger presence would provide more help for backcountry users 120 234241

While you can't eliminate all backcountry hazards, some places are more dangerous than others. It would be beneficial to have more regular patrols between Hermit and Indian Garden. Ranger patrols protect both the wilderness and the visitors 131 234290

Large numbers of inner canyon users are doing so without a permit. I know personnel are a problem, but it would be worthwhile if a person rotated through the park and did nothing but check permits and issue fines at trailheads. Hiking without a permit should be a costly offense. If vehicles left at trailheads do not match the license and description of permit holders they should be impounded or locked 329 234539

Increase ranger presence in remote and wilderness areas. Increased presence will provide better information on the locations of both trespass grazing and non-native plants and animals. Technological advances track and map these locations NPS should consider adopting 375 234750

Information/Education

We love the ranger programs at Phantom Ranch! Please continue these 318 233950

The only problem in backcountry is encroachment of a backpacker group on me in the Boucher BN9 use area. There was plenty of room, but they camped right on top of me, and could not be dissuaded. This could happen anywhere, and short of allowing one group per area, this could probably not be avoided. Some people are just arrogant or insensitive. Perhaps more backcountry national park rangers patrolling would help. And more education at the Backcountry office on backcountry etiquette 524 235408

Have a trailhead sign for each trail. I wasn't sure if I was on the Beamer trail; we followed a shorter trail to a

Information/Education

camp and had to turn around. I found it a little bit difficult to find a camp at Beamer beach. Would be nice to have had a sign that said camp spots 6 230474

Perhaps better maps with noted landmarks would be a helpful improvement for those of us whom would like a better idea of what the trails may look like 8 230482

I would love to be able to get more info about some of the more remote sites 23 230613

Move the backcountry desk to the new visitor center so serious hikers can get information more readily, and those who are not so experienced can get some personal recommendations 36 231008

Make the primitive million acres more accessible to the hiking public by more information and maps, and encouragement to try trails other than the 2-3 over-used ones in developed areas. Accomplish in the same way as at Thunder River, with designated camping areas and improved trails. Whatever we can do to take the load off south rim and north rim routes would be useful. It is too difficult to get a backcountry permit for those areas and traffic is the main reason 38 231018

At permitting, campers should be instructed not to build any cairns (they have become excessive and often misleading along the East Tonto Trail). This route marking work should be the sole responsibility of park rangers when regularly patrolling the trails 320 233955

On corridor trails, signs are in English only. Many hikers do not speak or read it fluently. All signage should be, at a minimum, in German, Japanese, Italian and French, especially the signs in toilets which warn of the dangers of dehydration, and those that tell people not to throw trash or feminine products into them 68 234103

New South Rim displays are too Disney. God the visitor centers are sterile. I remember the dusty old river boat collection before it was renovated. Don't lose the earthy feeling of that collection, a reflection of Grand Canyon essence, to make it palatable to the Twitter/Skype/Facebook crowd. One look over the rim in the early morning light will tell you there's more to life than that stuff 91 234155

Document remote water sources more clearly. This is a safety issue. I have found and not found water as expected. I don't want to see the seep spring in the Tapeats at Slate Creek become overused but at the same time it's important a hiker in distress know its location and reliability 98 234169

Signage is truly inadequate for safety instructions, seasonal water turn-offs, and not only use of crampons but what they are and how to find them in multiple languages, particularly French 104 234187

There is an issue with signs and trail/camp markings. I think a system of consistent colored stakes or other non-offensive markers could be used to identify areas of concern to park users and personnel. And in high-traffic backcountry areas along the river a posted sign with a written message about areas of concern would be OK, if used in moderation 115 234217

Provide enough information to increase backcountry hikers safety 120 234233

In areas where there could be confusion about where the trail is, the trail should be well marked. For example, the sign at the junction of Bill Hall and Thunder River trail. This is an important safety marking and should be maintained 120 234234

If there are trail restrictions on camping, there should be a marker of some sort to alert people. For example, before cairns were put on the Clear Creek and Tonto trails east of South Kaibab, people were camping too early. In most cases, that was because they were not sure when they had reached the boundary area. You would only need something like this in the case of well-used trails. For example, it would probably not be needed on the Boucher trail below dripping springs 120 234235

USFS markings in Kanab Creek Wilderness Area shows how a wild backcountry area can be made safer by careful use of signage and semi-permanent alterations, a ladder at the bottom of a waterfall in Upper Jumpup Canyon, provides safety while at the same time retaining wilderness character. Similarly, the small sign in the canyon above Mountain Sheep spring is a good way to indicate where both ends of the trail cross the canyon. While signage, cairns, and small alterations won't prevent every crazy thing hikers do that result in injury or death, they will help in many cases and thus reduce environmental damage caused when a search must be mounted for someone who has gotten into trouble because they miss a turn or inappropriately shortcut a trail because they can't get over a rough spot 120 234237

I don't think it would be a negative thing, nor costly to place permanent marker or signs on the trail in areas

Information/Education

where it is easy to lose. While one could argue that markers aren't natural and do detract a little from the experience, but it would have made for over all a much better experience for me then getting lost, and safer experience. Cairns can be put up or knocked down easily (in fact I got lost following such markers put up to mark a social trail) 131 234288

Better signs on backcountry trails. One specific trail is Hermit trail, past Santa Maria Springs on the switchbacks to Tonto Trail junction. It is easy to veer off the trail which damages the terrain with subsequent loss of the trail exposing the hiker to increase risk of falls. At times, other hikers have placed the three stone markers, which I find woefully inadequate. I think improvement of directional signs on these trails would be helpful and would go a long way for hiker safety and reduction of the number of search and rescue missions the NPS rangers would have to complete 141 234356

Signage at popular trail heads stating graffiti is illegal and punishable by fines (they have these at Capitol Reef). Signage stating throwing rocks is illegal and dangerous. Rangers should carry a spray bottle and scrub brush to erase graffiti immediately 144 234369

Numerous rim path signs in many different languages explain why people should not feed squirrels. I took a picture of someone who had one hand on the sign while their other hand was outstretched with people food for a squirrel. Obviously, the signs are not working. I see this as an opportunity to get creative. Why not dress someone up as big squirrel and have them do a little humorous roving education along the rim? 285 234482

It would greatly enhance the experience to talk with carefully vetted tribal members provided opportunity to sell a very limited set of items (water bottles and Camelbacks with Havasupai and GRCA logos, etc.), teach people a couple of phrases in the Havasupai language and provide information about the history of Indian Garden farming and in the region more generally 319 234523

Only at Grand Canyon are signs considered evil. Since there is such an awareness of backcountry safety, NPS should consider a responsible way in which informative signs can be used to help people keep on their itinerary and hike safely 370 234674

Corridor trails signage explaining uphill hikers have the right away. Why? Safety. Signs explain what to do when a mule comes along. Why not for uphill hikers? I have seen many a person get knocked over by someone coming down the trail. This is a very inexpensive investment into hiker safety 459 235042

Provide for public understanding and support of preserving fundamental resources and values for which GRCA was established. Education is preferable to regulation and enforcement wherever possible and is consistent with providing backcountry visitors with knowledge needed to use and enjoy the park without impairing its natural resources 578 235210

Contact trail users before they embark about rearranging campsites, trash, and medical rescues 481 235345

Station rangers at trailheads to engage hikers and backpackers, for example, asking how much water they have if they look unprepared, answering questions, looking at footwear, etc., to increase safety of trail users and reduce damage to park resources 481 235346

Use volunteers to assist the public. I saw a lot of foolishness from overconfident hikers, endangering not only themselves but members of their party. That trail (north/south Kaibab) could use monitoring to inform and persuade or observe and report 14 230534

We awoke in early morning darkness to smell smoke. As we started up to South Rim, we saw clouds of smoke over North Rim. The mule train told us it was a controlled burn. We were never told about this when we filed our backcountry permit. Has the park considered installing a Siren based warning system, much like the Air Raid horns from the 50s to warn hikers to evacuate? We did see park service helicopters each day and thought they would alert us if there was a threat to our lives via a PA system 44 231055

At permitting, instruct campers not to build cairns (they are excessive and misleading along East Tonto Trail). Route marking should be the responsibility of park rangers when regularly patrolling trails 320 233955

Require first time hikers to take an outdoor and respect course and how to leave no trace 100 234181

Build a document to educate new employees on Grand Canyon's legacy and uniqueness 135 234310

Require persons entering park to be able to deal with any emergency s/he may encounter, and to be physically fit for their activity. Each activity may require additional education or training, physical/medical waiver, etc. to

Information/Education

ensure participant safety and Grand Canyon preservation 229 234433

More education is always preferable to more rules, and cuts need for added enforcement, an undesirable and problematic mitigation measure from a funding and staffing standpoint. Enforcement reminds visitors their trip is in a controlled environment and not necessarily a true wilderness experience. Specific recommendations are: 1) education as a long-term management strategy will allow it to take a more prominent role in mitigating potential negative impacts to canyon resources. Education is the precursor to stewardship necessary for backcountry visitors to understand resources in order to value them, and they must value them before they will protect them. 2) Additional monitoring assistance could be provided by specific backcountry user groups with NPS oversight, and will result in several distinct benefits: building resource knowledge in backcountry stakeholder groups, providing additional (no cost) assistance for monitoring duties, and investing backcountry users with a sense of stewardship and advocacy. 3) Standards for cultural sites should be articulated to the public at large, which ensures accountability and aids compliance. The park has done an excellent job disseminating information about important archeological work along the river corridor to the river running public. Similar efforts geared to backcountry users could be effective in building understanding needed to better protect fragile and irreplaceable resources. 4) Expand cultural resource education to include tribal perspectives and Traditional Cultural Properties of tribes who view Grand Canyon as sacred. Making the link between archaeological past and living cultures is important. 4) Look to the educational materials developed for the river corridor such as the Lees Ferry video, the River Courtesy Flyer, or the Action Guide for Preservation, and extend those outreach efforts to backcountry users 371 234679

Provide information to backcountry visitors (including climbers) to ensure they leave no trace 454 235029

Rules and Regulations

Focus on moderation when establishing environmental protection vs. public use 339 234566

Continue regulations as they now exist. I see no reason to make any changes 147 234374

Require CUA companies to carry workers compensation for their guides 464 235270

Adopt minimum formal rules necessary to accomplish objectives - allow exceptions to a rule, and the objective of any policy or regulation should be to protect Grand Canyon resources and natural environment from user impacts, not to protect users from the inherent risks of wilderness recreation activities 363 234621

Some of the safety regulations are annoying in the corridor like cooking on the ground 23 230611

Regulation can be suitably responsive to economic and tourist imperatives 291 233895

There are places where down debris inhibits growth of young, live growth. NPS dislikes fires in the back country, but if done properly they are good for the environment. I am proposing a class on campfire safety, where at completion a certificate is given to allow the holder to have fires in the backcountry 302 233908

Backpacking Grand Canyon each spring is an incredible experience; the highlight of the year. NPS does a great job managing the experience. Thank you staff. Existing rules and procedures work very well 332 234546

Allow nonmotorized wheeled carts for carrying camping gear and equipment for hikers with compromised knees or backs 65 234085

Increase criminal and civil penalties for people who remove artifacts from Grand Canyon 91 234152

Rules of use need to be maintained or enhanced. Everyone needs to respect wildlife. Climbers/cavers need to respect environment more cautiously than the normal packer 229 234434

In old days you were required to let NPS know when you returned from your hike. Why has that changed? You were also required to leave the NPS the color of your pack and auto license number. Aren't these things still practical and helpful? 329 234536

It appears a large number of inner canyon users are doing so without a permit. Wouldn't it be worthwhile if one person rotated throughout the park and did nothing but check permits and issue fines at trailheads to discourage this? Also blatant offenses such as the Boy Scout troop where a couple of kids died should have had the pants fined off them! It should be made clear hiking without a permit is a costly offense. If vehicles left at trailheads

Rules and Regulations

do not match the license and description of permit holders they should be impounded or locked with a wheel locking device 329 234539

A prominent bicyclist rode his bike into the Canyon. Great effort should be made to let the public know there are heavy penalties for such behavior, especially by someone who is known for disobeying wilderness designations intentionally 329 234540

Backcountry management is excessively restrictive. The Wilderness Act defines Wilderness partly as allowing free and unconfined recreation. NPS focuses on encounter rates which are only distantly related to the quality of visitor experience. Make the backcountry system looser, less confined, and more appropriate for a Wilderness experience. It seems giant zones of rarely-visited areas could be managed differently, so access to one area would not be blocked by usage of another area, 20 miles away, by another group. While keeping encounter rates low is laudable, current management is worse than the occasional backcountry encounter with another group, which the current plan goes to such extraordinary lengths to prevent 469 235085

Are there any official policies regarding establishment of campsites by hikers at sites commonly used by river parties for camps? It seems possible common courtesy might break down in a situation where a hiking party is camped where a large river party might want to move in 470 235096

Set specific regulations on acceptable anchor set ups. Require users to place buffer material where ropes rub at rappel top just below the anchor. Other areas have awful combed rock from rope rubbing away rock. Require anchors be set on most permanent land forms possible, and set a minimum DBH (diameter at Breast Height) standard for anchors which use trees. Many trees are destroyed from permanent anchors, and the first tree becomes undesirable, users move the anchor to the next tree. After a while you have a whole patch of impacted trees. Do not allow bolts be placed in rock. Only removable gear for anchor setups like nuts, cams, wedges, etc. should be allowed. No exceptions! Once you allow bolts, they'll pop up everywhere. State the NPS in no way carries liability for canyoneering anchors left behind as these are placed by other users 580 235217

Enforce and stiffen penalties for companies offering commercial services not legally authorized. The park knows of these companies but seems to be limited in ability to enforce or penalize these firms 464 235268

Group Size

Limit group size: small groups at 1 to 6 people and large groups at seven to eleven. Number of groups allowed in a zone at any time should not be increased and probably decreased based on monitoring results 481 235347

Decrease large group permit size to eight with only one large group per use area per night 98 234166

Manage large Rim to Rim day hikes with a permit system with fees and group size limit. Many of these large groups need instruction in how to hike the canyon and a lesson in trail etiquette 301 233904

Limitations make it challenging to running a NOLS-style course, which typically has a minimum of 12 participants 386 234928

Do not count CUA guides in the count for permit size (small group can be six and large group e 11 (not counting CUA guides). As an alternative to not counting guides, expand the large group size to 12 including 2 guides instead of 11. This is consistent with the small group size of 1 to 5 ratio 464 235271

Support group size limits 395 234962

Improved consideration for organized youth groups with a proven track record of use and respect for the park. The Boy Scouts and their adoption of the Leave No Trace program qualify us as a well-known and respected youth organization. Typical Scout troop size when hiking and camping are in the range of 15 to 25 scouts and 2 adults. Allowing for Scouts to travel in this size unit would be optimal for troop logistics planning, parental support, and have no greater impact upon the park than current rules. Current rules limiting group size cause multiple reservations and splitting of the team by 1 night/campsite. Current rules make little sense in the busy corridors where you have 100 people in a common campsite anyway 92 234156

Decrease large group permit size to eight with only one large group per use area per night 98 234166

Large group regulation and management seems adequate. Only one time in 8 trips did a group become a

Group Size

concern and that was only when they partied until after midnight at Indian Gardens 127 234263

Reconsider permitting large groups in threshold, primitive, and wild areas. Some areas, such as Royal Arch loop, do not support a large group. In these cases, only small groups should be permitted 139 234351

No group size increase. I do not want groups to have multiple sites in the same use area or campground (a de facto increase in group size) 144 234365

Whether commercial or private, group size limits are appropriate at the point user conflicts, resource damage, or crowding begins. In more remote areas, group size limit should be six people, including guides 356 234605

Support reasonable use limits on canyons, wilderness ethics, and group size limits 395 234962

How about some larger campsites at Cottonwood Camp? They are permitted for 6 people, but some only have enough room for 3 or 4 and that is crowded. Would allow more folks to do Rim 2 Rim backpacking trips. Maybe 1 large group site at Roaring Springs residence 410 234974

Study large group distribution (i.e. greater than 6 people) with special regard to impacts due to human waste and general disruption of plants, soils, and riparian areas. Perhaps large groups should be steered to areas with toilets and well-used campsites. Include both commercial and private parties 470 235095

Mechanized/Motorized

Do not allow bicycles below the rim or on Greenway Trail. It is not appropriate use 524 235411

Do not change laws governing motorized vehicles. Grand Canyon's peace is important 17 230561

Don't allow mechanized travel in the canyon 52 231081

Limit bicycles to non-wilderness areas such as South Rim to Desert View rim pathway, Boundary Line road, and Hermits Rest road, North Rim's Point Sublime and Cape Royal roads, and the Arizona Trail (except the inner canyon) consistent with NPS and wilderness mandates and protecting wilderness character 481 235352

Keep backcountry free from mechanized and motorized recreation, except bicycles above the rim and rafts to minimize impact on natural and cultural resources by limiting access to hikers and river runners 473 235230

Allow bicycles above the rim to reach remote trailheads, even when roads are closed to motor vehicles. Several former roads could be ridden, making it easier to access remote areas, or allow hikers more time in the canyon rather than hoofing through the forest. It could also reduce the number of vehicles driving the rim, by allowing use of bikes as shuttle vehicles between distant trailheads on open loop hikes, for example Swamp Point to Monument Point, South Canyon to Nankoweap, or Shinumo Wash to Eminence Break 473 235231

Make accommodation for all modes of transportation, in particular backpacking and bicycling. Due to the noise and impact of motorized vehicles, effectively but fairly partition and deemphasize them 16 230537

Keep Cape Solitude road open to biking. It is an ideal mountain bike route. Is there a category for this? Wilderness designation excludes bicycles, but they have far less impact than motorized vehicles 108 234200

It is just plain wrong to not allow bike access to Cape Solitude or Tiyo Point 133 234303

I support Wilderness designation, but want to ride my bike along roads to trail heads such as Silver Bell Trail and Comanche Point. The boundary road should stay closed due to hunting concerns 144 234368

No bicycles below the rim 329 234534

Make bicycle lanes for safety. No bicycles in wilderness, it is against the law 348 234581

Allow bicycles on some trails and any roads closed to public vehicular travel but maintained for patrol or fire. This would serve an important recreational need, diversify visitor opportunity and experience, and encourage visitors to bring their bikes, improving traffic congestion and air quality 363 234634

Wilderness designation discriminates against mountain bikes but allows horse access. Horse access ensures these roads will never be reclaimed and horses do far more damage to road systems than mountain bikes. Support maintaining mountain bike access on the Rainbow Rim trail system 372 234702

Limit bicycles on the rim to paved paths. Put together a comprehensive bike path system. Allowing bicycles on

Mechanized/Motorized

unpaved paths leads to extensive resource damage 380 234767

Motorized access to special overlooks should not be designated wilderness if the distance is longer than 12 miles and waterless. The confluence overlook should be accessible by car or bicycle; people should be able to get there safely. And that means allowing motorized/bicycle traffic

Limit motorized traffic (helicopters, powerboats, etc) to the minimum (today's levels are fine) 318 233944

Motorized and non-motorized access to Cape Solitude. Maybe some parts of the year can be reserved for hiking only, or for hiking and bikes only, but some accommodation should be made. It would be insane to hike out here in July, so why not allow vehicles then 461 235058

Trails

Current management of corridor trails is appropriate 469 235086

Continue work to make Bright Angel and Kaibab trails more hiker friendly 290 233892

Maintain trails as is; improving them detracts from what is expected on a wilderness hiking trail 8 230481

Pay special attention to proper management and impact protection levels required for backcountry trails used both by backcountry and river users. One example might be Boucher Trail 512 235380

Would like to see trail repair work on secondary trails like Grandview, Hermit, etc. 86 234143

Promote and maintain Grandview Trail. It might take pressure off other corridor trails 36 231009

Encourage trails other than the 2-3 overused ones in developed areas. Accomplish in the same way as Thunder River: designated camping areas and improved trails. Take the load off South and North Rim routes. It is too difficult to get a backcountry permit for those areas, and traffic is the main reason 38 231018

A marked trail to Comanche Point would be ideal for hikers unable to negotiate the canyon 108 234201

North Bass: ambiguous trail markings in areas of high exposure. Trail markers should be clear 41 231041

Concerned about overflow from Bright Angel and Indian Garden spilling onto Hermit, Tonto, and Boucher Trails. Expand BA and IG: the more people who experience a night below the rim, the more people will protect the canyon. But the more inexperienced hikers, the more abuse sites take: Hermit and Monument are cesspools due to inexperienced hikers rolling into camp completely exhausted from over-sized packs, late starts, and lack of physical fitness. When humans are in that state they just don't care for the environment 60 234069

Trail Access

There is no paved road to South Bass Trail. Visitors must take an arduous, unpaved road through the Havasupai Reservation. This road is at best, unstable and at worst, potentially hazardous 283 234475

A road, closed to vehicle traffic and completely on park property, goes to South Bass Trailhead, open to foot traffic, but, with minimal improvements, suitable for vehicles. Hermit Road improvement should include new roadway connecting to South Bass Trailhead. An alternative is route connecting Forest Service Road #328 to South Bass Trailhead via the footpath on park property 283 234477

Adequate access may exist but is informally documented and not widely known. Such factors include mapped roads closed or removed or impassable, lack of designated parking (subjecting hikers to penalty for unintentional improper parking), roads closed unexpectedly for administrative or budget considerations, lack of cooperative agreements with other agencies or tribal interests. Seek improved access or improved road conditions (specifically South Bass) 363 234625

The road along the rim above Scottys Hollow (K-37) is closed. Scottys Hollow is the most direct way in or out of Kanab Creek and the road should remain open to allow backpacker access. The roads to Flat Iron Butte and Yumtheska Point are closed inside GCNP boundary. These park roads to the rim should remain open. The road on Great Thumb that dips into and out of Park lands is closed; it should remain open. Currently, the Havasupai use this road and closure is unlikely. Many backpackers use this road even though access is ambiguous.

Trail Access

Congress mandated hiker access in the 1975 deal to provide Great Thumb to the Havasupai. Closing this road violates the Congressional mandate 372 234701

Need soft opening to North Rim road to N. Kaibab Trailhead. Many years North Rim is accessible by the 3rd week of April. Opening would help spread Rim to Rim permit demand. Also, most years, the canyon bottom is seeing triple digits by May 15. This would make for safer hiking. Print on permits there are risks going earlier than mid May and NO refunds. They can always turn it into Bright Angel Loop (provided they were going North to South). This could help increase park revenue. We do not need North Rim services to hike, and if a rescue was needed on N. Kaibab Trail, it would be no different than a rescue in Deer Creek, Clear Creek, or S. Canyon 459 235044

You can't drive to Francois Matthes or Tiyo Pt. By keeping people away, what have you accomplished? don't say you're doing this to preserve the park for future generations, because it seems clear the intent is to close these areas permanently, so nobody gets to enjoy them 461 235060

The Park determined W-4 impacted significantly fewer park resources and would become designated access to Point Sublime. The Basin road apparently and inexplicably is now the preferred route. Unless acceptable, expensive, and effective road restoration and maintenance guidelines are developed and implemented in a timely fashion, select the Swamp Ridge-Point Sublime road as motorized access to Point Sublime and restore the Basin portion of W-1 to a natural condition as presented in the Draft Basin Action Plan 481 235357

Better access to trailheads to the vast area west of highway to North Rim Lodge 304 23391

Improve access to New Hance, South Bass, Apache Point, and Great Thumb Mesa to allow more experienced hikers to pursue itineraries outside Corridor areas. Trail difficulty will manage the number of hikers. Wilderness quality will not be lost by whatever increased visitation results from improved trailhead access 106 234198

Maintain backcountry access roads to trailheads, e.g. Bill Hall. It's very frustrating when you go to the effort to get a permit and then have difficulty getting to the trailhead on time 41 231039

Need trailhead access anywhere on rims. Fence Road #1 to Pasture Wash has been closed for some time making access to Jicarilla Point almost impossible 133 234302

Permitted access/parking to Kaibab Trail is suggested for off-season (winter) both convenience and safety factors are involved 363 234624

Consider permitted trailhead access as an option where access is important to hikers but NPS does not wish to open the location to day-users and uncontrolled access 363 234626

Hikers face transportation challenges including arriving without a vehicle wishing to hike trails other than the Corridor, hikers not owning off-road vehicles but desiring access to remote trailheads, and hikers wishing to do loops such as South Bass to Hermit, other Tonto or Escalante Route sections. Public transportation services exist more in theory than reality. NPS policy has discouraged informal transportation assistance such as private-party arrangements or hitchhiking with the effect of failing to adequately provide for this need 363 234627

Shuttle service could be improved with direct routes to Hermits Rest. So a planned hike would not have to include a hectic hour long sightseeing ride for those with a specific destination in mind 8 230480

Develop parking areas with bus stops for people on multiple day backcountry trips 65 234084

Add daybreak bus service from BRO to South Kaibab trailhead in high temperature months 110 234204

Maybe some more parking at North Kaibab Trail, it is almost always overflowing these days 410 234975

Add parking at South Bass 464 235258

The lot for backpackers is often full at Grandview--because the sightseer lot is full. Last time we were there a huge bus was parked in the road. We have even seen the backcountry lot down to a couple spots 86 234144

Commercial tour buses take precedence for parking in limited areas around scenic pull-outs. Not allowing vehicles in specific areas limits areas physically challenged people can use 99 234176

Pay for a huge Tusayan parking lot, use a transportation fee per person for entrance, eliminate entrance by car fee to pay for the project bond: ask for donations from corporations and individuals 116 234222

Trail, Facility, and Campsite Development

Backcountry developed areas such as Phantom Ranch, Indian Gardens, Bright Angel and water/rest stops along Bright Angel and South Kaibab trails are appropriate and enough 17 230554

Recommend existing backcountry trails and campsites with little to no expansion beyond what exists. There's ample opportunity for everyone; manage existing infrastructure for minimal impact 30 230976

Implement the Backcountry Management Plan with 94% wilderness...1.1million acres. Include Indian Garden facilities to provide access by less than hardcore backpackers. Retain existing facilities and trail enhancements along Bright Angel--North Kaibab Trail 93 234157

The newsletter alludes to having only one lodging facility below the rim. It seems to imply there should be more. I totally do not want any more lodges below the rim; that would spoil wilderness 331 234545

The backcountry should remain a wilderness, with no modern conveniences, unsettled, uncultivated, left in its natural condition - no signage except for directional safety, no educational displays below the rim, no additional trail construction (trail maintenance should be part of the backcountry maintenance plan). It is a perilous land to the inexperienced. It should remain that way for future generations. No new toilet facilities. These are difficult and expensive to maintain, and backpackers conform to the rules of self-removal 524 235402

More north rim trails. Encourage north rim tourism would reduce crowds on south rim 5 230458

I really enjoy the shade and lemonade at Phantom Ranch, but one such ranch is enough 377 234758

Add only enough trails to improve safety where practical 48 231068

Do not need new trails in wilderness. Century old trails developed by American indigenous peoples can be discovered and re-used. Volunteer groups could help identify these trails for reclamation. Volunteer organizations may adopt a trail, or a segment, to keep it clear 36 231011

Backpack-hanging posts to prevent squirrel attacks at Bright Angel Campground are ineffectively placed. Some are too close to rock faces; some are too close to brush/trees 318 233949

Develop more or larger backcountry camping areas. Those available are crowded when full 65 234082

Develop more loop trails that allow hikers to go down on one trail and come up another trail and return to the approximate area their car is. More trails 65 234087

More trails available to hikers would disperse hikers throughout the canyon and reduce impact 75 234123

No additional campsites in the central corridor 127 234264

There's very limited ability to accommodate more people on the safe and relatively easy corridor trails with more campsites or cabins at Phantom Ranch, but I suspect NPS is looking at less and not more. Another six campsites or cabins wouldn't detract 131 234292

Specify trailer lengths and number of vehicles allowed to camp at the North Rim Stock Site. Specify similar limits for day use parking by stock users on CC Hill and identify other areas in the park where day use stock folks can park. Consider allowing a fire pit at the North Rim Stock site 384 234783

Build a bridge from S. Bass to N. Bass 459 235053

Consider outhouses in high use backcountry areas. Would rather see more outhouses versus less. Packing out waste using these bags is ultimately less environmentally friendly and since many people aren't going to pack out their waste, leads to areas that are gross due to smell/buried waste 509 235129

Water Availability

Water should be available at more locations including among many, Grandview Trail at Horseshoe Mesa, South Kaibab, New Hance, and South Bass, as well as more spots along Tonto Trail 464 235256

Adding hiking miles to rims means a small person like myself cannot go due to extra water weight 12 230518

A couple things make it hard to hike GC are lack of water and distance from the rim to the first campsite when we entered from Hermits Rest. One could go to Indian Garden, but it's just too crowded 13 230531

Install more water stations along drier trail sections. Though it does attract less serious people into the

backcountry, it can also help dramatically in case of emergency 13 230532
Provide drinking water on South Kaibab trail 110 234203
Lack of water makes hikes daunting and dangerous. Water stations and a few kybos [toilets] would be great. However, if you want to discourage people going there, the best thing to do is do nothing. Leave the land as is, and let the adventurous trek through, hopefully without disturbing the environment 112 234210
Make other locations more accessible and developed, so the Corridor overflow doesn't end up without water and sufficient toilets? Maybe put a tank of water at the tip off and on Horseshoe Mesa 391 234941
Add 500 gallon backcountry water tanks (i.e., somewhere in the Jewels, between S. Kaibab and Grandview, S. Bass) This would spread demand from other trails. Fill once in spring and once in fall 459 235051

Trail and Facility Maintenance
It is a testament to management we did not see a single piece of trash or graffiti 69 234107
Hermit Trail is the next step up from Corridor Trails. Repeated Supai rockfalls have caused deterioration. It is much more difficult, routed through scratchy vegetation, with a notable amount of uphill on the descent, and problematic route-finding. This trail needs complete re-working from Supai to Bright Angel and clearing of broken rock in the Redwall and Muav. The trail below the Hermit Shale is terrible 68 234104
Make improvements to all trails to improve safety where practical 48 231068
Backcountry management of Tonto Trail between Hermit Rapids and Horseshoe Mesa and the main Corridor on Bright Angel and Kaibab trails needs more active and increased oversight and maintenance to prevent and repair damage. When last on Hermit Trail, we found it in steadily increasing need of trail maintenance, specifically to stabilize and mark areas where rock slides have cut the trail. The trail, both climbing down and up, was often difficult to find at times even for experienced backcountry hikers. This results in improvised trail routes through these slides which damages the terrain and reduces safety 320 233951
Regular trail maintenance needs to be done on the main trail descending Cottonwood Creek side from Horseshoe Mesa. It's increasingly prone to unsafe gravelly slides that harm hikers and terrain alike. This trail also shows much damage from people improvising routes around unsafe slides. East Tonto Trail sections that pass over slide areas and cross washouts also need to be patrolled and inspected annually to prevent further damage from slides and improvised route finding. Trail maintenance teams should complete all essential repairs identified in these patrols on the above trails at least every two years 320 233952
Imagine being at Phantom Ranch on a weekend in May after North Rim opens and you see approximately 50 hikers waiting to use hiker bathrooms. The waste water treatment plant is not capable of handling hundreds of hikers flushing a toilet, in addition to the 100+ campers at Bright Angel Campground and 90 visitors staying overnight at Phantom Ranch. Is the answer to add more toilets, maybe non-flushing toilets for the hikers? How do we pay for them? Who is going to pay for the maintenance? 125 234251
Backcountry management in the last 20 years has been fantastic! It is difficult to manage such a world-class feature but I think you have done a fantastic job. Trails are clean and the campgrounds pleasant 370 234666
Great stewardship!! I have been hiking Grand Canyon for 43 years and the backcountry is in excellent shape. Unmaintained trails show increased use but generally the resource itself is little changed from my youth. The maintained corridor trails show the fine results of your trail crews' hard professional work 98 234164
Improve road to South Bass 464 235257
Need safe access points to get water out of Bright Angel Creek. Last year, our group ran out of water (not replenishing at Cottonwood). I feared someone would fall in the creek while trying to refill 14 230533
Trail maintenance when trails become dangerous, not just challenging. Realizing funds are limited, we would gladly pay more for a permit if that money goes to trail and campsite maintenance 28 230964
Keep commercial areas as they are with improvements for safety and security 48 231070
Royal Arch route would be greatly enhanced and made safer by putting a chain across the rock face used to bypass the pour-off 66 234089
Mark trails clearly in areas with high impact. A few miles east of South Kaibab trail, Tonto Trail has a section

Trail and Facility Maintenance

where it drops into a side canyon, but the route out is marked by many competing cairns. When a ranger walks through there, it would make sense if she knocked down cairns that mark less-desired trails 72 234119

Trail repair work on secondary trails--Grandview, Hermit, etc. 86 234143

Natural processes (rock slides, etc.) that block or damage existing trails should be cleared to maintain present access (within limits) 93 234158

If a trail has dangerous areas, some maintenance work should be done to increase safety. Work done on Grandview trail just below the saddle was an important safety change 120 234236

Have trail crews make dangerous rock-slide crossings a little safer 131 234289

Threshold trails could and should be improved to make them safer and more accessible with better patrols, better markings, marking of hard to find water sources and maybe emergency water\electrolyte store locations, etc. Making trail more accessible makes them less natural, but these trails are a small area of the whole canyon. There are miles and miles of empty wilderness out there, small improvements and use around these trails will not severely damage ecosystem integrity 131 234293

NPS, in the name of conservation, turns away from safety with a: you are in the backcountry, you are on your own attitude. There are areas where there is no practical way to make the experience safer, but it could be safer in the threshold trails 131 234294

Packing from rim to rim, I enjoyed well maintained trails and campgrounds 229 234438

Limit trail improvements to those affecting safety of hikers, including ability to follow routes without too much risk of losing the trail 244 234441

More backcountry trail maintenance. It's unusual the only trails that receive regular maintenance are corridor trails. As backcountry trail users, we pay an entrance fee into the park and fees to use the backcountry. Thought these fees were paying to work on the resource were now paying to use 390 234938

Types of Use Day Use

All canyon users should pay. Require fees from anyone passing the first resthouse or Supai Tunnel, with the assumption that anyone doing that will be using park service-provided amenities. The primary issue is too much humanity on that trail. Requiring backcountry permits of runners as well as packers would allow the park service to control numbers at any given time 121 234245

The number of daily users of the cross-canyon corridor trail should be limited, especially the area between the Colorado River and Cottonwood Camp 62 234075

Address the issue of rim to rim runners/dayhikers and their extreme impact on the corridor during peak season: limit number per day, require a special use permit for a reasonable fee (if not free) 342 234573

Corridor trails don't represent true wilderness, but this is perhaps as remote as many have ever been. To realize you're in a heavily traveled highway of hikers severely detracts from the experience and is quite disappointing. Address this issue and consider implementing a permit system for these times of year and to limit the number of dayhikers/runners per day during peak season 342 234571

Hiking opportunities should be available for visitors. Hiking is almost the only way to really appreciate the beauty and grandeur of the wilderness 315 233943

Limit the number of rim to rim hikers in May and October. This hike is becoming more and more popular and because these hikers are day hiking and not camping, even though they are often hiking across overnight, there is no limit to how many hikers can be crossing the canyon 125 234250

Mt. Whitney has a limit to the number of day hikers to summit, and a permit is required. This is another really big day hike hikers see as a personal challenge. I don't want to take public land away from the public, but rim to rim hiker numbers are going up every year; it is becoming more like Disney World in the corridor 125 234253

If there are limits on rafts and mules, why is there no limit on hikers on the trail? 125 234254

The problem of day hikers hiking beyond all possibility of returning safely before dark continues. This

Types of Use	Day Use
	contributes to safety issues for park personnel. I have seen day hikers on every south rim trail far below where it would be possible to get back up by dark. Perhaps a free day hiking permit system would help. According to the 1988 BCMP, day use may be restricted to fulfill visitor and/or resource protection mandates 138 234342
	The volume of park visitors continues to rise facilitating more trips into the canyon is probably not a good idea. The Bright Angel Trail is easy to follow and well-maintained. We hiked to the river in 1999 and when we hiked rim-to-rim in 2010, we did not notice significant changes to the trail. What was different was the volume of hikers; there were significantly more in 2010. What is concerning is hikers were less prepared to hike (no hats, inappropriate footwear, no water, etc.). The canyon is very unforgiving. Don't develop trails so even more inexperienced and unprepared hikers can go 331 234543
	The past policy of allowing unlimited dayhiking without a permit may no longer be viable management policy. Factors influencing this comment include significant numbers of serious incidents, searches, rescues, and fatalities associated with dayhikers, increasing numbers of rim-to-rim seasonal adventurers, and the deceptive ease of descending further into the depths than is appropriate for many first-time visitors -- or specifically, tourists who are not really hikers. On specific dates, overuse of the rim-to-rim trail system is now evident. Require a permit or registration in some form for any person going below the Redwall on any hike for any period. Where appropriate for resource management there should be a permit limit specified 363 234633

Types of Use	Rim-to-Rim
	Increased Rim-to-Rim day use by large groups has resulted in increased conflicts between backpackers and trail-runners, increased demands being placed on Corridor Rangers to provide Emergency Medical Services, and increased ecological degradation in the form of increased human waste along the trail. One possible way to address these issues would be to begin a permit system for day access to elevations below Indian Gardens/Tip-off on the South and Cottonwood on the North. As Half Dome now has a permit system, so should rim-to-rim activities 513 235395
	Numbers should be limited on any given day, and they should be required to pay impact fees and get a permit just like overnight hikers do. Running on the trail - esp. in groups - is a hazard to other hikers 59 234064
	Rim-to rim and rim-to-rim-to-rim runners/hikers who do not possess a backcountry permit have become a significant annoyance during certain time periods (spring, fall, weekends, full-moon, etc.) 62 234076
	Last year, my trip was rim to rim to rim. I was surprised by all the trail runners, which inundated the Kaibab trail. They certainly detracted from the beauty, and serenity, that is Grand Canyon. While anyone should be able to access the park, a national treasure such as this, should be treated with more respect than a training event, or extreme sport 73 234120
	There should be easier ways to plan rim-to-rim hikes 86 234142
	Concerned about organized runs, from rim to rim, in hot summer months, and large groups like Group Athena, that hike in large numbers. I observed 2 helicopter evacs; one for a runner and one for a Group Athena hiker. Both occurred during midday. These kinds of events are risking the lives of their participants as well as the rescue pilots/crews. Their large numbers (300 plus runners ran rim to rim detract from the experience my clients enjoy when so many pass us en masse 288 234487
	Prohibit organized runs and large group hikes such as Athena May through September. Impose a fine if they break this rule 288 234488
	Hikers wanting to stay overnight wait daily at the backcountry office attempting to get a permit for the corridor and often can't. NPS limits how many campers can stay in an area, but if a group of 200 hikers want to hike rim to rim, they can, anytime, regardless of how these large numbers will affect other hikers outdoor experience. Many of the backpackers want to stay in the corridor where there is drinking water. Rim to rim hikers or day hiker numbers aren't affecting backpackers on the Escalante Route or on S. Bass Trail 125 234252
	Rim to Rim large hiking groups are making the corridor trails unsafe, unhealthy, and unfriendly. (I do not have an axe to grind with this group). But their numbers and lack of respect for Grand Canyon as a natural resource (it is not their gymnasium) has gotten to a critical levels needing more oversight. I have encountered many individuals in these groups who have no idea of trail etiquette or resource protection. They do not yield right of

Types of Use	Rim-to-Rim
	way to hikers with large packs and seem to be committed only to the time it takes them to cross the canyon. I propose that for Rim to Rim day hikers, you consider: A) A permit system modeled after the system now in place for camping permits. The number of permits limited to carrying capacity of the trail as determined by NPS. A permit system for this user group, perhaps the only user group in all of Grand Canyon with no oversight, allows NPS to interact with all cross canyon hiking groups in advance of their trip, informing them of rules and etiquette. Many of these users are not outdoors people and do not know the proper way to dispose of human waste, trash, or trail etiquette. B) Group size for Rim to Rim day hikers limited to 12 persons maximum. Grand Canyon is not the place for large office groups or non-profits from the Valley to perform their fund-raising events - no matter how touching their goals are. No more than 5 groups per day allowed. C) Individual Rim to Rim day hikers do not need a permit but must register so that appropriate pre-trip advice can be distributed to them. This type of activity has grown beyond its carrying capacity and has a first-line impact on other canyon users. The corridor is busy by definition but it still remains part of Grand Canyons backcountry and this type of use is inconsistent with other uses 370 234668
	Rim to Rim runners? Let's charge them and get some of our money back 459 235043
	Open North Rim May 1 instead of May 15. Weather issues at the risk of the permit holder. This would result in hundreds of additional rim to rim permits being available in May 464 235253
	Develop a second rim to rim trail 464 235259

Types of Use	Trail Running
	What to do with the runners? It is a nightmare for all of us and especially NPS when North Rim opens and we have 700 runners dashing across the Canyon, creating garbage and rescues everywhere. Make Rim Runners get a permit and allow a certain, reasonable number. With the permit they buy, they get a video on Canyon etiquette and how not to get rescued. It does not seem like a national park when there are hundreds of people treating it as a marathon event 410 234975
	Shocked by the number of runners/hikers on the trail and especially in campgrounds at all hours of the night. Bright headlamps, overloaded bathrooms and obvious bathroom breaks ON the trail were disturbing. Our final trip photo on North Rim was cancelled due to a circus of ice chests, lawn chairs, and general race day behavior by participants and support crews. As a former ultra distance competitor I understand the desire to complete such events, but I object to the location in a national park 62 234077
	What our group experienced was discouraging. The constant stream of runners tarnished the experience. A few examples: We never experienced a quiet time in Cottonwood Campground due to a runner passing through the campground at the rate of several per hour all night long. While this certainly smells of exaggeration, it is not. I was aware of headlamps passing and pounding feet and snippets of conversation while I tried to sleep. The passing on narrow switchbacks in the most precarious places was often dangerous to both parties. The restrooms along the trail were depleted within hours of cleaning (we experienced this while camped in Cottonwood and IG). Trash on the trail was not in line with the normal backcountry experience 121 234243
	Runners are a danger. Many times they came up behind us and tried to slip by without notice and couldn't help making contact anyway. Everyone using the trail should be required to have a permit (and pay) and this activity should be strongly discouraged or simply prohibited on canyon trails 126 234257
	Rim to rim runners and hikers are rude and pushy, can be up to a couple of hundred in a day, and bring inexperienced and ill-prepared friends who then get left behind and have problems. Permits could serve as a useful way to educate and limit them 142 234361
	Neither runners nor mules imposed a threat to us while we were there 229 234435
	Prohibit organized runs and large group hikes such as Athena May through September. Impose a fine if they break this rule 288 234488
	Trail running - Disallow. Trail running is about meeting a personal challenge and would be hard argue how anyone doing this is really experiencing Grand Canyon in a meaningful way 339 234565

Types of Use Trail Running

Rim to Rim runners are a major detractor from the wilderness experience I hope to find in the backcountry. I have spent four-day trips where I constantly have to move aside for literally hundreds of runners/dayhikers. I repeatedly notice a substantial increase in trash on the trails and in the campsite restrooms (especially Cottonwood). I regularly arrive in camp only to find the restrooms in unacceptable condition and out of toilet paper. I would like to think that my backcountry fees, though very reasonable, contribute to the stocking and upkeep of these facilities. Rim to rim runners/dayhikers don't pay these fees yet they reap the benefits and abuse the opportunity 342 234570

Types of Use Canyoneering and Climbing

Adopt a policy requiring natural anchors wherever practicable. High traffic areas such as 150-Mile Canyon-- which is already bolted throughout--should be granted an exception; impacts of the few bolts there is less than impacts of successive groups attempting to build natural anchors. The canyoneering community, largely centered on Zion National Park, has developed its own standards of conduct relating to anchors, leave-no-trace, etc. Encourage adoption of best practices by including educational information in permits issued to hikers who plan canyoneering as part of a trip. Ask on the permit application whether a hiker plans to be canyoneering. This will also help the park monitor the activity 473 235237

Technical canyoneering is a legitimate use and activity. Climbing is allowed without a permit. Backpacking, caving, and rafting are allowed with a permit 419 234985

Have designated climbing area(s) where holds are pre-mounted instead of each climbing group mount/remove holds 229 234437

Eliminate any climbing activity that damages the environment. Rock climbing is a personal, self focused activity that can be accomplished in many other non Grand Canyon areas 339 234564

With canyoneering placing arbitrary limits does not spread the traffic but actually increases. The classic example is Zion NP. High area front-range beginner friendly canyons are restricted too much. This pushes users deeper into the backcountry into places they lack the necessary skills to safely manage, increasing erosion and trail damage. This would not have been a problem had a strict quota number permit not forced users to seek out other places to recreate 368 234657

Technical canyoneering is an appropriate use of the resource. Background: People have been descending Grand Canyon drainages with the aid of ropes and other technical gear since the Kolb Brothers in the early 1900s. In fact, John Wesley Powell coined the term canyoneering and he pioneered exploration like Shinumo Wash at river mile 29. The park is considering regulation specific to technical canyoneering. Technique and technology have come a long way to make technical canyoneering safe and far more popular today than in the past. Techniques to minimize environmental impacts have also evolved significantly. Canyoneering in other national parks like Zion is a very popular activity and land managers have adapted policies successfully to support this user group. A few suggestions: a. Natural anchors should be strongly encouraged at all times over bolts. b. Webbing used to construct natural anchors should be black to remain neutral or hidden. c. Canyoneers should clean up webbing from prior parties, never leaving more than one sling behind at an anchor. d. Bolt Policy Exploration Vs routes with beta 1. Bolts kits are carried as a matter of safety during exploration of slot canyons that haven't been descended before. On rare occasions explorers might find themselves in a bind where a bolt is required to safely exit a slot canyon. Exploration bolts are highly discouraged but appropriate if natural anchors do not exist. Explorers who place bolts must notify NPS after the descent. If the bolt is deemed unnecessary, NPS should reserve the right to remove it or seek help from canyoneering organizations to remove the bolt. 2. No bolts are allowed in canyons with existing beta. If bolts are found in canyons with beta they will be removed 372 234704

There are certain routes in GCNP where bolts are very helpful. Bolts should be maintained (if damaged by flash floods) by the technical canyoneering community. Two examples: 1. 150 Mile Canyon; bolts were installed in by George Steck 30 years ago. Later, Steck published his popular Loops Hikes book with 150 Mile Canyon an essential route for several loops. Furthermore, 150 Mile Canyon is the essential route for legal and unfettered access to the Esplanade area under Great Thumb Mesa. Canyoneers often descend 150 Mile Canyon, cross the river on pack rafts, ascend Matkat Canyon, descend technical canyons under Great Thumb Mesa, then pack raft

Types of Use	Canyoneering and Climbing
	back to 150 Mile Canyon to exit to the rim. This exit requires ascending four fixed ropes. The anchor placement of the bolts greatly increases the odds of safe rope ascents to escape 150 Mile Canyon. Some bolts have been blown out or damaged by flash floods over the years but the canyoneering community occasionally replaces these bad bolts to keep the route open. The canyoneering community should be allowed to maintain the bolts in 150 Mile Canyon. 2. Garden Creek; Many people travel down Bright Angel trail past Garden Creek at the top of Devils Corkscrew. This access makes frequent technical descents of Garden Creek likely. After the first two rappels from natural anchors in Garden Creek, the canyoneer is confronted with a 400 rappel down a big waterfall. There is one bolt in the schist 200 down the waterfall out of the water allowing a person on rappel to clip into the wall to rig another rope for the remainder 200 to the floor of the drainage below. This bolt allows a descent with a 200 rope, a common length available to canyoneers 372 234705
	Technical canyoneering is appropriate use, and low-impact anchoring techniques are being widely taught and used in canyons, which is consistent with wilderness ethics 394 234959
	Technical canyoneering is coming of age in GC and is not only an appropriate but important use. Canyoneering should require a backcountry hiking permit. Strongly support low impact canyoneering and the effort to educate permit users to practice the latest low impact techniques. The backcountry use permit would offer a brilliant venue for educational. Canyoneers have and are developing no impact anchors. Movement toward their use is growing. We are already using sand as an anchor in a retrievable bag 397 234966
	Canyoneering is, at least a combination of hiking and climbing, and at most adds rafting. We typically travel short distances on the river out of necessity. Canyoneers who visit GCNP are typically technically competent and able to travel through terrain without placing fixed anchors. A no-bolt ethic should be promoted, but bolt placement should be allowed if the life of the participant is at risk. Many canyons in GCNP had bolts or pitons established by rafters, and canyoneers should not be judged by their actions. I can email you pictures of anchors in Olo and 150 Mile which no canyoneer would dare establish 419 234986
	1) Canyoneers travel watercourses. This limits impact because these are hardened areas subject to violent flash floods. Flood events tend to erase any sign of human travel. 2) Grand Canyon technical canyons tend to be amenable to natural anchor techniques, as there are often chockstones, cracks, pinches or other features that minimize impact. Also, canyoneering technique is advancing with new anchoring techniques that allow ghosting of anchors or nearly so, and result in no long-term impact 457 235035
	Technical Canyoneering is an appropriate Wilderness activity, and should not be over-managed. Canyoneering ethic is focused on leave-no-trace techniques. It is a small sport and will remain so due to obvious physical challenges. It can be managed under the backcountry permit system, especially with re-evaluation of zone boundaries and quotas, to meet park goals while minimizing restrictions on visitor adventures 469 235089
	Heavily restrict canyoneering as its impact is concentrated in unique, isolated environments, typical with sensitive species and potential arch sites 580 235213
	Clearly name all canyons within Grand Canyon and list which do not allow technical canyoneering, then, of the canyons which do allow technical canyoneering--set specific seasons that those activities cannot or can occur (example--wildlife activity may close an area to canyoneering during certain seasons, just as some rock climbing areas have temporary closures due to nesting activities) 580 235215

Types of Use	Pack Rafting
	Permits should be issued to allow river crossings by personal flotation with a complete release of liability to the park service. Example: Tanner or Bass 98 234167
	Slot canyon trip with a packraft exit should not require a separate river permit on top of the backcountry permit. In 99% of cases these routes require less than a day on the river corridor. It would make more sense to simply require packrafters to exit the canyon at the first possible exit route, which is usually only a few miles downstream. These routes are rarely completed, so impact is minimal, especially compared to numerous commercial and private trips that launch from Lees Ferry every day 109 234202
	When you only need to pack raft a limited river distance do not require the same permit as those rafting the entire 270 miles. Pack rafting on a two-day trip puts a lot less impact on the park than someone on the river for

Types of Use	Pack Rafting
	<p>three weeks. No cap on number of miles one can pack raft as some slots require pack rafting a longer distance to reach the first available exit out of the canyon. The river should be broken into zones and if the side canyon you are descending falls in that zone you must take the first available exit in that zone. This will ensure pack rafters are not travelling large distances where the traditional river permit is required 88 234147</p>
	<p>Regarding the arbitrary 5 mile packrafting limit: for trip planning and safety, it would be more reasonable the exit route be specified in the backcountry application. To help administer this permit process, experienced Grand Canyon Canyoneers can help define safe routes to exit 295 233899</p>
	<p>Institute a permit that states entry and exit point. It would be easier to enforce and still allow access to those who want to hike and canyoneer in Grand Canyon 292 233897</p>
	<p>We use packrafts to cross the river to access canyons and use the river as transportation not recreation. I understand the desire to somehow manage packraft distance, but five miles is an arbitrary number without relation to the canyon and its exits. Since we are using the packraft to complete a route, it would make more sense to limit packrafting to the distance needed to complete the route. It makes sense to address packrafting through the backcountry permit process as part of the route and one mode of transportation 286 234484</p>
	<p>Limit Flotation Assisted Backpacking to backcountry use area zones. These zones should be implemented around clearly defined trails going from the rim to either side of the river. Example of FAB zones: Lees Ferry to Eminence Break on the east and Nankoweap Trail on the west, from Eminence Break on the east and Nankoweap Trail on the west to Phantom Ranch, from Phantom Ranch to the North and South Bass Trails, from the North and South Bass Trails to Whitmore Wash on the west and Diamond Creek on the east, and from to Whitmore Wash on the west and Diamond Creek on the east to Pearce Ferry. There should be no additional restriction on camping for FAB activities. River runners presently share camps with backpackers, and FAB activities should not be considered any differently 513 235394</p>
	<p>Do not limit pack-rafting to miles. It would be hard to monitor/enforce, and conditions can force a change of plans causing one to need to use the pack raft more or less than originally planned 307 233922</p>
	<p>Packrafting limit- 5 miles- unrealistic. Managed by including rafting mileage with the permit 308 233923</p>
	<p>Packrafting is incidental to a backcountry permit and should not be regulated by the river permit office (a pfd should be required). Have a zone system; whereby depending in which area of the Canyon the traveler was, they would be allowed a certain amount of river miles. In some areas of the canyon 4 or 5 miles would be plenty, whereas in others 20 miles or more may be what is necessary to create a safe, practical trip. The other option is to use a high number (say 25 miles) and have that be the maximum for all trips 84 234138</p>
	<p>Pack rafting is necessary when it's impossible to ascend back up the side canyon you just descended because rappelling was required to descend. The pack raft then allows the individual to travel down river to a point where that person can hike/ backpack out of the canyon. Without pack rafting, exploring many of these slots will be impossible 88 234146</p>
	<p>Backcountry permits should be allowed such that a combined backpacking and pack-rafting trip is unencumbered by additional requirements or other permits. Current limits appear to be arbitrarily chosen and illogical given standard pack-rafting routes one could possibly embark on 123 234249</p>
	<p>The basic limitation on packrafting mileage should be more liberal--say 10 miles--unless the applicant has received alternative permission for a longer distance and that any such alternative permission be included in the already-required backcountry permit 344 234576</p>
	<p>We prefer the phrase floatation assisted hiking or backpacking rather than packrafting as hikers are not river-users and there may or may not be an actual raft involved. There is competition along the river due to high demand for commercial and non-commercial river-running. Permitted hikers share the river zone and camping areas out of necessity. There have been rumors of new restrictive regulation of hiker use of river and beach areas, travel restrictions other than defined by permit zones, or equipment requirements for hikers making a river crossing. Hiker access to river and beach areas is integral to hiking, and restrictions on camping along the river would be inappropriate, forcing hikers away from critical water access, into areas where camping would increase resource impacts, and create potential conflict or hazard (not problematic to the present). It is desirable for the permit process to indicate and track when parties have trip plans that require them to be on the river regardless of distance, location, or travel means. The permit should show intention whenever trip itinerary</p>

Types of Use	Pack Rafting
	involves hitching a ride or using personal floatation equipment. It would be most appropriate for the suitability of any methods (other than briefly joining a permitted river party) to remain at hiker discretion 363 234630
	Do not place strict rules on raft assisted backpacking, or packrafting. It spreads users out in the backcountry and will rarely meet standard backpackers. The only way to experience hundreds if not thousands of routes is using a raft. I understand the parks needs to address safety, which it should. But placing too much burden to meet the same requirements as rafting trips and evaluation at Lees Ferry is too much and not realistic to most users using packrafts 368 234660
	Backpackers using river travel to complete routes should be required to carry all raft equipment into and out of the canyon, and required to wear a personal flotation device. But they should not be required to carry fire pans or groovers [toilets] that would make pack raft travel impossible. Most pack rafters choose to portage significant rapids, and PFD choice should be left to the pack rafter for the type of pack raft travel planned. Pack raft technology is undergoing innovation and unnecessary regulations could stifle innovation and quickly become obsolete. The backpacker should decide which pack raft system is most effective. Individual choices on river gear should not be mandated by the NPS except where resource protection dictates 372 234697
	Descent of 36.7 Mile Canyon requires a pack raft exit of 8 miles to Eminence Break. A technical descent of Cork Spring Canyon requires a pack raft exit of 6 miles to Tuckup Canyon. A technical descent of Muav Canyon requires a 22 mile exit to Galloway Canyon, the longest pack raft exit in GCNP. Walking the shore short distances is possible, but it's arbitrary and requires a time consuming process of deflating the pack raft and re-inflating when river travel again becomes necessary. Exits through tribal lands could shorten the pack raft distances, but Havasupai and Hualapai lands are generally not accessible today. The backcountry permit holders group cannot travel in more than two consecutive zones. The zones are selected for access to hiking entrances and exits: Zone Definitions: Zone 1: Lees Ferry to Rider Canyon Zone 2: Rider Canyon to South Canyon Zone 3: South Canyon to Eminence Break Zone 4: Eminence Break to LCR Zone 5: LCR to Red Canyon (New Hance) Zone 6: Red Canyon to Phantom Ranch Zone 7: Phantom Ranch to South Bass Zone 8: South Bass to Tapeats Creek Zone 9: Tapeats Creek to Lava Falls Zone 10: Lava Falls to Whitmore Wash Zone 11: Whitmore Wash to Diamond Creek Zone 12: Diamond Creek to Pierce Ferry 372 234698
	Some Park managers may suggest pack rafting distances longer than 5 miles could cause conflicts with other user groups along the river. Some managers might argue beach camps are limited and there is no room for additional use from pack rafters. This oversimplifies the issue and ignores a long history of rafters and backpackers coexisting along the river corridor. To address this specific issue: 1. Pack rafters are almost always in small groups relative to rafting parties, by virtue of backcountry permit size restrictions, and can camp at river beaches unsuitable for larger rafting groups. Carve out popular large river camps from pack raft camp use. If this concept is required, apply only to select specific beaches where impacts are certain. Backpackers can get to almost all river beaches today, legally, and further camping restrictions should be an exception, not the rule. 2. Rather than limit pack rafting to a specific distance, instead limit it to a number of nights camped at the river. For example, implement the zone system defined above but limit camping at the river to no more than two nights on a backcountry permit. This reduces likelihood of conflicts between permitted river runners and backpackers. Pack rafters have a high degree of mobility and can camp several hundred yards up drainages to reduce beach camp impacts 372 234699
	The five mile rule should be directly linked to a specific canyon and the physical nature of the canyon exit options rather than on an arbitrary distance or distance of river travel 397 234964
	It is not in the park service mission to get in the way of Wilderness-appropriate adventures, even if the activity does not fit into the trammel of the current management system. Write rules that do not block the people who wish to partake of these adventures 469 235087
	Other limitations could ensure a hike remains a hike, including a limit on the number of days which a packraft can be used other than for crossing the river; or a distance limit based on an itinerary including adjacent use areas on successive nights (to prevent hikers floating far downriver). There is no reason to unduly limit packrafting as a component of a backpacking trip. If I hike into the canyon, visit one area, float down to another area, visit that area, and hike out, this is a backpacking trip not a river trip. In terms of resource impacts, time spent in a packraft creates ZERO impact since water is not affected by my passage 473 235238

Types of Use	Commercial Use
	Only four percent of permits used are for CUA holders, the reason they get that small percent is because they're using uncommonly used canyon areas. CUA holders know people aren't going to be competing for those sites as Corridor Trails. We have a minimal impact on usage because we take what is left over . The reason we can do that is because we can safely get people through those areas that are left over 475 235299
	We need local trekking companies who save us transporting heavy and bulky equipment 291 233894
	Don't regulate Toroweap like a backcountry area. There are many side canyons more suited for low volume, less to zero motorized activity. Toroweap is a great motorized area for the adventurous. Commercial use should also be permitted. CUAs control and monitor use. These permit holders are responsible and can teach such principles as responsible use and respect. This corridor leading to Toroweap should be left as a corridor for use. Don't limit use of Toroweap overlook 393 234953
	Verified commercial IBP holder client lists once each quarter prior to permit application 481 235344
	Happy overall with the current Backcountry Management Plan. We hold CUAs in three National Parks, with USFS, and BLM and the plan in place at Grand Canyon is probably the most extensive one we work with. We can tell great thought and care is taken in developing the plan for the canyon 349 234582
	Grand Canyon Field Institute should be the main commercial backcountry access. Their prices are good and their guides are well schooled in the best way to hike the canyon 120 234242
	GCA & GCFI should not receive preferred permitting, they should enter the lottery with other users, this (early permit) is discriminatory, those with money can just go with the GCFI or GCA eliminating some permits for general use 137 234320
	Better accessibility means more guided trip access. Set aside some permits for paid guide services 131234296
	I have hiked Grand Canyon by myself and on a guided trip. I enjoyed both experiences and hope both will continue. Part of what you pay for when you take a guided trip is not having the hassle of the lottery permit system. If you don't want to deal with the complex and uncertain lottery process you can pay more to guarantee a trip with a guide. I hope to see both options available in the future 150 234377
	At least one guide company is offering a rim to rim using south bass and north bass trails. The problem is they make their guests carry backpacking rafts (and I assume life vests?) and have them raft across. This is ridiculous and quite dangerous/reckless. I am all for the park building another crossing to have another rim to rim trail, but not this way. It needs to be stopped 450 235025
	Professionally guided backpacking trips give opportunity to people who don't have experience and gear, to safely experience the Canyon. Professional backpacking guides educate guests on the human and natural history of Grand Canyon, as well as LNT principles, and act as eyes and ears for Rangers notifying them of hiker issues. Professional guides offer support and assistance to distressed hikers on the trail offering them food, water, electrolytes and basic first aid. Professional guides help their own group and other hikers stay safe and adhere to LNT principles to protect the Canyon 243 234408
	Allow guided hikes by professional guiding companies. Although I am an experienced hiker whose has twice crossed the canyon unassisted, I was amazed at the number of unprepared hikers putting their own health and safety at risk as well as the safety of their hiking partners. I believe professional guides offer a reasonable prices and safe means for inexperienced hikers to enjoy the canyon without letting their own inexperience jeopardize their experience. While I always favor equal access to the outdoors, there are many people whose experience is best served by a professional guide 278 234473
	Consider the critical role companies play in serving the needs of overseas visitors 291 234494
	Hiking guide services are necessary and any plans you may have to limit or eliminate their services would have a negative effect on the Canyon itself and on the local communities and economy. Hundreds of these hard working individuals rely on Grand Canyon for their business. Not only do they create business for local hotels, restaurants, and gift shops they also generate revenue for the park through fees and permits 310 234516
	As a business owner in Flagstaff, I also recognize the economic value of these companies. They provide jobs for

Types of Use	Commercial Use
	residents, not to mention all their clients stay at local motel/hotels and eat at local restaurants. It would be a mistake to limit or do away with these companies 325 234530
	A guide service provides equipment combined with expertise on proper use at a relatively minor cost when compared to gear purchase. There are skills and a learning curve for backpacking safely which take time to acquire, not all of us live in an environment where this is feasible. For single hikers, a guide service can group inexperienced travelers together for a safer trip. For people who travel long distances lugging backpacking gear, food and fuel is not always practical or cost effective. Even experienced backpackers unfamiliar with the desert environment or the language might seek the added insurance of a guide to ensure a safe journey 333 234550
	I can't speculate why the park would consider eliminating guide services (especially considering it was recently mandated that commercial river trips must provide guides to escort passenger exchanges at Phantom). Apparently someone feels hikers are better off with trained, experienced guides. I imagine the park received considerable pressure from the public (specifically locals/frequent Canyon hikers) on this issue 333 234550
	People are under the false impression guide services have an advantage over the general public in obtaining permits. This is not the case. It is said guide services get all the permits and severely limit opportunities for the general public. We are not able to obtain a permit without a verifiable client list. We have no advantage and are not reducing permit availability any more than any other person applying 333 234550
	It is a rare corridor trip in which I don't assist sick, injured and/or under-prepared hikers. I regularly provide salty food, extra water and first-aid, as do my fellow guides. We are trained and experienced in hiking the Canyon in all types of weather and provide valuable assistance to Park staff/rangers when they are not around. The corridor might not be remote wilderness but, the majority of hiker deaths and rescues occur along corridor trails. The risks and dangers are real and guide services make it a safer experience for those who choose to travel with us, as well as those whom we assist out of good will 333 234550
	Do not remove guide services from the corridor, they provide a great service in response to considerable demand 342 234574
	Without a service like ours you potentially alienate a segment of the population from experiencing backcountry. As I imagine all of you involved with the Park Service have a sense of pride and responsibility toward the park, so do we and we also have a serious passion and concern for the canyon's future 357 234609
	Hikers should have the option of guided hikes if/when/where they desire or prefer. Commercial guiding services should not have advance booking or privileged access to permits reservations without a designated client list showing a need for services. The present regime is effective in managing demand for access if adequately enforced. Self-guided hiking has been and still is the predominant model for backcountry users, permits must remain available to the general public on an equitable basis closely tracking variability in public or commercial preference. No guiding concessions or commercial allocations for backcountry use 363 234629
	Access to commercial guiding through CUAs should be enhanced because commercial guides 1) promote a safety culture, 2) exemplify environmental stewardship, and 3) allow visitors who would not venture through the very intimidating landscape opportunity to enjoy the national park. By supporting commercial guiding in the BMP, NPS will be supporting and enhancing the wellbeing of those who live in and around Grand Canyon. Commercial guides trained in advanced wilderness first aid are an important resource. They not only provide a vigilant eye for their own clientele and all who cross their path, they also prevent many incidents 365 234644
	Guides ensure environmental regulations are met (human waste, etc.), a factor visitors from other regions might not understand 373 234736
	I have seen hikers completely unprepared on corridor trails. I have often lent a hand to hikers who have been ill due to heat, dehydration and hyponatremia. Without my help the park service would have very likely extended their already taxed resources. As a result of multiple accounts like these I feel guided services are an asset to hikers on the corridor 391 234943
	I reported to Phantom Ranch Rangers illegal campers they were unaware of. We are a positive presence on the trails & I would like to stay there. I have carried more than my share of garbage out of the inner canyon, no idea how many old, dirty sleeping bags out of Hermit Creek area. I feel like I have a positive role in the Grand Canyon & have for over a decade 410 234970
	The guides' familiarity with backcountry evacuation protocols, wilderness medicine, emergency response and

Types of Use	Commercial Use
	the Grand Canyon can help to save lives and do so while saving on the GCNPs resources! 430 234999
	We wanted to backpack the Grand Canyon for a long time, but as it is very difficult for non-American citizen to get a permit via phone (we tried for hours to get through) and as we were inexperienced in Canyon trekking we finally decided to go on a guided tour. They organized everything for us: the guide was great, telling us what to do and not to do, helping us (especially our children age 11) to take care of the environment, to leave no trace, to keep the canyon as it is for future generations. Our guide was very knowledgeable and we felt always safe and were sure that he would have been able to cope with any emergency 434 235006
	I see the need for guided tours because we would have never had the experience of GC. However, I realize they cut into the availability of corridor campsites for the general public 436 235009
	Even for those that don't decide to book with a CUA, through phone inquiries and internet searches, operators lead guests to invaluable information: Operators help guests plan vacations whether on a guided trek or not. Many of the guests (70-80%) that call operators do not book for different reasons. However, we all spend time with them on the phone promoting the area. We educate guests on summer heat and winter snow. Very few guests understand monsoons and the related danger. Or something as simple as drive times including how long the drive is from South to North Rim. Canyon care in guest communiqués Taking no shortcuts on the trail or in camp given the adverse impact Explaining the backcountry as an arid, desert climate compared to other places i.e. crypto-biotic soil and not washing dishes in water potholes. Packing it in, packing it out. Making no campfires. Not feeding the wildlife. Not disturbing archaeological sites 464 235241
	Hold commercial services below the rim to a minimum to maintain the Wilderness designation the backcountry should have 524 235403
	Commercial services presently provided on North and South Rims are more than sufficient. The canyon should forever remain an outback where commerce is kept to a minimum 32 230987
	My prime concern is the distribution of permits to CUAs. Most sprung up when they realized you could go to the backcountry office on the first and walk away with the permit you wanted. The CUAs got very good at working the system and this created their business. Upon the opening of any popular month at least five of the first 10 numbers called were CUAs. These were primarily corridor trips and I think they could get up to 4 permits each. This was clearly not a fair system and the new system was an attempt to rectify this. However I noticed on one company's website over 30 transcanyon corridor trips offered: unfair. The Canyon permit system cannot be fair and benefit commercial operators at the expense of individual hikers 313 233925
	More park operations are turned over to concessioners to manage. This just adds an additional cost to visitors, and begins the process of making ordinary activities inaccessible to a large portion of the public 99 234175
	Under the current BMP we are required to follow the same guidelines for our .75 mile canyon hike that a multi-day backcountry commercial trip follows: in particular the guide to participant ratio of 1:7. While I understand the appeal to safety, I think there would be value for vendors operating short day hikes in allowing a higher guide to participant ratio. Our destination takes us less than a mile into the canyon and does not fall within the same skill or risk level many hikes require. I propose a distinction be made for guide: participant ratios for hikes that fall within a certain distance from the rim. A short hike of 2 miles or less from the rim is certainly a more manageable experience than a multi-day backcountry experience and therefore would require less guides for participants. For such a short distance a larger ratio of even 1:15 would be a reasonable adjustment and still provide for that safe, unique, and awesome experience we provide our students 107 234199
	Restrict commercial companies offering backcountry trips. Extensive river corridor use by commercial companies with increased large group camping and subsequent reduction in individual permits for river trips is a cautionary example of what could happen in the backcountry if backcountry commercial access is increased. Animals attacking food at river campsites is most likely a function of this overuse. Backcountry hikers using campsites or doing at-large camping at a trail ending at the river have their food attacked by rodents and ravens because camping by commercial river trips is so ubiquitous 120 234238
	Institute a commercial guiding system for backpacking permits. The new system of permits has greatly impacted the professional guiding community. Many have to advertise dates before they have permits. Many have trouble getting permits for trips they have been doing for years 142 234357
	Consider some method of providing guaranteed dates and permits for Commercial guides 259 234446

Types of Use	Commercial Use
	Please do not increase commercial use authorization (CUA) or their access to permits. Commercial users are likely to develop and use focused methods to improve their success in the permit process and can be doing this without clients so they can then procure clients who were not involved in the process and therefore not as concerned for the area 338 234558
	If group or commercial activities are truly a problem, reduce the number of opportunities or eliminate the option. Those who enter the backcountry or Cross-Canyon Corridor areas should be willing to invest the time to fully understand (e.g. geology, flora, fauna) and experience Grand Canyon on their own 339 234563
	The number of CUAs may not need to be limited. Even with the moratorium on new companies, we have seen some Backpacking CUA holders' sales suffer and 2 have closed shop. There is only a small population of backcountry users that want a guided tour in proportion to all backcountry users. With over 20 companies going after this limited number of people, market competition should control the number of companies operating at any given time through elimination of companies that can't compete 349 234589
	Cap the number of overnight backpacking CUAs. You guys just kept letting everyone in. Business need to generate revenue, so we must sell trips. Limit the number of CUAs and there will be fewer guides in the park. Perhaps create two levels of CUAs: companies that actually guide at the park on a regular basis and know the trails and those that come three times a year and give the rest of us a bad name. Keep the number of CUAs to eight or so, enough companies to create competition so the customer has choices, but not so many none of us can survive. Also, there are only so many competent guides available for work 463 235073
	October 2011 backcountry permit requests exceeded 1,300 resulting in our securing only 60% of requests. Three competing businesses received less than 50% of their requests 472 235227
	A moratorium on new CUAs should be maintained 464 235245
	Review the 27 eligible CUA companies and eliminate all that have not secured at least 6 permits in 2010 and 6 permits in 2011. The long-term goal is to limit the number of full, active CUA holders to six or eight and could be accomplished through attrition as CUA holders go out of business, drop their CUAs or reduce permit needs. Should there be any eligible and active CUA holders that fall below the requirement outlined, on a case by case basis they may be awarded some form of IBP for a specific trip. For example, a group that has historically secured one permit every spring may be given that opportunity still, but no right to expand. These exceptions should also be highly limited 464 235248
	All CUA holders will receive a set number of use nights per month guaranteed (CUA holders will work with Park personnel to determine this number. This number should be equal for all CUA holders in this group). As a part of administering this system, CUA holders would submit their requests for the guaranteed allocations up to one month in advance of general public and then would participate in the lottery system with the general public for the balance of available permits. The goal of this approach is to assure the portion of the public wishing to use guide services is served appropriately. This idea of some advance permits being awarded is not dissimilar to the advantage GCFI currently enjoys. CUA holder representatives would work with Park personnel to design the appropriate system 464 235249
	Extend term of all CUA contracts to three or five years at a time reducing paperwork requirements and associated costs 464 235260
	Eliminate the cost of a Transportation CUA to Backpacking CUA holders 464 235261
	Increase the cost to \$1,000/year for Backpacking CUAs and \$500/year for Day Hiking CUAs 464 235262
	Establish a day hike concession with a single location in Grand Canyon Village that can be shared by several CUA holders to address only same day requests. Further details would need to be determined 464 235264
	Limit Day Hike CUAs; exact number and terms to be determined 464 235265
	Exempt CUA vehicles from the USDOT signage and inspection requirements. The goal of that program is long haul drivers with unsafe practices. The required signage creates extra costs and puts unnecessary risks of theft on CUA vehicles parked during overnight trips 464 235267
	Given the overwhelming demand for self-guided permits, commercial services defined as necessary will need to be clearly limited in size and scope 481 235341
	No type of business concession should exist involving overnight use of backcountry areas by permit, including

Types of Use	Commercial Use
	the corridor trails. Such a commercial service is neither necessary nor appropriate 513 235383
	Require commercial guides to produce a list of clients when they apply for a permit. Some companies list rim to rim hikes available leaving every other day: I doubt they have client lists for all these hikes 144 234364
	The commercial guide vetting process needs to be more stringent. I have met guided groups who have no clue about desert hiking, much less Grand Canyon 144 234371
	The park abandoned its old permit distribution system in favor of a lottery system. This action compromised the ability of CUA holders to secure permits, which in turn hurt the bottom-line of many small businesses struggling in an already difficult economy. This also appeared to promote a broader agenda to marginalize commercial backpacking, which constituted only 3-4% of all backcountry permits issued in 2010 156 234416
	Consider a CUA system whereby permittees are guaranteed a minimum number of commercial user days, and a permit distribution system that does not compete with everyone else on the same terms. These simple actions would allow CUA holders to better plan and build long-term, sustainable businesses 156 234419
	If you feel you must issue permits to commercial users, please make it a very, very, low percentage. Hiking the Grand Canyon is a personal experience, not someone you pay someone else to arrange for you 329 234541
	Why not make us like the river guiding companies? Give us user days & we can pay for them & that money could go back into the Park 410 234969
	Issue two types of day hike CUAs: one for rim top only and one for below the rim hikes. Below the rim CUA holders should be held to the same standards as backpacking CUA holders 464 235266
	Restrict commercial use to the corridor 137 234319
	Analyze commercial backcountry hiking guide users as to their real need (and subsequently their use of slots). If hikers need a guide or someone to bail them out if they can't handle the Canyon, then maybe they shouldn't be there in the first place. Limit commercial hiking guides to rim areas or day hiking below the rim 380 234768
	Do not allow commercial use that could potentially damage the canyon environment 454 235030
	Do not allow overnight trips to Phantom Ranch with a day hiking CUA 463 235075

Types of Use	Camping
	Close heavily impacted campsites, and if rehabilitated, reopen when recovered 480 235308
	I miss camping on the rim at Toroweep. The first time I was there, the two spots at the rim were open for overnight camping 11 230514
	Add at least one additional campsite at Horn Creek 464 235255
	Privatize inner canyon campgrounds, they should be market priced (with different owners) 461 235062
	Some campgrounds simply have too few camp spots. Some have many empty spots, even when the few permits available have been given out. Other zone/corridors can accommodate many more backpackers without seeming crowded 39 231029
	There is real need for an additional group site at both Cottonwood and Indian Garden. These campgrounds create a bottleneck when there are two sites at Phantom Ranch. Cottonwood is also a bottleneck on any Rim to Rim during peak season; could it be even a little larger? 301 233903
	Now that Roaring Springs pump station is automated, establish a few campsites there to provide an additional overnight stop for North Kaibab trail hikers. It would not need to be large but would provide an extra option for those who like to explore that area and who need extra time to make our way 59 234065
	Reopen Roaring Springs campsites and reserve them for CUA holders (all or part). Limited spaces at Cottonwood are the bottleneck in the rim to rim permit process. Opening five spots at Roaring Springs would make 150 additional spots per month. While not as ideal as Cottonwood, it offers options 464 235254
	We hiked North Rim to Phantom Ranch and up Bright Angel to South Rim. We spent nights at Cottonwood, Bright Angel and Indian Garden. It was the superhighway of backpacking. Each night there was running water

Types of Use Camping	
and sit-down toilets. It was deluxe backpacking! We are used to camping in wilderness areas with little in amenities. We thoroughly enjoyed the trip	61 234072
Perhaps a camp share plan would help in main campgrounds	86 234143
I would like to see more campsites at Cottonwood and/or Roaring Springs. It is too difficult to get into one of the 12 Cottonwood campsites. Please strongly consider more campsites on North Kaibab Trail	87 234145
More Colorado River beach camping for hikers! Separate use areas according to creek campsite and beach campsite. For example Boucher Creek use area and a Boucher Rapid use area. Hermit, Red Canyon, Crystal, Shinumo, Kanab, etc.	98 234170
Open Boundary Road and North Rim forest access roads with unlimited day use and overnight stays restricted by permit only at designated areas	98 234173
Consider three strategies to address growing demand for Corridor campgrounds: 1. Add more campsites at Indian Garden and Bright Angel campgrounds 2. Develop Hermit Camp and Horseshoe Mesa as adjunct Corridor areas 3. Expand access to South Rim via existing forest roads	106 234195
Develop Hermit Camp and Horseshoe Mesa as adjunct Corridor areas. Restore Hermit trail to its condition under Santa Fe railroad management. Make improvements to Grandview trail. Provide potable water to these sites, plant trees for shade, add more campsites and install toilets. These improvements will create Corridor-like areas that will give first-time visitors more viable option for multi-day hikes below the rim. An improved Hermit Camp would serve as a gateway for itineraries involving use areas to the west as far as South Bass. An improved Horseshoe Mesa would serve as a hub for hikes to the west (toward Indian Garden) and east (toward Hance and Tanner)	106 234197
Why, along Tonto Trail between Indian Garden and Hermit Creek, is camping restricted to specific campsites (BL4 ? Horn Creek, BL5 ? Salt Creek, BL6 ? Cedar Spring, and BL7 ? Monument Creek)? This forces users to camp near water sources, concentrating human activity and waste near water sources. There are a number of attractive locations to camp on flat parts of the Tonto and/or overlooking Inner Gorge. If at-large camping were permitted (without increasing the total number of available permits in this corridor), camping could become more dispersed (desirable) and human activity and waste would be located away from water sources (reducing vegetation and human waste impacts at existing campsites). Issue permits for at-large camping in this corridor, but require camping be one-half mile from existing water sources (i.e., at least one-half mile from the existing specific campsites of Horn Creek, Salt Creek, Cedar Spring and Monument Creek)	117 234226
Could Cottonwood be expanded to better match availability at the other campgrounds?	126 234261
Add new camping areas in corridor: Tip-off, Roaring Springs Residence, Tonto Trail at Pipe Creek. Add new sites in other backcountry areas	142 234359
Hermit campsites are a disgrace. They are not flat, and not well marked. The only good site is the one under the overhang. Groups spread through the entire area rather than stay in one site	144 234370
I enjoy campsites spread out and somewhat secluded. Camp sites in the Zion narrows are spread out spanning several miles. Benefits are several. One has the privacy to enjoy nature without interference. There is more human presence through the backcountry allowing increased vigilance, and assistance to hikers from hikers. If one is traveling to a centralized camp site, if a hiker gets hurt, they need to turn back or get to the site. There are no intermediary sites where they can stop. Decentralized campsites would help. The negative is delivering services (water, restrooms, etc.) to decentralized areas. Perhaps a centralized camp site with others along the backcountry close to facilities would be best	146 234373
Perennial creeks are getting hammered with use in at-large areas. Clear Creek, Hance, and Cottonwood creeks come to mind. Visitors are camping way too close to water resources. Consider creating a buffer zone between the creeks and campsites where no camping is allowed in order to protect precious resources.	384 234782

Stock Use	
Mules cause excessive damage to corridor trails. Especially in need of repair and regular upkeep is the trail to	

Stock Use

Plateau Point. The rut from mules is 2 feet deep. Hikers blaze parallel routes to avoid the ditch, thus widening the damage. Fill the rut with gravel and Tonto dirt. As this damage resulted from day-use mule rides, this maintenance should be paid from concessionaire use fees 320 233953

Commend mule drivers on corridor trails for the care they exercise with public safety and common enjoyment of trails. I have seen more than one driver wait patiently for hikers to move up the trail while using the opportunity to provide more information to riders. Hikers appreciate this very much 318 233946

If mules must be used the animals should be fitted with waste bags to keep the trail clean 33 230996

Allow mule travel on Cross-Corridor routes. This allows more people to experience the inner canyon and is part of the Grand Canyon historical narrative. The minor inconvenience of stepping around the occasional excrement or urine puddle should not be a show stopper 339 234562

Because mules were not allowed down North Kaibab trail past the tunnel, the trail did not feel over used. There were plenty of mule trains going up Bright Angel but since we had the more pristine experience of North Kaibab trail it was not too objectionable. Don't change a thing 61 234073

Mule traffic seems very reasonable. Mule trains are considerate and aware of safety considerations 127 234265

It was discouraging when NPS did away with the one day Mule Ride to Plateau Point. While I have no doubt mules are tough on trails, it seems instead of eliminating one day mule trips you could have allowed less than daily frequencies or some such thing, cutting folks off entirely seemed like overkill 131 234284

Thankful to use mules to carry my backpack on the trip out. One park function is to allow people to see and touch the park, to provide access to those who may not be able to carry a full load or even walk themselves; mules make this possible. Please continue this wonderful heritage for others to enjoy and use 336 234556

Although number of mules was recently decreased, environmental impact is still devastating. Mules eat everything within reach, then defecate and urinate along the trail. For hikers this is a sometimes unhealthy or unsafe. Mule trains are considered a historical use for visitor enjoyment. So was the Firefall at Yosemite National Park, that event, however, did not make big bucks for the Concessionaire 524 235409

It isn't fair people can pay to go down on donkeys to this special place. This is a good way for the park to generate revenue, but the donkey business should stay separate from the hiking 13 230528

Mules for those who cannot manage to walk should be discouraged and brought to an end as soon as possible. Damage created by mule trains is excessive and runs counter to proposed protection of resources. Mules are an intrusion as they grind the pathway to dust, defecate and urinate causing an unnecessary health risk. Their historical connection with the canyon is no longer a justifiable reason for continuing the practice 32 230983

We walked out Bright Angel trail and while I was prepared for the mass of humanity, I was not ready for the mule trains, or the smell of urine and manure along many sections of the trail. Discontinue visitor mule trips to Indian Gardens and/or Phantom Ranch 33 230995

Another thing impacted our last trip greatly: denigration of the upper 2-3 miles at the north rim by commercial use of mules. When we did this jaunt 5 years ago, it was one of the most pleasant parts of the trail. This time, dodging the many, many trains of mules, eating gallons of dust and walking in thick dust, it was the worst part of the entire south to north rim experience. The commercialization has ruined it. If people cannot walk 2 nearly flat miles, they need to go to south rim where they can hop out of their car and peer over 38 231019

Make the S. Kaibab trail off limits to mules 46 231058

Create a minor trail where mules could give the unfit a taste of the canyon 32 230986

Mules go out south rim with no load and could carry people that only wanted to hike down. This could be a paying proposition for the park and would necessarily be very limited, as it would be one way 38 231022

Allow mule service with stopovers. Allow riders/duffles to overnight in Indian Garden 110 234206

Neither runners nor mules impose a threat 229 234435

As an equestrian, I would like to see more access for private stock use in backcountry. My favorite is the Thunder River, Tapeats Creek, Surprise Valley area. I would like to see that open for stock use 348 234580

Develop a Free Permit system for private stock users to North Rim (and South and Tuweep), requiring stock

Stock Use

users check in at the backcountry office, make travel time arrangements with concession mule wranglers, and get a list of rules they sign. Requiring a free permit would track stock use and educate users of Leave No Trace practices, help with mule wrangler/visitor safety, and in educating users about areas they can ride 384 234779

Permits Number Available

Make public the number of permits/persons allowed in each use area and how many other applications were submitted. We'd love to know where we stand each time we are denied 4 230449

Accommodate backcountry visitors who show up unannounced. Have limited user days available 9 230490

Number of permits allowed is about right. While I wish I always got the permit I want when I want it, I also do not want more permits to be available 10 230497

The most important thing is limited amount of permits for backcountry facilities 17 230548

I hope the number of permits do not change; it is a fair system 17 230553

The backcountry is well managed. The number of people I encounter in the Canyon is definitely related to the type of area I am in, and is both predictable and acceptable 72 234116

No increase in use of backcountry areas. There's enough human contact to make me feel safe but perhaps a little more than wanted in camp areas. Please, keep traffic low in the backcountry 22 230606

No increase in the number of backcountry permits issued and support a reduction in the number of people allowed in the corridor and perhaps even into the wilderness areas 33 230992

Backcountry areas should be managed for minimal impact, through strict visitor quotas if necessary. It's worth a wait to visit 35 231003

Greatly increase number, and ease, of obtaining backcountry. Some campgrounds have too few camp spots. Some campgrounds have many empty camp spots, even when the few permits available have all been given out. Other zone/corridors can accommodate many more backpackers without seeming crowded. Make the number, and the ease, of getting permits within the four month window more generous 39 231029

Give some advantage to the person that shows up in person on the first day of the month. Maybe they could be in the top 25% of the numbers issued to the permits 301 233906

Lottery system for allocating backcountry permits on a monthly basis seems outdated. Inconvenience of the fax system is an avoidable hardship. Applications should require identification of alternate leaders 318 233947

Increase permits for solo or two person groups at each use area not to exceed resource carrying capacity 98 234165

As visitation to Grand Canyon grows, interest in backcountry permits for overnight stays will increase and put pressure on Corridor trails and campgrounds, the most popular overnight destinations for first-time backpackers. More-experienced hikers rely on Corridor trails and campgrounds for access to wilderness areas. When entering from south rim, the easiest path to the north involves crossing one of two bridges connecting Bright Angel and South Kaibab trails to Phantom Ranch. For this reason, many backcountry permit requests for remote wilderness areas include at least one night in Corridor campgrounds 106 234194

Consider options that open the backcountry for more people, like adding more trails, more campsites, and more access. My favorite backcountry experience is the one that happens. My wife and I have been denied campsites in GCNP over and over again because of the demand for limited sites. If the number of campsites were doubled they would still be filled all year 113 234212

No additional campsites in the central corridor 127 234264

Too many people who apply for sites in peak spring and fall seasons do not get a permit 142 234360

I was surprised at the figures on backpacking user nights in 2010. I had no idea there was so much use. You can't expect to have a quality backcountry experience with this many people, unless permits are kept at the same level, or decreased. In 20 years no one will have a quality experience. What studies have been done on the impact to the backcountry by this many people? If so, where can the information be found? Can we sustain the

Permits	Number Available
natural beauty if we continue these numbers? I am not trying to keep anyone out, I just want to make sure this beautiful natural setting is properly managed to make it last indefinitely	348 234578
The current backcountry permit system is a fair one and since demand is far greater than supply of permits, the lottery type process that is in place is the best way to handle this dilemma	349 234585
With many national park management plans the goal is to preserve the quality wilderness experience. With canyoneering placing arbitrary limits does not spread out the traffic but actually increases. The classic example is Zion NP. Front-range beginner friendly canyons are restricted too much. This pushes users deeper into the backcountry into places they lack the necessary skills to safely manage, increasing erosion and trail damage. This would not have been a problem had a strict quota number permit not forced users to seek out other places to recreate	368 234657
Grand Canyon limits people in a certain backcountry zones to preserve user wilderness experience. This number applies to both canyoneers and backpackers and should not. Deep in a canyon a canyoneer will not disturb a backpacker's experience because they will not be seen or heard. Change strict quotas applied to backcountry zones and user groups	368 234658
Too many first-time visitors leave the park frustrated because they can't get permits either on the waitlist or by reservation. Limit number of consecutive days a CUA can be first on the permit waitlist	384 234781
It seems more and more difficult to get permits in the corridor and that should be addressed	391 234939
Set strict permit limits per canyon per day (no more than three permits and a maximum 12 people or less). Cater to each individual canyon, as smaller narrower canyons may need limits on the lowest end of the allowable users per day as those canyons will be damaged more quickly from frequent traffic	580 235216
I'm willing to wait to get a permit, have a hard time getting a permit even, so that when I do get a permit it's a high quality experience	477 235304

Permits	Types and Restrictions
Some special provision for permit reservation for AZT through-hikers would make sense. Coordinating a permit for AZT hikers is problematic and discourages hikers who wish to complete the AZT	363 234635
The problem of day hikers hiking beyond all possibility of returning safely before dark continues. This contributes to safety issues for park personnel who have to perform rescue operations. I have seen day hikers on every south rim trail far below where it would be possible to get back up by dark. Perhaps a free day hiking permit system would help. At present, according to the 1988 BCMP, day use in a given area may be restricted when necessary to fulfill visitor and/or resource protection mandates	524 235410
Consider allowing 2 nights consecutive in areas requiring long or difficult hikes. Areas such as Clear Creek cannot be fully explored/enjoyed if only one night camping is permitted	4 230447
Develop a rating system to access different backcountry permit use areas. Consideration should be given to a rating system for all national parks. The goal should be to reward greater access to use areas based on hiker experience. Perhaps there should be 4 levels: Novice; Intermediate; Advanced; Expert. Hikers move into different categories based on experience and perhaps educational courses such as Leave No Trace. Divide use areas according to the 4 levels. This approach does not discriminate; it classifies and allows access to everyone based on level of expertise. This could also have impact on number of SARs each year. Wilderness areas need to be protected from hikers who do not know how to practice LNT hiking/camping and who are a greater threat to the environment and themselves. The importance of a national system would be to allow someone who has an expert level in the Sierra Nevadas to hike in the more difficult use areas in Grand Canyon due to their experience. All parks should share the same system so information regarding permits and field notes can be accessed by all	34 230999
Manage Rim to Rim day hikes with some sort of permit system with fees and group size limit. Many large groups need instruction in how to hike the canyon and a lesson in trail etiquette	301 233904
When you only need to pack raft a limited distance of the river you should not be required to get the same	

Permits Types and Restrictions

permit as those rafting the entire 270 miles. Pack rafting a limited distance of river on a two-day trip is a completely different animal and puts a lot less impact on the park than someone on the river for three weeks. There should not be a cap on number of miles one can pack raft as some slots require pack rafting a longer distance to reach the first available exit out of the canyon. The river should be broken into zones and if the side canyon you are descending falls within that zone you must take the first available exit out of the canyon bottom within that zone. This will ensure pack rafters are not using pack rafts to travel large distances of the river where the traditional river permit is required 88 234147

A runner does not need a backcountry permit. Even the multitude of rim-to-rim-to-rim runners we encountered were not technically considered overnights. Yet several runners had their schedule began 2AM and ended near midnight. Each of these persons used the same restrooms, water spigots, resthouses, etc. that we did. They pounded the trails as hard or harder, contributed to the noise as much or more, disturbed night vision with the stream of headlamps, and interrupted the quiet time much more than the typical backcountry user. Yet, I am doubtful these persons that far outnumbered backpackers held a single backcountry permit 121 234244

All users--air tourists, mule riders, boaters (already are) hikers (backpackers & those hiking more than 1.5 mile) should enter a permit process 137 234323

Members of the public should have priority over any group or commercial permitting 339 234561

Permitted trailhead access should be considered where access is important to hikers but NPS does not wish to open the location to day-users and uncontrolled access 363 234626

Require a permit or registration for any person going below the Redwall on any hike for any period. Where appropriate for resource management there should be a permit limit 363 234633

Bona-fide educational hiking groups (Grand Canyon Field Institute, Museum of Northern Arizona, Elderhostel, etc.) may be better served with their own permit allocation system. Very few group permits are issued to these organizations but if they were allowed to compete with each other in advance of the hiking season, it would promote more cooperation between these groups 370 234669

Add the Dragon Lookout area to the backcountry permit system as a separate backcountry vehicle campsite, similar to the Fire Point and Sublime sites. It is already used for vehicle based camping and use will likely continue in the future whether or not it is legal, so it may as well be added. It's closer alternative than Pt. Sublime 384 234775

Require permit holders in at-large use areas to get ¼ mile off dirt roads before camping. The rule exists for paved roads already, but not for dirt. This would eliminate potential for adverse resource damage from car camping in backpacking zones 384 234776

Develop a Free Permit system for private stock users to North Rim (and South and Tuweep, if necessary), requiring stock users to check in at the backcountry office, make travel time arrangements with concessions mule wranglers, and get a list of rules and regulations they can sign. Requiring a free permit enables the park to track the amount of stock use and be instrumental in educating stock users of Leave No Trace practices, as well as helping with mule wrangler/visitor safety, and in educating users about areas they can ride 384 234779

The park uses a lot of resources rescuing people. Could a screening system be set up? Maybe one can't get a Primitive Zone permit without prior Grand Canyon experience? Also, can summer hiking inside the canyon be monitored for potential problems before they happen? 387 234930

Consider a three tiered system, as follows: Tier 1: Permits for designated camping spots in the Corridor and Threshold use areas. Tier 2: Permits for open camping in Primitive areas. Tier 3: No specific permits necessary for Wild areas. Require backpackers file an itinerary with the park (obtaining whatever permits are needed for Tiers 1 and 2). If use rises dramatically, a wild area can be changed to a Primitive area 461 235065

The current permit process allows technical canyoneering to happen under a backpacking permit. This system is ideal, already in place, and works well 394 234957

There ought to be specific canyoneering permits different than regular backcountry hiker permits, as use by canyoneers has much different impacts which should be tracked separately. This might be hard to sort, as many hikers employ minimal canyoneering skills at some point. Maybe the plan should define a canyoneering permit as one which the itinerary includes 2 or more technical rappels of 30 feet or more. A technical rappel would be

Permits	Types and Restrictions
	defined as any descent which the permittee uses of any one of the following: rope, harness, belay/rappel device, anchor, or webbing 580 235214
	Put safeguards in place to eliminate re-sale of backcountry permits. Commercial IBP holders must have a verifiable client list prior to application for a permit. Commercial IBP holders must have their verifiable client lists verified annually at a minimum of once a quarter prior to application for a permit 513 235385

Permits	Approve of System
	Demand is mostly a corridor problem. There isn't a ready solution since campgrounds are already at capacity. The current system rations high-demand permits according to a random process at the beginning of each four-month advance request period. This system is fair and should continue 473 235232
	Policies and practices of limiting access via permits is a vital part of managing the flow of people through the Canyon 21 230597
	Being able to get backcountry permits at Pipe Springs is a great help 11 230512
	Trusting that we're talking about the real backcountry, not Bright Angel or other tourist-packed trails, I believe the reservation system works fairly well 22 230605
	Permit system changes are fair, but it makes it harder for AZ residents to get a permit. We were used to going up to the backcountry office and requesting our permit. Of course this isn't fair to the rest of world 28 230970
	I like the permitting process using a FAX application 41 231042
	The current permitting system helps preserve resources and solitude in the canyon 52 231080
	I like the new permit system that does not give priority to people who go stand in line at the backcountry office. Although I have benefited from that in the past, the new system seems more fair 72 234118
	I support the traditional backpacking/camping permit as many trips require two or more days 88 34148
	Your rules about having a permit, making sure there are a limited number of people, etc. are fantastic. It keeps the landscape and environment from eroding 112 234208
	I like the four month timeframe for permit application and think it is quite manageable. I have also had luck getting permits much closer to the start of the trip 358 234611

Permits	System Problems and Suggestions
	The Grand Canyon, the backcountry plan, the air tours all seem to be disproportionately tilted toward money. Have money--you can bypass the permit system 137 234321
	Current party limitations in more remote areas are absurd. Letting two solo hikers monopolize Nankowep is untenable. It would be better to impose a number limit, than a party limit. This past spring, my 3-person group was permitted for the same areas along the gems as an 8 party group and guess what? We were on exactly the same itinerary for 3 days, with all of us camping together in Ruby and Slate (the third day, we camped atop the Redwall on Boucher trail rather than at Boucher creek). Allow people to buy up slots if they really want a solitary experience (maybe on a rising scale; say \$5 for the 1st slot, \$10 for the 2nd, and so on) 461 235063
	Now that we cannot go to the window on the first of the month and work with a ranger one on one, we find ourselves at a loss when trying to plan 459 235047
	We put in that four-month draw for a certain date. We're finding it very difficult. We don't know how to coordinate when we're horseback packing or even if we have people helping out ahead of us for a campsite. There is no way to plan an itinerary in that long time frame while we're on horseback 476 235300
	Permit issuance should be made in conjunction with the best knowledge of the backcountry office personnel of the trail/use area/management zone requested, the experience of the backpacker, and conditions in the canyon as a whole 524 235405
	I have applied for several backcountry permits that bounced back requesting my backcountry experience and

Permits	System Problems and Suggestions
	that my itinerary was dangerous 241 234412
	The FAX system is really bad 18 230567
	Don't like the system of reserving backcountry hikes. Took three hours for the fax machine to take my reservation 51 231076
	At permit issuance, backcountry overnights should show they have tools and proper waste carry out bags then signoff they know where and how to dig a cat hole and will not do so in or near obvious tent-sites along Tonto Trail or any other primitive areas 320 233956
	Not a fan of the four month mail-in, three month walk-in, mostly because I had an advantage before--being from Phoenix. Would like to implement a 7-day check-in required. Seven days before your first night in Canyon you must call and confirm you will use your permits, if you don't call you lose your spot. Put those cancellations on the web for those of us that can drive to the park on short notice 60 234070
	People wanting to fax applications have an uphill job. I've been applying this way for six years and it takes me at least eight tries to complete a call. Either your fax line needs an upgrade badly, or you need a couple more lines to handle the large volume of calls 68 234105
	I am wondering why, when the BCO recently changed permit regulations, GCFI was granted the pick-of-the-litter on backcountry permits to the exclusion of everyone else on the planet. That seems arbitrary and systematically unfair. That should be remedied. Remember the liberty and justice for ALL part? 84 234139
	By no means should someone from the east coast with no Grand Canyon hiking knowledge be able to get a permit just as easy if not easier than those of us local and committed to the canyon. First come first serve is fair. Any other national park gives locals a chance to get a permit by walking up to a window. Folks also miss the help trip planning when they walk up and talk with someone who is knowledgeable 391 234945
	Increase potential for first-time visitors to have an opportunity to camp at corridor campsites. Consider restricting visitors to one corridor trip every other year 384 234780
	The park uses a lot of resources rescuing people who get in over their heads. Could a screening system be set up? Maybe one can't get a Primitive Zone permit without prior Grand Canyon experience? Can summer hiking inside the canyon be monitored for potential problems before they happen? 387 234930
	Repeat hikers should give way to those who have not had the opportunity. Everyone should have to buy a permit--not just those staying overnight. Perhaps permits should be by lottery and then there should be opportunities to trade dates with other hikers if need be 126 234259
	An agenda aimed at reducing commercial backpacking is true if this BMP does not change the current permit system, or the forthcoming computer system (gives no advantage to CUA holders or anyone else). We base this on increasing demand for permits and decreasing success in our securing permits 472 235226
	The first day of the month permit distribution process for the next open month must remain neutral, without granting permits in person at the backcountry office before all others. Permits must be distributed to all applicants, be they the general public, IBP, GCFI, etc., in a random process, regardless of intended use, as in a lottery. Advanced distribution of backcountry and corridor area permits for any educational programs such as Grand Canyon Field Institute should be discontinued. GCFI, just like every other guided business, group or individual, should be managed formally within the general lottery schedule 513 235386
	All other park service backcountry hiker use should be considered included in the already substantial park entry fee all backcountry users pay on entering the park 1 230431
	Hold auctions for some sites at Bright Angel, Cottonwood and Indian Garden. That way someone willing to spend more than \$5 per night for sites in mid-May could bid on them 3 230444
	When permits are drawn, consider placing permit requests in a queue (2nd, 3rd, 4th in line). That way cancellations may be fairly offered to those next in line, rather than offered to those parties that have easy access to the backcountry office due to proximity or other means. Electronic media make it easy to notify next in line parties where they stand and when a cancelled permit becomes available 4 230448
	Reserve backcountry permits earlier. I think 6 months would be better; a year is too early 5 230453

Permits	System Problems and Suggestions
	Make it simpler to get an overnight stay. Reading the information guide makes it sound very complicated and nearly impossible specially for someone who may not be able to plan a year in advance 8 230483
	When making reservations, according to time windows and reservation rules, I ended up looking for a FAX machine on January 1. Improve the technology for applying for permits 16 230543
	Windows for each reservation (permit, campsite, mules, etc) each had different windows making it a crap shoot regarding whether the first request for permit would be aligned with my first request for campsite dates, etc. This system(s) could be much better coordinated 16 230544
	Recent changes that change when faxed applications are accepted relative to when walk-up applications are accepted have pros and cons. Now that I live in Oregon instead of New Mexico, I like the idea of not getting shut out of a planned trip by walk-up applications when I have to fax my application. On the other hand, when there are conflicts or mistakes on faxed applications, it can cause anxiety and disappointment in trying to make modifications/adjustments to fit what is available 21 230600
	Have email confirmation of permit approval. I always wait until confirmation to buy airline tickets and it seems like forever. Is everything still done via Fax? If so, I would hope regular visitors who aren't trouble makers would be ushered through the process quickly 23 230609
	Permit process for overnight stays needs to be more transparent. When denied a permit, it would be helpful to understand why and what I could do to improve my chances next time 49 231071
	Take mail requests, wait one week into the month and then randomize all the letters postmarked on the first-of-the-month in the first pool and then continue to organize by postmarked dates. Walk-ins can also be considered in the same pools by placing them into the date they walked-in 18 232423
	Please do continue to permit day hikers to pass through without a lottery. It is a great experience that should not be denied the casual visitor from elsewhere in the country, from outside the US and from right here in Arizona. I love the Grand Canyon and it would be awful not to be able to visit favorite places with family members who have trained for the experience with me 318 233948
	Permits for the backcountry are now slanted toward local walk ups on the first day for permits 56 234060
	Getting lodging or a campsite on South or North rim can be a challenge. It would be very helpful to get and immediate response to a permit request so you can firm up dates for lodging or camping before and after the backcountry trip. Could you tie rim campgrounds to the backcountry permit process so you could at least be sure of getting a campsite? 71 234112
	Change Phantom Ranch reservation system and reduce advance timeframe to 8 months. Peoples' schedules do not allow planning that far in advance, so a lot of people miss out because cabins are reserved 12-13 months in advance 75 234122
	I understand there are no refunds and I am fine with that but I think the price paid should be applicable to another permit without the restriction of the 3 day advance notice. The 3 day advance notice requirement is probably designed to free up the permit for other people but who really plans a grand canyon backcountry trip in 3 days? Why is there a 3 day restriction? 102 234183
	Withhold a certain percentage of permits for walk-ins in backcountry (wilderness and non-wilderness). It is unfair to onsite park users to be giving virtually all permits away in advance, denying visitors opportunity for a spontaneous experience. There should be some way of identifying commercial abusers of this system besides shutting down access to private parties who don't have concrete plans months ahead of time 115 234216
	Are fees high enough to dissuade hikers from booking various permits far in advance and then not using those permits when they decide what dates they want? We met other hikers who suggested we use this procedure on our next visit. Are there many permits that go unused for this reason? Shouldn't first time hikers be given some consideration over those who hike the area frequently? 126 234256
	Permitting timeline and ability to plan in advance - more than 3 months 128 234270
	Change concession permit system for Phantom Ranch to a more user friendly system (e.g. like Desolation River permits). Current system is too limited with only 1 day/month for making reservations 128 234273
	Create an online reservation system after reservations have been accepted by fax to allow reservation trading

Permits System Problems and Suggestions

amongst people who already have reservations. There are so many last minute cancellations or no-shows that may be avoided if such a system was employed 130 234282

Limited access combined with limited vacation makes it tougher for folks to make cautious decisions. On my first trip down the corridor trail I was facing thunderstorms on the first day of my permit. I felt a real pressure to take a risk because the permit wouldn't allow me to wait a day for better weather. Consider building in some flexibility to allow people to let a trip slip a day, maybe adding a standby campsite or two 131 234295

Reinstate the ability to apply for permits in person on the first available day. If there is a concern about commercial guides taking advantage of this, only allow private individuals to apply 144 234363

Allow camping permits earlier than 6 months in advance. It is very difficult to plan and coordinate a trip to camp at Bright Angel Campground and eat at the Cantina as meal reservations have to be made 13 months in advance. Then you have to wait 7 months to try and coordinate your camping permits with your meal reservations. Very tricky 285 234481

Post a Full Use Area Report to the GRCA website. This is an idea that Yosemite National Park implements and as a result, keeps us from calling the Backcountry Permitting Office to check on available dates. If a list like this were used by the canyon and known to the general public, there should be less phone calls to the park by the general public looking for dates 349 234587

Have an email address for backcountry permit questions. This is a more efficient way to get in touch with our clients and an e-mail contact would help rangers handle questions and send bulk responses to people who have the same questions such as When are you going to be done with processing permits? It would also enable overseas backcountry users to contact the park since phone lines are only open when other parts of the world are sleeping 349 234588

A person interested in obtaining a last minute permit can call in the afternoon to see if space is available. If there's availability, they can't fax a request for a reservation. I have to drive 6 hours to get there in person the next morning then hope the space was still available. Let the caller fax a permit request or pay by credit card over the phone. It would be the requestors responsibility to get to the BCO to pick up the permit; if they don't get there on time the space becomes available for someone else (no refunds). Perhaps this could alleviate long lines at the BCO (during spring) as well. Open up a will call type window at the BCO so those who are coming in just to pick up a permit can go to that window and not stand in line for hours 353 234597

People should be required to cancel so others can use the spots, maybe have a large deposit refunded on arrival 436 235010

The system for drawing permits has become less equitable over time. We used to fax in a permit at midnight four months before our hike, and had a chance. No more. We have friends that take time off four months before their planned hike and drive-up in person so they can compete with the many commercial outfitters who now dominate the backcountry permit process. That should change so individuals have priority, or at least an equal shot. At least, we are in Arizona. People in other states or countries are at a huge disadvantage with the current system 456 235033

The reason for changing the old permit system was to make it a level playing field. It will never be a level playing field if GCFI can get permits before anyone else. All the new permitting system did was screw locals, whom you should be working with. Make it a level playing field or go back to the old system where we can come up to the window on the first of the month and get permits. With the new system, the first permit processed every month can still get denied its first choice if GCFI can get whatever they want before permits go on sale. And it is nice to be able to talk to a ranger while planning an itinerary 459 235049

Revise the permitting process. The fact that it has devolved into a random draw based on fax arrival times is a signal something is terribly wrong 461 235066

Everything falls apart when the outfitter does not get permits. Surely it must be possible to devise a plan that removes the uncertainty around planning a backcountry hike. A system that allows for better long-range planning would make it easier for non-local visitors to have a Grand Canyon experience 462 235068

The new permitting system will put us out of business. We have no idea what permit we will get or if we will get any. The new permit system is bad for NPS, look at the turnover in the Backcountry Office since it started. They cannot keep up, it takes about 3 weeks to get the results, way too slow. Let people come back to the

Permits	System Problems and Suggestions
	window on the 1st. A much better system for the park service and the people. Better for safety, it is nice to have the opportunity to work one on one with a ranger when planning a more extended trip 463 235069
	Allow applications on a shorter timescale than the 2-week current limit. Frequent backcountry users should be allowed a fast-track application process whereby application submission and approval are processed less than 1 week from the start of a backcountry trip. Experienced visitors are familiar with backcountry use policies, thus should be eligible for fast processing and approval 470 235094
	It should be easier to cancel permits and also see what is available if changes are necessary via some kind of on-line system 509 235128
	Reduce general public (non-CUA holder) permit request lead time to three months from four months (February 1 for May). All CUA holders (non-profit and for-profit) should adhere to this same system 464 235250
	Allow changes to guests on the verifiable client list. We find guests often change their minds when we do not get their first priority dates or trips requested. Allow permit transfer between CUA holders in case CUA holder experiences a guide staffing challenge, illness, guest cancellation, etc. 464 235251
	Require an initial payment with permit request and a second payment to re-confirm intended permit use (a nominal amount like \$20) 60 days before first camp night to reduce unused permits. The no-refund/credit only policy is resulting in unused permits and thereby restricting access to those desiring a permit 464 235252

Permits	Online System
	To facilitate access for technical canyoneers traveling from considerable distance, an online permit system like the one that is successfully used in Zion National Park should be considered 458 235041
	Transition permit distribution to a web-based system, while still allowing walk-up applications 513 235387
	Create an online system to automatically track requests by time submitted and, if desired, give preference to U.S. citizens. The fee could be raised slightly to account for any additional costs 27 230961
	Change the permit system so that one may apply via email 46 231060
	Maintain a web site with a calendar that shows which days backcountry use areas are full so we don't waste time asking for full places/dates 65 234081
	People should be able to book camp sites online and pay prior to arriving. The person can print their permit and bring it with them. I believe those that plan a trip ahead of time should be able to know whether or not they will have a camp site available when they arrive. I understand one can make this request via mail but that process is archaic. The pros are you give people broader access to campsites, will likely collect more revenue, and allow hikers to begin hikes early in the morning or late at night when backcountry offices are closed. Last summer we waited at the backcountry permit office until it opened, paid for our permit, and then began our descent into the canyon. Beginning our hike at that point would have us finishing during peak temperatures. If we already had our permits we could have left at 5am avoiding temperatures that result in so many people getting sick. The cons: lack of face time with hikers, counterfeit permits, an increase in unused camp sites despite reservation, the initial cost of implementation, and the need to create policies for cancellations, and check in 146 234372
	Create an equitable way to reserve permits online. If they still have to be picked up in person, this should help reduce fraud by those who are exceeding limits 329 234537
	An on-line reservation tool may skew inexperienced backpackers to areas beyond their abilities. Provide information about the likelihood of success of getting a trip such as 75% of requests granted for particular trips during particular months. This should be accurate information updated from data continually 338 234559
	It may be difficult to implement a computerized backcountry permitting system due to heavy volume on the first date of sale but maybe it's possible after the first month of sale for permits to be purchased or cancelled on line. This type of system would alleviate many questions backcountry rangers receive during the week regarding open use areas and dates. As a CUA owner, it would make it simpler to work with potential clients who are looking for last minute trips 349 234586

Permits	Online System
Reservations should NOT be online. If hikers see what is available, when threshold or corridor zones is not available they may choose a zone beyond their abilities	358 234613
While Zion National Park does not have a perfect permit system, they do allow for the online purchase of permits. This is magnified even more so in Grand Canyon where North Rim is less accessible and it is quite inconvenient for users in our county to obtain permits during operating hours	395 234960
People are looking two features: (1) access to use area availability for planning purposes, and (2) convenient method for requesting and obtaining a permit. (1) Hikers should be able to look online to see whether a particular itinerary is available. This would be of great value outside the corridor. Inside the corridor, unless there were an instant permit system it would not be useful to know campsites are available since many hikers will be simultaneously vying for these sites. (2) As recently seen in Yosemite, there will likely be efforts to scalp the most desirable permits. More broadly there is danger a fast and transparent system would be much easier to game. The current system, at least, has a certain inertia that discourages people from requesting permits they don't really intend to use, or from requesting multiple permits with intent to cancel most. An instant permit system would carry with it too many risks of undesirable behavior by the problem-causing minority of hikers. An online application process is great, but permits should still be reviewed and issued by backcountry rangers. This will also allow continued review of itineraries for reasonableness, and obtaining hiker information sheets from solo hikers	473 235233
The process seems complicated and maybe not fair to all. Study the systems, procedures, and computer programs used by Olympic NP, Zion NP, and Rocky Mountain NP. I have recently used these three and yours and I find theirs simpler and more efficient	479 235305

Permits	Fee
Increase cost of all camping permits to \$8/night pp. Increase price with increasing demand. Based on approximately 90,000 user nights per year, this would create new revenue of \$270,000	464 235263
Fees for an backcountry permit are excessive, consider reducing or eliminating them. Overnight backcountry users do not use or receive any park services. An exception can be made for hikers who overnight in one of the 3 backcountry campgrounds where services such as water and toilets are provided. A reasonable additional fee can be charged for that, similar to the fee charged for Mather campground	1 230418
When camping in far backcountry sites (without toilets, picnic tables, etc.) there should not be a per night per person camping fee. A permit fee is fine but not a per night fee	301 233905
Charge big enough fees to help manage your office. Most backpackers support fees to manage and improve the backcountry experience	71 234115
Your entrance fees are the highest of parks in this area. I have a hard time believing I get \$25 of use on each visit. The American public pays taxes to support the parks, and the entrance fees, permits fees to walk around or visit the backcountry, tax-payers begin to be priced out of the market	99 234178
Permits are expensive. \$10 for a permit plus \$5 person per night is steep considering as backcountry there are no amenities, no services given, etc. Not sure what we are getting except permission. Seems it is merely a fee (and a rather high one) for processing the permit	102 234184
All canyon users should pay. Require fees from anyone passing the first resthouse or Supai Tunnel, with the assumption that anyone doing that will be using park service-provided amenities	121 234245
Permit and camping fees are very low. I would not object to an increase in these fees as I consider it a privilege to hike in the Canyon on such well maintained trails and to use facilities provided	127 234266
I believe Americans should not be prohibited from viewing this national treasure. Americans should be able to view Grand Canyon for a reasonable and affordable rate	229 234432
My very reasonable backcountry fees contribute to stocking and upkeep of facilities. Rim to rim runners/day hikers don't pay fees yet they reap the benefits and abuse the opportunity. I have also noticed an increase in human waste along the trails during these times	342 234570

Permits	Fee
Limit number of nights one has to pay for. After a week or ten days the money each hiker is contributing to the system should be sufficient	358 234614
Institute a discount for students. When a student I would not have been able to pay entrance fees and permit fees. It is important to give youth the opportunity to appreciate the park. They are the ones who will be running the place in the future and need to love and appreciate it as much as the rest of us	358 234614
Make the backcountry permit fee schedule responsive to infrastructure provided. Right now, a person pays just as much for a camping permit to the Kanab Creek area as Phantom Ranch. This is unfair	370 234670
Modestly increase fee charged for all backcountry permits. Provide the overage to the three tribes that control access to vast parts of GCNP: Havasupai, Hualapai, Navajo. While most hikers use corridor trails and won't benefit from this increase, it provides a way for the tribes to have a reasonable economic basis to administer a permit program. It also creates jobs for the tribes and allows them to have visibility into who is hiking on their lands and where hikers go. The \$5 per night permit fee is low and a modest increase to benefit the tribes will not create a hardship for most Grand Canyon hikers	372 234688
Administering a hiking permit program is costly and the tribes might argue demand is too low to justify cost. Hiking organizations could buy an annual block of permits on a use it or lose it basis. For example, Grand Canyon Canyoneering Association could buy a block of permits from the tribes and administer distribution to its members. If all permits are not used annually, the organization loses out. This concept could ensure there is enough money coming to the tribes to enable a hiking permit program. It also provides a way for tribes to keep administrative costs low since the organizations would have obligation to administer the permit process. In this example, Grand Canyon Canyoneering Association would provide tribes with information on permits issued so they know who is on tribal lands, when they will be there, and what routes are being accessed	372 234689

Use Areas/Zoning	
Existing large zones should not be bifurcated into smaller zones for any reason	481 235347
Reduce visitor numbers in the Widforss use area by one permit to provide more solitude to visitors. It's a small area. Allow only two permits, one large and one small (or two small)--rather than three	384 234784
Allow more groups into certain wild areas or resize some use zones. Case in point is the Royal Arch Loop, mostly in the Garnet Zone. Since most groups itinerary is to move through the route in 5 -7 days, perhaps that zone could be broken into smaller pieces so more groups could have access in a given week, but still maintain separation. Under the current plan, it may take a typical group 5 days to work through the Garnet Zone, which means other groups can't really get started even though they might be at opposite ends	387 234929
The Management Zone/Opportunity Class System works well and the quota system is necessary and affective. I passed one party per day and found trail conditions and side canyon sites sufficiently primitive and fairly non-impacted. The Zone/Class quota system should be maintained. Having revisited areas I have seen little change in impact or numbers of people	18 230563
Previously named Use Areas and Management Zones should be retained. Recreational opportunities and resource protection levels, as described in Management Objectives in BCMP Appendix F should be re-evaluated and revised. The Corridor Use Area, CBG, CCG, and CIG should not be enlarged	524 235406
Focus inexperienced backcountry users to impacted areas that have appropriate facilities	305 233919
A hiker new to the Grand Canyon, wanting to experience a more wilderness experience than the Corridor Trails is faced with a substantial escalation of challenge beyond their expectations, and the park has no good alternative. This is not ideal for the hiker, and increases the workload of backcountry rangers that help those in over their heads	80 234129
Keep current primitive or wild use areas designated as such (i.e., do not change any to threshold or similar); we need as many areas as possible to remain primitive and wild. Keep visitation numbers low; I can see how pack rafts and other modes for crossing the river may lead to more people getting to primitive and wild use areas, but	

Use Areas/Zoning

don't radically increase the number of people that are allowed in to these areas 353 234595

Backpacking zones are too broad. A strict quota prevents another group from experiencing a backcountry drainage, rim, etc., even though they would be miles from another group backpacking a popular backcountry trail. Change strict quotas applied to backcountry zones 368 234659

Particular Special Use Areas, Backcountry Visitor Permitted Use Density Map: Since East End has 90% or more of the actual backcountry visitor permitted use, this aspect is best illustrated by production of Visitor Density Use Maps, one for the park as whole, another for East End, specifically (enlarged), as to relative numbers of permitted backcountry users there assigned, by season, in various use zones. By season is important, due to seasonal variations in access and comfort (thus, density) for permitted populations 512 235376

Some use areas could be split into smaller sizes to allow more visitation without sacrificing wilderness values. Examples: Nankoweap, Unkar, Crystal 98 234168

More Colorado River beach camping for hikers. Separate use areas according to creek campsite and beach campsite. For example Boucher Creek use area and a Boucher Rapid use area. Hermit, Red Canyon, Crystal, Shinumo, Kanab, etc. 98 234170

Divide Blacktail zone into two zones so parties can be approaching it from both directions. It is a huge zone and takes a while to get through and if there are a couple of groups coming in one from one side, there is a huge area with no hikers 358 234612

The way permit zones are divided has been a successful adaptation of original permit zones, with appropriate administrative adjustments responding to changing demand for popular destinations offering camps near available water with good trail conditions. Some unusually large zones are candidates to be divided into smaller areas. Some of these include AU9 Blacktail which covers portions of the Tapeats Basin and an extensive (but physically unrelated) area to the east. Hikers can be in the same use area without the most remote possibility of encountering the other party or sharing any resource. Similar issues have been identified for BS9 Great Thumb, AR9 Scorpion Ridge, AQ9 Trinity Creek, AF9 Chuar. Considering the difficulty of accessing these remote areas, often by traveling through areas with much higher use-demand, it can be problematic for groups with significantly different planned itineraries to access these large zones if their dates overlap but not in the same place 363 234623

Reduce the size of some wild use areas. (LB9) Tuckup/150 Mile is excessively large. It should be split at Cork Spring Canyon to allow hikers better access down 150 Mile Canyon and across the river to Matkat. This is one of a few legal ways to access GCNP under Great Thumb due to Havasupai restrictions. Tuckup Canyon is a destination unto itself where a group could spend considerable time and effectively block access to 150 Mile Canyon many miles away. (AU9) Blacktail is excessively large. It should be split so access north of Muav Saddle (Saddle Canyon, Crazy Jug Canyon, Tapeats Cave Canyon) is a separate use area from access south of Muav Saddle (North Bass trail and drainages on south side Powell Plateau) 372 234700

Allow more groups into certain wild areas or resize some use zones. Royal Arch Loop, mostly in the Garnet Zone. Since most groups itinerary is to move through the route in 5 -7 days, that zone could be broken into smaller pieces so more groups could have access in a given week but still maintain separation. Under the current plan, it may take a typical group 5 days to work through the Garnet Zone, which means other groups can't really get started even though they might be at opposite ends 387 234929

Use areas balance the desire for hiker access with natural resources protection, and also protect hikers from excessive contact among groups which could otherwise diminish enjoyment of a private remote outdoor experience. The system as a whole works well but some use areas should be revised. AU9: is too big and includes two non-competing areas. It should be divided into a use area comprising the Crazy Jug and Saddle Canyon drainages, and another use area comprising drainages below Powell Plateau between Hakatai and 133 Mile Creek. This change would eliminate the possibility of an itinerary being unavailable because of other parties hiking in a completely different part of the canyon where there is no possibility of encountering one another and no impacting of the same resources. BR9: Because the popular Royal Arch loop hike falls almost entirely in this use area, it should be divided into two areas, each with a limit of one group. This won't increase use since the current limit is two groups, but will ensure there is no conflict between groups. One use area should include the area below the Redwall upriver from Elves Chasm to the boundary of the BQ9 use area. This area would include Toltec Beach and the Garnet and Copper Canyon drainages. The second use area should

Use Areas/Zoning

include the remainder of today's BR9 use area. This area would include the Esplanade and Royal Arch Creek, including the popular campsite below the arch. It would also include the area below Apache Point along Stephen Aisle and Conquistador Aisle. LB9: This use area is simply too large. It should be divided to separate Tuckup Canyon drainage from upriver drainages between SB Point and 150-Mile Canyon 473 235239

Wilderness

NPS and GCNP should also be commended for long-term management of the park in such a way that has preserved the wilderness characteristics of this special place 470 235092

Designate as much of Grand Canyon's undeveloped land as backcountry and not the more restrictive Proposed Wilderness and/or the Wilderness designation. The backcountry designation provides the park system flexibility to limit development and use without legal and permit restrictions as the other two designations. The goal of the park should be to provide access to those adventurous enough to seek it out and enjoy its natural splendor without infringing on the indigenous plants and wild life. Providing and maintaining hiking trails and use will serve both the park and park visitors well 19 230571

Ground the recreational component of the BCMP in the Wilderness Act 481 235340

Backcountry should remain a wilderness, with no modern conveniences, unsettled, uncultivated, left in its natural condition; no signage except directional safety, no educational displays below the rim, no additional trail construction (except existing trail maintenance). It is a perilous land to the inexperienced, and should remain that way for future generations. Backcountry does not need additional toilet facilities. These are difficult and expensive to maintain; backpackers conform to the rules of self-removal 513 235396

The ever-increasing number of backcountry toilets adversely impacts visitor experience of wilderness and wilderness camping decisions. The Wilderness Act states there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area. It should be clear that wilderness is to be free of fixed structures. Though temporary, backcountry toilets are about as close to a fixed structure as anything in the backcountry. These structures directly impact visitors wilderness experience and alter backpackers' wilderness behavior in that visitors camp near toilets. This focused visitor decision making increases opportunistic rodent populations at these sites. Increased camping near toilets leads to hardening of campsites near these fixtures. This leads to a need for the park to consider metal lockers to hold backpackers' food, adding another temporary structure. Having wilderness free of these behavioral modifications to activities is what wilderness values are all about. We encourage GRCA to remove toilets at Monument, Horseshoe Mesa, Upper Tapeats and Clear Creek, instead of building new structures that will need yearly maintenance. Concurrently, the park should implement a Wag-bag program of solid waste removal for all backcountry wilderness visitors. Solid waste removal and being responsible for our impacts is a component of being a responsible park steward. There was a time at Grand Canyon when park visitors made backcountry campfires. Now we either pack out all charcoal from fires burned in metal fire pans, use a portable camping stove, or go without. There was a time when backcountry visitors left piles of refuse. The park now advocates a Leave No Trace footprint. This is the future of responsible stewardship, a future we look to GCNP to take the lead in guiding us toward. Packing out all individual solid waste is a very powerful way to solve the issue of the need for remote backcountry toilets very simply, economically, and responsibly

In 2006, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, in consultation with former NPS staff and others familiar with the terminated park river-supported program, proposed a non-motorized boat supported maintenance plan for five toilets accessible by river in the proposed wilderness. The project conforms to the Wilderness Act and NPS Wilderness Policy regarding Minimum Requirement and the general prohibition regarding use of motorized equipment, motorboats, landing of aircraft, and other forms of mechanical transport. The project conforms to the 1995 General Management Objective to [p]rotect the natural quiet and solitude of the park, and mitigate or eliminate the effects of activities causing excessive or unnecessary noise in, over, or adjacent to the park. The project contributes to requirements of Public Law 100-91 of substantially restoring natural quiet and experience of the park relative to aircraft overflights, and the project contributes to GRCA's earlier commitment to reduce nonessential administrative flights. The original GCWC request was denied citing unsubstantiated impacts of

Wilderness	
significantly [increased] administrative use of the river and significant additional costs. Given the current maintenance program's clear impact to visitor wilderness character experience, the recent emphasis the Director has given partnerships in fulfilling the NPS mission and foster[ing] a shared sense of stewardship that is so crucial for our future, and the recent emphasis of the Climate Friendly Parks program to reduce park carbon emissions, we request that the park reconsider GCWCs partnership proposal	481 235356
Nearly all the parks backcountry is proposed wilderness, less the cross-canyon corridor and portions of Pasture Wash and Toroweap. As such, the plan should be primarily a wilderness management plan	481 235309
Apply only minimum tools and regulations to achieve Wilderness-Area objectives	293 234499
Tourist overflights are a travesty, and make a mockery of the term, wilderness protection	25 230952
I hope wilderness areas remain as they are -- completely wild	17 230555
Why if all else becomes wilderness is the river not included?	12 230521
Will wilderness keep the park from having toilets serviced by helicopter? What will this do to rescue efforts?	12 230519

Wilderness	Designate
Further protection of critical resources by designating the backcountry a wilderness should be the first priority of both DOI and GRCA (which should be lobbying the DOI for this designation)	524 235399
The BCMP should include as the highest priority recommendation of wilderness designation for the proposed park acreage. Only with official, permanent wilderness designation can the backcountry be effectively managed as wilderness in whole. Otherwise, uses which conflict with wilderness characteristics will inevitably be proposed, such as new road construction	470 235091
Reaffirm the 1993 recommendation with boundary modifications, and update it in 2010. Continue expressing your support of upgrading this special piece of this Earth to the status of designated wilderness	467 235083
Areas currently designated wilderness in GRCA should remain that way, and those being considered for such designation be so designated. Oppose any plan to open these areas to motor vehicles	382 234772
In absence of a Wilderness Management Plan, support the goal of providing a framework and programmatic guidance for consistent decision making in managing backcountry and proposed wilderness. Support minimum requirement concept. Concur lands designated as proposed wilderness must be managed as wilderness until such a time as they are designated as wilderness or denied. The Wilderness Act's primary purpose is to preserve and protect lands in their natural condition. Although the Wilderness Act acknowledges wilderness areas shall be devoted to public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation and historical use, it does not require them be optimized for such public uses	371 234676
The 1.1 million acres of primitive undeveloped land proposed for wilderness should receive and be managed for maximum protection so future generations can experience the same quality experience as today. Proposed wilderness should be managed for full wilderness protection in the future. This land should be protected from mineral exploration, mining, air, water and noise pollution, and overuse	369 234662
Most of the hiking community supports full wilderness protection and designation for areas below the rim, with NPS operations limited to what is necessary for resource protection and public safety. Continuing the policy of managing these areas as if they had gained formal wilderness status is appropriate protection under the new plan. For some undeveloped areas above the rim, NPS policies and objectives are less clear and should be clarified in the new plan. Trailhead access is often closely related to this subject	363 234622
Formally recommend Congress enact legislation to make GRCA proposed wilderness permanent statutory wilderness. This is reasonable, necessary, and long overdue	356 234603
Ban helicopters, airplanes, and motorized rafts from Grand Canyon	152 234380
Wilderness in the inner canyon makes sense. Wilderness on the rims doesn't make sense	133 234300
Designate as much area near North Rim as feasible as wilderness	116 234219

Wilderness	Designate
Preserve and expand Wilderness Areas. As more areas of our country become developed it will become more important to conserve what little Wilderness we have left. Expand the wilderness	114 234215
Oppose converting most of GCNP into wilderness because it tends to restrict human activity. The most harmful restriction is not allowing man-made machines in the wilderness, even for rescue. There is no piece of ground anywhere that is worth endangering a human life	113 234211
The more wilderness area the better. Make the entire canyon a wilderness area	101 234182
Protect the areas, but not prohibit ordinary people from enjoying them. Leave these areas accessible and available for everyone. National Parks are already protected. Be responsible and not go for overkill	99 234177
Support the most stringent protection of Grand Canyon Wilderness possible. Over the 25 years I have been hiking the canyon I have been increasingly disturbed by airplane and helicopter noise, boat groups camping in the inner gorge, litter, crowded campsites, etc. This is disturbing to the person willing to do the work of backpacking but I also wonder what harm it does to wildlife. We love our parks to death. Protect our Grand canyon as strictly as possible	85 234140
Concerned many primitive, unpaved park roads may fall under restrictions that come with Wilderness designation. While the provided map refers to these roads as Non-Wilderness Corridors, it is not clear if the 2010 BMP will maintain these as Non-Wilderness Corridors. To visitors properly prepared, these roads provide a unique way to experience park areas otherwise not seen, to get away from crowds, and truly experience the solitude the park offers. Ensure these primitive roads are maintained as Non-Wilderness Corridors so others can experience the canyon at Point Sublime and other primitive areas in the park	64 234079
The entire Grand Canyon ought to be officially designated as Wilderness. The park needs to defend pristine areas when faced with pressures from user groups. If wilderness designation was more official, it would decrease threats Grand Canyon faces and encourage DOI as a whole to be forced not to compromise its integrity. Grant official designation of Grand Canyon as a Wilderness Area	63 234078
Current management of proposed wilderness areas with limited camp areas, development, and no motorized vehicle access will maintain the park in an ideal manner for current and future generations	54 233988
Oppose proposed wilderness area: 1. The canyon is not threatened. Wilderness rules, regulations, criminal fines and penalties are extreme. For example, \$10,000 fine and felony charge for riding a bicycle into a wilderness area (this should be a minor infraction, maybe a misdemeanor). All of the land proposed for wilderness designation is already owned by the federal government. There is no mining, building, or development. The land is already protected. Making the land wilderness is an overreaction when the land isn't threatened. 2. In rescues, such as cave rescues, or climbing rescues, machinery wouldn't be allowed. The rescuers would have to use simple methods. No jacks, winches, helicopters, etc., would be allowed. This will slow rescues and cost lives. 3. Maintenance would become much more labor intensive and expensive. The trails, bridges, water pipeline and pump stations must be maintained. Helicopters and boats can now be used to move heavy equipment and materials. If this area becomes wilderness, no machinery is allowed and maintenance would become much more difficult or impossible. 4. There are still areas, such as the uranium mine, that need to be cleaned up. Machinery will be needed in these areas. Wilderness rules and regulations would stop machinery from being used in the clean up. 5. The canyon's steep terrain is protection in itself. People can't drive ATVs, jeeps, bicycles, or motorcycles in the canyon. This type of environmental damage is non-existent. No new regulations are needed. 6. Fire fighting would also become more difficult or impossible. This would lead to more damage to the land. 7. There will be improvements needed in the future that we can't predict now. Converting this land to wilderness would likely stop these future improvements	53 233987
Having such an intensively used area as the Grand Canyon be designated as wilderness is a bit confusing. I have never considered a national park as wilderness. The mandate for parks includes a whole host of activities, whereas wilderness has but one high purpose. National Parks can regulate activities in the park however they choose with very strict guidelines to prevent overuse and degradation of resources, so what does wilderness designation add? Some places in the park need trail maintenance. Some areas require designated campsites and toilets. What will happen to these places with a wilderness designation?	52 231078
If you do not lay down this protective groundwork someone may come along and challenge your plans or policies. Truly there are so few acres and areas designated wilderness that when an opportunity comes along to	

Wilderness	Designate
	add to that base we should do it. The other thing is for all intents and purposes it is already wilderness in everything but name so we may as well make it official 31 230980
	Assumed most of the park away from major corridors was already designated wilderness. If the question is whether or not to request Congress to officially designate those 1 million plus acres as wilderness, you should do it. Folks who want to drive to vistas but never go a mile from the road, on north rim you can still access the rim via dirt road, and those who want to get into the canyon on their own terms and comfort level, all these can be met at the park 31 230977
	Keep the wilderness designation for the proposed area allowing for limited recreational use, scientific study and cultural and natural resource preservation 30 230975

Wilderness	Opportunity for Solitude
	Limit mechanical noise. National Parks and many other public lands were set aside to protect natural resources, including natural quiet. Parks were not created to promote commercial industries that adversely impact visitor experience of natural resources 47 231063
	Discontinue helicopter overflights over Boucher and Hermit areas. It ruins an outstanding backcountry experience. Reroute helicopter flights over corridor trails. There's a lot of activity on these trails, and on the rim; it's noisy with vehicles, motorcycles, buses and people it would receive little or no notice 390 234937
	Overflights are an ongoing problem. We find them especially irritating in Travertine Canyon on Boucher Trail and on Tanner Trail. At times the noise is constant. After hauling backpack for the better part of a day. It is a huge irritation to be confronted with aircraft noise 456 235034
	Solitude and natural quiet are indispensable aspects of any backcountry or wilderness experience. You can't manage for quiet on the ground if there are endless loud tour planes and helicopters overhead 356 234602
	The main issue the park needs to deal with (which I doubt it will in the name of compromise), is the constant noise from sightseeing flights especially helicopters. I have been places in the canyon where I have not seen people all day, but the noise level from flights was never ending. It is ridiculous to have a wilderness designation with constant man-made noise. You might as well move the canyon to New York City--we could have the smell of car exhaust (but no cars) in the wilderness there also 52 231079
	The quality of my wilderness experience that I have come to appreciate is the beauty of the canyon area, the natural quiet and the solitude. I do not want to see someone around every curve in the trail 348 234579
	Identify and shield the few Grand Canyon Village light bulbs visible from the Tonto Trail 332 234547
	Can't help complaining about airplane and helicopter noise. I have quit using some areas because it ruins the natural experience. One doesn't hike for days to listen to the noise of motors every few seconds 329 234538
	Most helicopter and aircraft flights are hidden from tourists who limit their visit to main hotel areas and road viewpoints on North and South Rim. For those tourists, there is an illusion Grand Canyon is a wild and wonderful place. But, for those of us who visit the Canyon for its wonder and solitude in the primitive and wilderness areas, the experience is sometimes more like Viet Nam or Blackhawk Down 287 234486
	On those days our group conversations were often centered on the irritating nature of aircraft rather than on the beauty of the canyon 269 234449
	I sat alone for many hours high atop a butte, marveling at natural sounds and sights as the sun moved across the sky. This was solitude. I want my little girls and all others to have that same chance in this fine park 154 234382
	Surely technology has gotten to the point where boats can run nearly silent, and airplanes and helicopters can be quieter. I'd like to see more restrictions in the types and amount of traffic in the Canyon that disturbs the natural sounds (or lack thereof) of the place 140 234353
	It is disturbing and upsetting to see aircraft over the Canyon. I have experienced this myself on the Boucher Trail and the Tonto Trail connecting Boucher to Hermit. Please address this issue in the revised Environmental Impact Statement to the BCMP 138 234339

Wilderness	Opportunity for Solitude
	Natural quiet! Does not appear on the backcountry resources board 137 234316
	Keep a cap on overflights and create times of year when overflights are banned from certain areas so backpackers can enjoy natural quiet. Maybe there should be two Dragon Corridors each of which is used at different times of year so backpackers could plan accordingly 122 234246
	Reviewing and modifying the backcountry management plan will be a futile exercise if overflights are not addressed so that actual solitude and peace are reestablished in proposed wilderness areas 118 234231
	Near Boucher Canyon, noise especially from the helicopters was very loud, and nearly all day long. Fewer flights with higher altitude restrictions might help, or possibly requiring quieter aircraft 89 234149
	In a recent visit, we spent time along trails in the no-fly zone and its counterpart. It is thoroughly counter-productive to the backcountry experience to be inundated by the incessant intrusion on the solitude and serenity offered in the Canyon by tour helicopters and planes 81 234131
	I value the convenience of Phantom Ranch (and the Tecates) when staying at Bright Angel Campground with my wife. I value the solitude of the nights spent in Clear Creek Drainage. I value the ruggedness of hiking the Tonto Trail 60 234067
	Minimize noise and eliminate it whenever possible (aircraft, boat motors) 305 233917
	Maximize solitude and the wilderness experience of the Grand Canyon backcountry 305 233916
	The Canyon needs to be quiet so everyone can enjoy the natural beauty: hikers, backpackers, and just simple tourists. People before us have preserved this treasure and we need to continue 299 233901
	There are so many competing groups and needs out there, and primary to that is the ability to enjoy the relative solitude of the remote reaches, while still being able to access it all 289 233889
	Quiet is a scarce commodity in our world. Any opportunity to limit mechanical noise should be implemented. National Parks and many other public lands were set aside to protect natural resources, including natural quiet. Parks were not created to promote commercial industries that adversely impact visitor experience of the park's natural resources 47 231063
	As a birder, I'm attuned to sound, of which planes provide plenty! It's a real distraction to a wilderness experience 45 231057
	Limit air noise from the most remote areas 28 230968
	Do not change laws governing motorized vehicles. Grand Canyon's peace is of utmost importance 17 230561
	The most important thing is lack of noise, including lack of motorized vehicles, air traffic, and limited permits for backcountry facilities 17 230548
	The backcountry experience is about solitude and ease with which you can focus only on the task at hand. There are no distractions, and you really feel at peace 13 230527
	Limit noise pollution from overhead activities. 20 years from now I would like to see the backcountry even more pristine than it is today 9 230489

Wilderness	Experience
	What used to be an area where people would go to experience wilderness, in the manner of the wilderness, finding their own routes, carrying their own food, their own gear, is evolving into a commercialized situation. Professional guides lead hikes, which diminishes the wilderness experience 477 235302
	Demand for hiking the canyon will only grow; prepare for it. After all NPS is willing to fly people off the river for hangnails, why not make people are happy on hiking trails as well. Just a couple trails, this still leaves plenty of wilderness, if you can call it that with the NPS helicopter flying all the time, Phantom Ranch, power lines below the rim and rafts going down the river with motorized engines 459 235052
	I value the factors that make up a wilderness experience such as beauty, solitude, wildlife, and challenging terrain 369 234661

The quality of my wilderness experience I have come to appreciate is the beauty of the canyon, the natural quiet and solitude. I do not want to see someone around every curve in the trail 348 234579
Hikers in use areas designated Wild or Primitive are often alone in their use area, until they get close to the river corridor, which is full of motor boats in summer. Motorboats had a significant detrimental impact on the wilderness experience of the whole trip. NPS should manage the river corridor according wilderness values in a new management plan 58 234062
Maximize solitude and the wilderness experience of the Grand Canyon backcountry 305 233916
I am a believer in the wilderness experience. Areas of Grand Canyon and wilderness sites are much too distant from trailheads to be practical for all but the most vigorous and determined hiker and backpacker 304 233911
Grand Canyon is much busier than many other wilderness areas I have visited, and this has to shift our paradigm of what to expect in a wilderness experience 16 230536
An ideal backcountry experience approximates wilderness as much as is possible. Keep the wilderness in the backcountry. Protect wilderness character to the highest degree possible. Make this a top priority 9 230488
Consistent implementation of the Minimum Requirement Analysis for all administrative activities, ensure park operations, particularly those affecting proposed wilderness, use procedures and equipment that eliminate or at least minimize natural and cultural resource impacts, including experiential impacts; and reduces carbon footprint. Develop training opportunities for backcountry staff (rangers, fire crews, maintenance, resource mgt., and interpretation) to acquire and improve skills relevant to wilderness management (e.g., traditional tools, non-mechanized transport, and an adequate knowledge of natural, evolving wildlands and native wildlife requirements) 481 235355
Scientific research activities and park infrastructure needed to maintain such research are critical to maintaining the backcountry as a wilderness 524 235404

Economics

This BMP has potential to significantly hinder or promote health and viability of our business 472 235222
Reopen forest management to timber companies and lumber business. Let the state manage wolves. Open mining leases around Grand Canyon. All provide jobs in Arizona. Stop lawsuits by anti groups 312 233924
Lost CUA monies for the Park; Reduces spending by guests as guided-guests spend more given traditional socio-economic profile; impacts Park revenues, concessionaires revenues and non-profit revenues; Risks for CUA and other small businesses associated with changes; Has potential to put small entities out of business, to put all guides out of work or greatly reduce their work, to negatively impact a wide variety of related businesses: auto shops, food stores, gear and equipment stores, insurance companies, airlines, car rentals, etc. Negative impact on Arizona and U.S. tourism (numbers and impression/brand image). Backcountry permits become commodities for sale at places like eBay (despite being illegal). Overseas operators arrange tour groups without proper certified guides or awareness of Park, etc. (Operating as unofficial CUAs) 464 235243
Regulations that limit the ability of CUA holders to operate will almost certainly increase Park costs related to rescues, compromise backcountry resources, deny a percentage of the population an opportunity to experience a national treasure, and reduce regional economic benefits associated with guest dollars spent 156 234417
Analyze contributions companies make to management and preservation, and the cooperative effort by all to foster private sector participation in management 355 234599
While NPS does a good job in its current capacity, private guides provide a greater source of oversight and more protection to the Canyon. These companies not only provide jobs but help support the local economy by attracting visitors willing to pay for these services and the underlying taxes 362 234619
This proposed plan stands in stark contrast to the principles of competition and consumer choice in the free market America has the privilege to enjoy. In an economy already plagued by years of recession and government spending, eliminating private industry from the BMP seems not only criminal but thoroughly un-American, and inherently inefficient 447 235015
Numerous communities spanning multiple states have a niche in the backcountry service industry. Numerous businesses in Northern Arizona, Central Arizona, Southern Utah, and Southern Nevada would be devastated by

Economics

the loss of revenue incurred by such a plan. Eliminating these mom and pop family oriented companies would literally put Americans out of work with repercussions on the economy wider than just the families that would lose a large portion of their income 447 235017

Keep local business in the park, it is important to local communities. It says this in your mission statement and it seems you have a responsibility to do that 459 235055

Do not kick guides off corridor trails. We'd go out of business if we couldn't work on those trails 463 235071

Other Concerns

Improve Hermit Road. Plan does not go far enough in improving roadway safety and driving conditions on South Rim's western section 283 234474

Better clarify park boundaries and relations with neighbors. No one seems to know or agree where park boundaries start and finish. This makes it tough to access remote areas and do it by the rules. If well defined it would be easier to plan and coordinate a trip. If not well defined, the park's future is limited 459 235047

NPS needs to freeze commercial development on South rim. Any further development will diminish the canyon's quality experience. Commercial development of North Rim should not be expanded 369 234664

Increase fees for transporting backpacks to Bright Angel campgrounds. If doubling pack charges eliminates a few campers, I'm sure there are backpackers to take their places 91 234153

Permanent ban on future hydro electric proposals 116 234220

Everyone is aware of the number of birds killed annually by wind turbines, and the horrendous disturbance to large and small animals; vigorously oppose these projects to keep them away from the Canyon! 511 235142

Xanterra improvements: Expand facilities, especially meal seating limits for Phantom Ranch 110 234205

Open Phantom Ranch shower facilities to the public for a minimal charge. The current policy of restricting access seems very unfair to campsite permit holders, rafters, and day hikers 174 234420

No more cell phone coverage within the canyon. We find it hard to tell our tour guests to leave the cell phones at their hotel when they see other hikers using their phones. It's not a big problem yet but as the world gets more connected this could be a bigger issue 349 234583

I expect there will be much interest in expanding wireless network, cell phone service and other kinds of telecom coverage to the various levels of the Grand Canyon. I think it would be terrible to see more towers for power lines and transmission antennae on or below the rim 21 230599

No electric transmission lines should be allowed 320 233964

Xantara has been impossible to access, their phone is always busy on the first of a month when we have tried to get Phantom Ranch reservations. The chaos of this system must be improved. These rooms are so precious, they should make the cost non-refundable for any reason, and allow reservation farther in advance, with a requirement that one checks in at Bright Angel by 9am (or some logical time) or the room is released to a walk-in 338 234560