

Correspondence ID: 1 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: medcor Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: OfficialRep

Received: Jan,30,2017 18:14:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wish to express our company support to expand the coverage and capabilities for telecommunications as outlined by the plans. We have a strong need for increased accessibility with all telecommunications in a professional capacity. This is decreased functionality is an issue that directly affects our clinic mission and consequently becomes a patient safety.

We have had to cobble together a system to transmit radiology images from our Lake clinic to a radiologist because of the lack of bandwidth available. While the system currently works, a more direct and speedy route would be even better.

Additionally the overloaded cell towers in the area make this form of communication unreliable and problematic which limits our access to providers and off duty staff in times of crisis.

Increasing the telecommunications capabilities would be an improvement in our operational capabilities. We support this project fully. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 05:35:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our National Parks are not Disneyland. They are not a place to remain tethered to technology. They are a place to experience the world that exists outside the realm of our everyday civilized life. Parks are a place to come to terms with a world that is bigger than we are, that allows us to escape from the petty human-focused view that we are surrounded with every day. Those who insist on having access to all the trappings of social media might as well stay home and just experience their virtual reality and leave the parks to those of us who care about the value of nature and wilderness. Not only should we not add to the technology in the parks, we should actively remove what is there. It adds nothing to the parks.

Correspondence ID: 3 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Ms. Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Jan,31,2017 05:45:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have visited Yellowstone twice and will be there again in September 2017. The first time in 2013 it was difficult to communicate with my husband who was not with me. He was always nervous if he didn't hear from me. Of course the main sites have service but I was only able to call in certain areas. We literally lived by how many bars our phone had. We would pull off the road as soon as we heard the phone beeping, so we could make a call home. The second time in 2015 we stayed in fishing bridge it was so much easier. I didn't have to worry about what time I could contact him. I can appreciate unplugging in Yellowstone but the cell service I think allows people to be at ease in an area where anything can go wrong. I don't want

to watch TV just want to be able to communicate in an emergency. People can unplug themselves they don't need it done for them. Communication with Rangers would be so much simpler if there were an emergency. I've seen how people disregard their safety to get a good shot of an animal, more and more you will need to respond to incidents and the cell service will come in handy.

Correspondence ID: 4 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 07:13:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the NPS in making sure that emergency communication is available in as many places within the parks as possible. There is a difference though between emergency communication and the need to upload photos to Instagram. Emergency communication can be completed by calling or texting 911. With technology the way it is today, I'm sure cell towers could be configured to only allow for voice and text. Towers that allow data transmission should be low power and confined to areas near visitor housing (ie: Lodges and cabins). If the NPS makes it easier for people to be able to almost instantaneously take a photo and upload it on social media then I believe we will likely see more things like bison selfies.

Correspondence ID: 5 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: United States of America Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Jan,31,2017 08:28:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You can bury it, put it in vaults, under roads and otherwise hide the towers and wires, but you can't hide the sound of someone's cell phone playing "Sweet Home Alabama" full blast on the Lamar River or any other wilderness place where we go to escape these telecommunication devices and the culture and civilization they represent. So I vote no to the new improvements and furthermore favor the removal of all cell equipment from within the park or near its boundaries.

Thank you,



Correspondence ID: 6 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 09:57:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support these upgrades as long as it means that the Mt Washburn antennae will still supply cell service in Slough Creek. I depend on that service when staying in Cooke City to be able to check for emergency messages from my pet sitters and family. I spend most of my time in the Northern Tier while visiting.

I think that having access to cell service in the park is good for safety as well.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 7 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 10:02:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to building more cell towers / communication centers in YNP, including the Mount Washburn area. They are aesthetically ugly. More people walking around YNP glued to their cell phones, smart phones and i-pads makes YNP less appealing. It's already bad enough.

Correspondence ID: 8 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 13:53:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would not be opposed to a well designed added to the Yellowstone National Park.

Correspondence ID: 9 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 13:56:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Better cell service would make it MUCH easier to keep-check on my elderly Mother while visiting the park, thus, it would make my park stay more enjoyable.

Correspondence ID: 10 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 14:06:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The last thing the park needs is better cell phone coverage. If cell blockers were installed I'd appreciate that more. Make people put away their phone and look up! We need rangers explaining to tourists about not taking selfies with buffalo, not making it all the easier to Live broadcast from the park!!!! Who paid how much to get this on the docket? Verizon? Sprint? It's a national park, not a coffee shop. Please treat it like the treasure it is. This is just stupid!

Correspondence ID: 11 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 14:16:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep Yellowstone wild! We have enough people in the park that are

distracted by devices. I do not support expanding cell service in the park.

Correspondence ID: 12 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 14:20:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't spend park money on this project. Increase cell phone connectivity does not increase the public's benefit in using the park. There are lodges with wifi and land lines if there is an emergency, as well as trained rangers and responders. I see you plan to hide them from view, but more people distracted by their phones while driving and hiking in the park will be a far bigger problem regardless of how unobtrusive the towers are. If there is a way to support park communications without increasing the public's cell usage in the park, I think that would be ok, but I'd rather see the money go to preserving historic structures and funding outreach and education efforts.

Correspondence ID: 13 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 14:28:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not agree with having more cell service in the park. Yellowstone is a beautiful and peaceful place where you should be enjoying nature. Not constantly on your phone. I can see increased safety hazards to both other visitors and wildlife resulting from texting and driving. Please keep this place as wild as possible.

Correspondence ID: 14 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 14:30:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The plans appear to make the least impact on the environment possible while bringing modern technology to the area. With all modernization, we have to accept some changes to the landscape. It seems to me that this plan is aesthetically pleasing and conscientiously designed.

Correspondence ID: 15 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 14:47:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No!!! People come to YNP to disconnect from technology. YNP is my favorite national park because it is natural. Cell phones and cell phone towers are not natural parts of the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 16 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 14:56:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would support improvements or replacements to existing structures, but it looks like (based on the photo simulations) that there will be many additions. I don't think this is necessary and is rather unsightly in a national park/wilderness setting. Additionally, while I understand that this is in part for safety of visitors; people need to understand that they are in the wilderness, that cell service is NOT guaranteed, that they need to use common sense and be careful and know their limitations. Providing cell service is not a necessity. What would people have done 20 years ago before they had a smart phone? Do we really need to encourage more selfies with wildlife that they can then instantly post to instagram? This money could be used elsewhere in the park. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 17 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 15:03:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, cell service should NOT be improved!

As a parent, I understand people feeling they need to be able to use their cell phone at all times. And I understand the view of it being a safety issue. However, improving the cell service in Yellowstone should NOT be done. With the winding roads and high traffic flow, better cell service will increase the amount of accidents since people will be distracted with their phones. That is one of many issues better cell service will bring. The backcountry draws people in because of the disconnect from life's chaos, most people going into the backcountry don't want cell service. The money spent to increase cell service could go to so many other park services.

Correspondence ID: 18 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 15:15:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not add more coverage. There is coverage at the campgrounds and hotels. Absolutely no need to have it anywhere else. I LOVED that I did not have coverage while I was there last summer. It's all about unplugging and connecting with yourself and nature. Please please. Don't add more. It's an unnecessary expense. Leave the world behind people. And find yourself.

Correspondence ID: 19 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 15:21:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In a society that is struggling with addiction to digital devices, I do not

believe better cell service is needed in the parks. Not having service in some areas gives them a chance to look up at the surrounding environment. Also, it is very stressful to go to a park and have the serenity of enjoying nature ruined by the ringing of cell phones or the person not paying attention as they Pokémon or whatever. Please put the money to better use.

Correspondence ID: 20 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 15:22:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I understand that, in some instances, improved cell phone service would be helpful for staff and visitor safety. My concern is that improved service will also allow visitors to enter the park without proper safety preparations. They will likely just rely on being able to make a phone call if they have a safety issue.

I also feel that improved cell service will detract from the experience of visiting the park - visitors walking trails and boardwalks while talking on their phone will be a nuisance and a distraction for others. In addition, driving the roads in Yellowstone is challenging enough during peak season. Having drivers on the phone or using text messaging will only increase the risk of accidents involving other motorists or wildlife.

I hope the plan will be carefully and fully reviewed to determine whether or not the benefits outweigh the negatives before anything is done to change the current situation. We have visited the park annually since 1999 and have never had an issue with lack of service. We are prepared for it when we arrive and we've learned to deal with it. I also visited the parks a number of times with my parents in the 1970's. We survived just fine with NO cell service at all.

Correspondence ID: 21 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 15:24:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No!!! There isn't a need for service! We go to the parks to get away from all the phones, etc. I don't want to see towers and people standing around on their phones the entire time.....

I see plenty of that out in the world.....

If there is an emergency... help is nearby... they will be the ones with access....

Correspondence ID: 22 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 15:32:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, I am in favor of this proposal. Communications and safety are

important.

Correspondence ID: 23 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 15:38:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We enjoy the lack of connectedness that comes from being in the Park. Please do not ugly up the landscape with cell towers. I don't want to hear other peoples' phones beeping. I want to hear water rushing, birds, families talking, that sort of thing. As it is, and has been JUST FINE for 100 years, it's nice and quiet. And, frankly, if you can't disconnect for a few days, then maybe the park just isn't for you. Yes, I have a 9-year-old who complained about lack of service when we visited in August. Yes, he got over it.

Correspondence ID: 24 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 15:49:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Upgrade existing but no new towers. There are enough people walking around with faces in phones as it is or driving and texting. Yellowstone is a great place to get away from the electronic world for a bit.

Correspondence ID: 25 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 15:58:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I concur with updating the technology to provide better communication in the management of Park functions, especially for emergency communication, I have issue with it being for the 'betterment of the visitor experience'. I visit Yellowstone two to three times each year, and have been doing so since 1989. I have been witness to the improvement of cell service during that time, so that when I need to contact someone, I can do so in certain places within the Park. However, I abhor seeing people talking on their phones, sending texts, and being on Facebook even while viewing the sites; for they are missing the whole point to visiting a national park - getting away from civilization. In that regard I do not believe having improved cellular service benefits the visitor experience. As an executive, I like to get away from the craziness of the 'real world' by disconnecting. When my staff, colleagues and clients know that I am going to be in Yellowstone, they also know that I am not accessible. While this is a personal preference, I believe that it is an important one to bring visitors the true experience.

Towers may be camouflaged with extensions to look like tree limbs, and the use thereof I would approve for the new towers being placed. I further support new towers being placed in location and as replacement for current towers, as indicated in the proposal. I would expect contractors utilized for the work perform such in a way that it has minimal impact on the flora and fauna;

and that all damage be immediately remediated.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 26 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:00:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO! I for one believe that the wild places should be left wild. I would believe the motive for safety or emergencies to be true if this was 10 or more years ago, but in today's day, its only to stay connected via social media. If people want that, they can stay at home as they are most likely staring at their phones in the park anyways. Don't mess up the outdoors because the populace can't handle being away from their precious social media. After all, national parks were created to preserve the wild lands of America. Cell phones are not wild lands or part of it. Yellowstone should be a vacation and not being annoyed by a cell phone is part of a vacation in my opinion.

Correspondence ID: 27 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:06:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am responding to a FB posting about cell phone coverage areas being expanded in YNP. Really, people have explored YNP for a long time without a cell phone. If you are seriously that concerned about being 'unavailable' while out of cell phone range - get a satellite phone. Leave the screen behind and enjoy nature.

Correspondence ID: 28 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:07:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The parks need to remain a wilderness retreat as much as possible. Adding infrastructure and technology are contrary to the reasons many visit the parks in the first place. I am against improving cell phone reception in any National Park.

Correspondence ID: 29 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:11:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No reason to change. No added service

Correspondence ID: 30 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** Jan,31,2017 16:16:35**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, please upgrade cell service. I know many purists would like to see the parks just as they were when they were first developed but we allow cars and other modern amenities in the parks and upgraded cell phone and Wi-Fi service is a natural progression and in my opinion necessary.

Correspondence ID: 31 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2017 16:19:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I support the improvement of cellular service in Yellowstone National Park. I do not support the idea of limiting it to the front country and trying to keep signals from the backcountry. It is in backcountry areas where a cell phone can be the most useful in calling for help in the event of an emergency situation.

Improving cell phone coverage to Front country areas will certainly affect the larger number of visitors, but failure to do so for those in the backcountry is likely to have a more drastic potential for negative outcomes for people in need of emergency medical care where time is an important factor. You would simply be catering to the Hotel crowd and ignoring the thousands who take the trails less traveled.

As a retired ranger I know of several incidents where a visitor in the backcountry was able to obtain needed assistance because they were able to get a cell phone signal. Lives were saved because of cell phones in the backcountry.

I think the NPS is open to liability issues if it is found that someone ends up dying in the backcountry due to an NPS policy that purposely aimed antennas so as not to provide coverage that could otherwise have allowed for help to have been summoned.

The argument that cell phones are intrusive in the backcountry is specious. People who don't want to receive calls in the backcountry simply have to turn off their phones. If you wanted to request people turn their phones off or set to silent mode you could suggest that on backcountry permits or at trailhead signs.

The NPS is always asking how we can make ourselves more relevant to visitors. Recognizing that the widest possible coverage of cell phone technology is in the best interest of the visitor and emergency responders (who also need coverage when in the backcountry) would help make the NPS relevant to everyone concerned.

Reducing the visual footprint of the various antennae is a good idea, but given the location of the Heritage Resource Center smack dab in the middle of the Historic Roosevelt Arch viewscape, it seems that the NPS doesn't really care too much about such matters.

Correspondence ID: 32 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:22:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of improving cellular service in the park, particularly if the towers are not in view. I am also in favor of replacing existing towers, if the new tower is similar to the old tower. In the case of Mt. Washburn, it sounds like you are cleaning up the antennas, and that seems reasonable, too.

I am in favor because it increases safety for visitors and visitors can choose to turn off their phones. I was at Mt. Rainier last summer. There is no cell service there, but there were still plenty of people walking around with their radios turned up loud.

On a personal note, my husband became severely ill in the park and had to go by ambulance to Cody. That was after I had to drive however many miles with him sick until I could get to the phone booth at Fishing Bridge. I got left behind at Fishing Bridge in the middle of the night. It was nearly impossible for me to get in contact with the hospital to figure out what was going on. I tried the pay phone - I believe the bill was \$35 for maybe five minutes. I found some signal east of Fishing Bridge, but barely. This was not a case of us not planning ahead or taking a risk. My husband is not old. He was simply stricken with a severe, acute, life-threatening illness that has no warning symptoms. Just unlucky.

I do appreciate the wildness of wilderness. We have backpacked many times in the wilderness and Yellowstone. A cell tower that we can't see, but might save a life, I'm OK with that.

Correspondence ID: 33 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:23:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I visited Yellowstone for the first time this past fall. What a glorious and special place! I have to say, part of what made Yellowstone feel special, is that it is still wild in so many ways. Not having great cell service adds to that "wildness" in my opinion.

That said, I would be in favor of improved cellular coverage in the following conditions: a) if the visual impact (ugly antennae highly visible to the public, vistas impaired, etc.) is limited, b) if the environmental impact is limited, and c) if it is genuinely in the best interests of safety and allow the park rangers to better execute their jobs.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 34 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:31:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a senior citizen who twice hiked the Mt Washburn trail, I certainly would have felt more secure if I'd had cell phone service along the way. I even changed cell phone providers the second time hoping that would allow me to get service. I would have hiked the trail a third time (for my 70th birthday), but the lack of service discouraged me.

It makes little sense not to offer this service to park visitors, and I'd like to have it if I come back to hike the trail for my 75th year.

Correspondence ID: 35 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:40:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: When I go to Yellowstone, I go to "unplug". I do not see a need to have more coverage. I go to Yellowstone twice per year, Spring and Autumn, and I find that with AT&T, you can find some spotty coverage some places in the park, and definitely in the surrounding towns.

Correspondence ID: 36 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 16:59:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would not mind having cell phone service in the parks. I travel to as many parks as I can every year. Yellowstone needs some service in a lot of areas. Seems like it should be a safety concerns more than anything else.

See you in August, regards

Correspondence ID: 37 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 17:04:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Leave as is, park is for peace an enjoyment. Not to be encroached upon by idiots without logical control of their devices.

Correspondence ID: 38 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 17:18:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I took 2 trips to Yellowstone, 2 to Glacier, 1 to Crater Lake. I have been visiting for decades and the most recent trips in Yellowstone I can honestly say that the use of cell phones has denigrated the awe and beauty in the serenity of the moment. It also creates ruder tourists in hot spots because they block paths, views, and IMHO- exasperated the lack of reverence and respect to break the rules to make instant fame on social media networks. I'm heartbroken from the damage done this Summer to Yellowstone. Please don't assist this behavior! I can tolerate the over indulgence inside the lodges. It did take away from our stay in the lodge at Crater Lake which used to pride itself with the nostalgia of reading on chatting with visitors from around the world by a cozy hearth. Thanks for the opportunity to comment!

Correspondence ID: 39 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 17:22:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think that improving cell service in the Park is ok, especially for emergency situations. A tower can be built that blends into the environment rather than putting up a large metal structure. I have seen pictures of cell towers that look like trees and blend into the surroundings and go unnoticed from a distance.

Correspondence ID: 40 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 17:49:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You go to YNP to connect with nature, not with your phone. Let it remain one of the last truly free places where you are not shackled by others on thier phone. the annoying ringtones disrupt wildlife too. Can you imagine how far an electronic ring travels, how many animals with acute hearing, hear it? Please leave it be. There are rangers for emergencies.

Correspondence ID: 41 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 18:28:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I spent a week in Yellowstone 2016, I was at first frustrated by because I live tech everyday. However, that quickly changed I loved the solitude and the disconnect. People talk to each other and families were not distracted by the phones or other devices. It was marvelous to see, please leave it as it is now.

Correspondence ID: 42 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 18:45:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support all efforts to improve civilian comm in YNP. Wireless makes

SAR easier. Make comm as easy as possible. Ask your SAR troops how much better it is to have coordinates or a signal to home in on.

Correspondence ID: 43 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 18:45:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Last summer entering the park from the South Gate we had a semi emergency. One of the kids locked the keys in the car. It is a totally dead spot. No cell, no Onstar and no landline at the ranger station. It is one of the busiest places in the park and it was shocking that there was not a form of communication. I, and 4 kids found a ranger and begged him to call for us. He radioed to Lake for help, and the guy came 2 1/2 hours later. I am not complaining for the wait, it was our fault. It would have been so much nicer to communicate with someone myself. The ranger had duties and once telling us that help was on the way he was gone. We were left wondering. I think there should be better service at least at the main places in the park. I shudder to think how you would report an accident and call for emergency help. In this day and age of more people visiting the communication has got to be updated. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 44 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 18:46:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Spill over in to the backcountry might be a good thing for emergency response purposes. If you want quiet and solitude don't take your cell phone or don't turn it on.

Correspondence ID: 45 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 19:31:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm in support of better coverage in general. I trust that the national parks service planners and personnel will do what can be done to limit spillover.

Correspondence ID: 46 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 19:38:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What man come on we're talking bout Yellowstone escape from rest of the world in the west don't screw that up to people can live without a damm cell phone

Correspondence ID: 47 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 19:42:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I did not see a need for better service while in the park. I spent a week there with my family in 2015. We were just fine...never felt the need for better service. The only reason I could see to improve on the service is public safety. In case someone needed help, otherwise, no.

Correspondence ID: 48 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 19:47:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose any cellphone upgrades in Yellowstone National Park. Use the money for the preservation of nature.
No to the cellphone service upgrade!

Correspondence ID: 49 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 20:12:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep cell phone service limited. The worst thing i see in the park is people looking down at their phones missing all the beauty surrounding them. I spent 3days this summer with a backcountry camping permit at 3 different locations in the park. Three of the most impressive days i have spent in nature. Hiking all the way to the end of seven mile hole. It was all magical and a huge part of that was the fact that i kept my phone on airplane mode unless needed for an emergency or to check in with a friend to let them know we were still kicking around the park.

Correspondence ID: 50 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 20:17:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I understand the need to keep the wildlife and landscape intact and safe, there is also a safety need. Better cellphone service throughout the park could save lives. There are many uneducated tourists who visit Yellowstone. There are many who need to be educated, but that doesn't mean they will take the time and a cellphone may mean life or death if they so choose to ignore regulations and do something dumb at the wrong time.

Correspondence ID: 51 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 20:26:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please so not add cell service to Yellowstone. It is just fine the way it is.

We go there to enjoy nature and each other. It was one of the best things for my family when we visited and had little service. It makes you connect in a totally different way. I am also concerned what all the wifi service would do to the animals and land. It's already not healthy for humans. Please keep the parks as a place to disconnect from our phones and just immerse in nature!

Correspondence ID: 52 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Veteran of Foreign War (VFW) Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Jan,31,2017 20:41:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not increase cellular service. People holding cell coversations, texting and the sound of ringing phones will severly detract from the serene, natural atmoshphere on the boardwalks and hiking trails. The national parks are the last vestige of the peace of nature.

Correspondence ID: 53 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 20:59:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would strongly oppose any placement of additional cellular communication or antennas in the national parks, especially Yellowstone National Park. One of my favorite memories of my vacation there was that I was able to fully enjoy the solitude of the park, and that was largely possible to to the fact I was "off the grid" with no cellular service. I was insulated and maybe even isolated from my work email and social media because of no cellular service, and I was thankful for that. Please leave it the way it is. I look forward to that solitude being there when I return.

Best Regards,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 54 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 21:38:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support improving cellular service in the park. As someone that frequents the area, I feel that the beauty of it is in the isolation. People need to have the disconnect from technology, otherwise nature is no longer the relaxing getaway it has been for years.

Correspondence ID: 55 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 21:44:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, no, a thousand times no. Please keep Verizon and their horrible fake tree cell phone towers out of the parks. Wireless radiation is a pollutant, and it is a possible carcinogen, according to the World Health Organization. I come to the parks for peace and relaxation, not to get radiated by microwave radiation. Camping is about being at one with nature, not being at one with you damn phone. Please, please, keep these horrible transmitters out. Where else can we escape them, if not in nature?

Correspondence ID: 56 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 21:53:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love being able to just shut off when visiting the park. So much of what makes this such a great destination is being able to enjoy time with your family and disconnect. If a level of safety can be maintained without infringing on the beauty of the park then why change the current coverage.

Correspondence ID: 57 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 21:54:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would vote no to more cell towers in Yellowstone National Park. The parks are the best place to disconnect in our world and day and age. There is already limited service in the park and I believe that is sufficient. More towers would add a visual footprint that is not appealing and does not flow with the original theme of getting back to nature. Thank you for the opportunity to give my opinion.

Correspondence ID: 58 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 22:01:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Adding more cell service will degrade the park experience for everyone, including those who want more reception. This is a big mistake. It goes against experiencing something timeless that can't be found elsewhere. It also means more hazards on the roadways...peoplet texting and driving, sending photo while the drive, etc. They'really already horribly distracted...please don't allow this.

Correspondence ID: 59 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Jan,31,2017 22:02:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Adding more cell service will degrade the park experience for everyone, including those who want more reception. This is a big mistake. It goes against experiencing

something timeless that can't be found elsewhere. It also means more hazards on the roadways...people texting and driving, sending photos while they drive, etc. They're already horribly distracted...please don't allow this.

Correspondence ID: 60 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 22:16:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Expansion of cell coverage is not necessary. Don't destroy the natural beauty with ugly cell towers. Not in favor of the cell coverage expansion.

Correspondence ID: 61 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 23:35:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I welcome the improvements. My husband is wheelchair bound. We are constantly aware of areas where there is no cell service. In an emergency we would have an issue if we could not make a phone call for help.

Correspondence ID: 62 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jan,31,2017 23:49:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When I'm visiting the parks it's for several reasons, none of which is to make cell phone calls or play games on my phone. In fact, one of the primary reasons for visiting the park is to unplug. My wish would be to leave it alone.

Correspondence ID: 63 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 04:21:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please no no no no no more damage to our parks and our peace and quiet. If we are to endure all the garbage of the outside world then there should be no entry fee. What are we entering?

Correspondence ID: 64 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Nuhop.org Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Feb,01,2017 07:02:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First of all.. Thank you for collecting input from us as users of the parks!! In today's political and social climate it feels nice when a service likes yours actively seeks my

and our collective voices.

I understand and support the necessity for the safety and well being of park staff to have an up to date and consistent means of communication. I wish there was another way than upgrading the telecommunications in the way that has been proposed.

My deepest concern is that I am already inundated with people on their cellular devices in my day to day work, and personal life. I use the parks as a way to escape the tech and unplug. Understandably people will want to photo/video document their experiences in the National Parks. I feel though that allowing further access of telecommunications to the public will only detract from those who truly want to live in the moment in our great protected parks.

Therefore if you are truly asking for my opinion, I would vote to look for an alternative means for park staff to communicate and less telecommunications access for the public.

Thank you again for giving the park users a chance to way in!! And good luck in your decision.

"I do not know the key to success, but I know the key to failure is trying to please everyone."

Regards,

■

Correspondence ID: 65 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 07:08:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't think additional cell service is necessary in the park. I actually enjoy coming into the park and turning off my cell phone, because it doesn't have service.

I think added cell coverage will not only take away from the visitor experience, it will also lead to more auto accidents and increase the threat visitors pose to wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 66 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 07:32:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly vote "no". The National Parks are an area to foster a love of nature and the outdoors. Increasing access to social media, cellular connections, etc will likely encourage people to be talking, taking and posting selfies and texting while in the outdoors. Also, texting and driving is a big enough problem as it is; it does not seem reasonable or necessary to increase the risk of that in the park with all the wildlife and pedestrians.

Correspondence ID: 67 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 09:04:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have visited Yellowstone every summer for the past eight Summers. Yellowstone is a very special place to me and my friends. Part of what makes Yellowstone such a unique place that will bring you so close to Nature is the separation of today's modern Technologies. Not being able to tap into the grid whenever you want is a blessing in this place. It allows you to actually look up and enjoy the world. By adding cell service I truly believe we would be doing an injustice to the park and the people visiting it. Not only will it affect the individuals with the mobile device, but the people around them as well that come to get away from it. Please keep Yellowstone exactly how it is so we can all enjoy the beauty of Mother Nature.

Correspondence ID: 68 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 09:17:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not encourage cell phone use in the park! We enjoy the escape from phones and people talking loudly! It's so calming to be ankle to hear the sounds of the park, not the sounds of technology.

Correspondence ID: 69 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 09:50:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The point of the national Park system was to allow us to have the most primitive, pristine examples of what this country is and was. Adding cell towers, digging, drilling for oil, or otherwise impacting these natural resources detrimental original purpose and cause behind their original establishment.

Please do not allow these cell towers. People will live without Facebook. These national parks are the best representative of the importance of properly managed resources. If you distort them into just a hybrid of modern technology and primitive landscape you lint the available effect.

Correspondence ID: 70 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 09:52:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please Do NOT spend money to improve cell phone service. That's part of the beauty of visiting the area, we should disconnect in order to fully appreciate the vast and grande nature of the park.

Correspondence ID: 71 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Yellowstone Forever Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Feb,01,2017 10:07:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do it! As long as it is environmentally sound!

Correspondence ID: 72 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 11:14:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote no. I worry about more people taking selfies and posting to social media, texting and driving, and talking on the cell phone while looking at our national treasures.

Correspondence ID: 73 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 11:28:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If there has to be towers in YNP - they should at least be camouflaged to "blend in" even if they never will completely look like the surrounding area. I believe there needs to be areas where the park is still the park and not have to have cell phone coverage in every single corner. We should be protecting the wildness instead of catering to the excuses of "emergency situations" and "communication." Whatever did we do when there were no cell phones?

Correspondence ID: 74 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 11:39:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am all for preserving our natural spaces. As a Boy Scout Leader we discourage technology on camp outs. However, it has become abundantly clear that technology can also enhance the wilderness experience by providing guidance in the sites, alerts to visitors, such as fires, traffic, etc. The national park service currently provides a cell phone application to Yellowstone that provides maps and attraction information. Cell service is also a lifeline for people who need emergency assistance. Cell technology provides a social dimension to sharing the excitement with others. Cell towers can be implemented so as not to detract from the natural beauty. We actually saw sever towers that were disguised as trees during our last drive towards the park.

I am all for the expansion and enhancement of cell service in Yellowstone and our other national parks. We live in an information age and better cell service opens up the possibility to provide better adventure for the visitors. Digital data is green, reducing trash and litter well at the same time allowing folks to contribute to the corpus of information about the parks.

Correspondence ID: 75 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 12:56:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: One of my favorite parts of being in yellowstone for a summer was my lack of reachability. I am strongly against the idea of increasing cell service- - it is simply not necessary. If you cannot go without your phone for more than 2 days- then I don't think the national parks are a place for you. The job of the national park service is to preserve the parks for the enjoyment of the people- and one definitely does not need their phone to enjoy yellowstone. Yellowstone's remoteness and being off the grid is one of my favorite parts of the park. There are so few places like such anymore. Furthermore, some of my best adventures came from the fact that people were unable to be in constant contact with one another.

Correspondence ID: 76 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 13:33:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have visited Yellowstone 6 times and always go back because it is "unplugged" from the rest of the world where I can be at peace without people talking on cell phones and ringers going off. This is especially important considering how many people visit the park.

Please do not change this aspect of the park.

Correspondence ID: 77 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Yellowstone Forever Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Feb,01,2017 13:35:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider the technical improvements for cell service in YNP. My last trip there, I admit to being frustrated by the lack of cell service. But that lack drove me to enjoy the natural wonders of the park. When needed, I traveled to those developed areas of the park where service was available. It caused a lot less inconvenience than I thought.

A suggested improvement is to make the available service more carrier neutral, not increase the area of service. It seems higher charges apply to those who don't have the correct carrier. So my input is to please not further infringe upon the natural habitat with increased service areas, but, instead, make the current service areas available to all carriers so that users who want/ need service don't get higher costs, but still have service available.

And for those worried about emergencies...rather than depend on the increased technology, simply plan better.

Correspondence ID: 78 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** Feb,01,2017 14:00:09**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: As much as technology has taken over all of our daily lives, the wonderful part about national parks is that they help us escape the connected world and get back in touch with our nature side. Poor cell service is a wonderful thing when you are in such a beautiful place with amazing sites every where you turn. I'd say leave it as is. Keep the parks as natural as we can.

Correspondence ID: 79 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,01,2017 14:02:08**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that since more ignorant and irresponsible people are entering the park there has to be access to contact park staff about dangerous and illegal activities

Correspondence ID: 80 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** retired Yellowstone NPS ranger Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** Member**Received:** Feb,01,2017 14:10:57**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Good proposal. Do it.

Correspondence ID: 81 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,01,2017 14:32:16**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I have been fortunate to vacation twice in Yellowstone. Most recently was Spring, 2016, for 8 days. I would oppose any expansion of cell service in the park. There are areas where you can get coverage if one desires. Part of the enjoyment of being in the park, is not only the natural beauty that surrounds a visitor and the wildlife, but the solitude one can discover by not "being connected" 24/7. Please do not expand cellular service in the park.

Correspondence ID: 82 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,01,2017 14:42:31**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Sell phone service should not be expanded. The park is all about reconnecting with nature, expanding cell service would seem to be at odds with goal. I am self employed and rely on my phone but there is a time and place for everything, the park is not the place. As long as most hotel areas are covered that should suffice.

Correspondence ID: 83 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Paradigm Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Feb,01,2017 15:03:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hiking up Mt Washburn and seeing Yellowstone in it's entirety for the first time is an incredibly powerful experience. Nothing can ruin a moment faster than hearing someone's phone tinging playing an idiotic tune. I would be grateful if we kept the area free from this kind of unwarranted intrusions. Let us enjoy it the way it is intended. Don't allow cell phone towers up there.

Correspondence ID: 84 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 15:40:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not make cell service available in national parks. Teach people to enjoy nature and vacation somewhere else if they need social media. It's bad enough that they get to close to the animals already.

Correspondence ID: 85 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 15:47:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No people are on their phones all the time already they drive while reading messages already. It is more dangerous for those around them and the animals. Let them check the mail at all the junctions where coverage already exists.

Correspondence ID: 86 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 16:09:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a full time employee of Xanterra Parks and Resorts based at Old Faithful in YNP, I rely on cell service and the Internet for many of life's necessities. The current bandwidth and speed issues usually interrupt my ability to perform many online tasks people take for granted such as banking and Bill payment. It also prevents me from taking online continuing education courses which has stymied my career.

Correspondence ID: 87 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 16:22:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not expand cell phone service to any other area of YNP. People are in desperate need of "unplugging" from the real world, and travelling throughout

Yellowstone should be definitely one of those places. For one, they would appreciate the natural beauty of the place more if their eyes aren't glued to the screens of their devices. Two, there are so many "distractions" already with driving the YNP roads- -- -animals come from out of nowhere onto the roads. I truly believe that because of this, there would be a major increase in traffic related accidents if given the extra distraction of phone service while travelling the Greater Yellowstone region.

Correspondence ID: 88 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 16:25:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a current employee of the park, I strongly support this proposal and plan to improve cellular communication thought the park.

In order to improve the safety and enjoyment of Yellowstone for both visitors and employees, I believe improving communication and access to networks is of critical importance.

In addition the environmental and "visual" impacts to the park and visitors seem minimal.

Correspondence ID: 89 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 16:42:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I ask that you not allow the expansion of cell phone reception inside the boundaries of Yellowstone Park.

I just read an article published in the Casper Star Tribune in 2015, and it appears that many of the emergencies, injuries, and unfortunately sometimes the deaths that occur within the park are mostly caused by people taking unnecessary risks. I am not sure, but it does not appear that many of these incidents would have had a different outcome had there been cell phone reception. I have been to Yellowstone many times, as I am originally from Wyoming and as a child we did yearly trips to the park. My trips have continued throughout the years. While we were in the military and living throughout the U.S., I always made a point to bring my family back to experience Yellowstone Park. Now that we are again within driving distance (Colorado) we continue to take frequent trips to the park. I have seen the transition from being in the park prior to the technology boom, to having a car full of technology addicted persons. I myself have gotten used to having the ability to quickly reach out and keep in touch with family and friends. However, the last time my 19 year old daughter and I visited Yellowstone we both let immediate family know where we were going to be that day and turned off our phones. I felt like if there was a true emergency then adequate information was given for a park employee to locate us.

It might be wise to make this information more visible to potential visitors that cell phone reception is not available. I think many times people assume that in today's technology driven world that they will have capability to connect. If being connected really is a priority for people,

and I do understand that at times it can be, then they might need to think twice about visiting the park or at the least, the days or even hours they visit.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 90 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 18:20:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No more cell service is needed. Stop, pick your head up, and look around at the beauty instead of looking down at a phone.

Correspondence ID: 91 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 18:21:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No. No, under any circumstance. Do not add further infrastructure for communication in the form of more cell towers. Ate there not enough people and problems with people in YNP as it is? It is to be kept wilderness. Adding additional cell coverage, wifi, etc, will detract from everyone's experience there. Not to mention tearing the place up more, to accomplish this. Absolutely not.

Correspondence ID: 92 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 18:41:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'd be ok w/ towers in the main visitor areas (ie Canyon lodge, Grant Village, etc) BUT definitely AGAINST towers outside of those " developed " areas. I do just fine w/ out my wifi or phone while enjoying the natural beauty of the park.Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 93 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 19:37:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While it would be optimal to tell people to unplug and enjoy the beauty of Yellowstone, reality is that they need to stay connected. In that vein, then I would say that improving communication in areas such as Grant Village are acceptable. People tend to congregate there so improved communication would make them happy. However, cell towers in wilderness areas are a sore thumb and don't belong in nature. I am not sure you can 100% hide the tower from public view.

In all my visits to Yellowstone, poor cell service never bothered me. I wasn't there to talk on the phone - I was there to explore Yellowstone, experience the immensity of the park and disconnect. Improve communications in areas of heavy human concentration and where it is vital to keep people safe and ensure medical/fire services have appropriate communication and leave the rest natural.

it is sad to travel our national parks and see all these people on the phone and not experiencing nature..they are missing the best of life!

thanks for listening!

Correspondence ID: 94 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 20:10:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Unearthing old cables to replace them with new ones is ultimately more destructive than it is useful. Please consult with environmentalist and park officials that work in the area every single day to properly assess the value of these "upgrades."

Correspondence ID: 95 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 20:28:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, This is one of the best things about the National Parks. A disconnect from the cell phones. People will constantly be on the phones ruining the area for others wanting to enjoy nature.
Please, stop the insanity of the ones that feel they can't disconnect for even a day!!!!

Correspondence ID: 96 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 20:40:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see cell service enhanced around the existing nodes, since the service is getting antiquated and quite crowded in the summer.

Also, I think limited service should be available all across the park for emergencies and maybe some mapping if possible.

These things are the wave of the future. Remember what happened when the park tried to outlaw cars. Might as well jump on the bandwagon, for safety's sake and to make the customers happy.

Correspondence ID: 97 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 20:41:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No don't expand cell phone coverage

Correspondence ID: 98 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 21:04:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of these additional antennas so that the Park will have better wireless coverage. These are certainly unobtrusive as designed and proposed.

Correspondence ID: 99 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 22:00:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I am loathe for any construction project in a national park, this one makes sense and I think it should be approved. Removing several existing old antennas and replacing them with one would be less of an eyesore, while providing improved communication capabilities. While we need to jealously guard our remaining wild places, we also need to allow for emergencies and improved public safety. As the proposal states, the new antennae will not be in public view and the project will reduce spillover into the back country. I have worked at a lookout for 8 summers, and the broken and sporadic communication we experienced because of old radio antennas was a hindrance to being able to report smoke sightings. This project is a win-win.

Respectfully submitted,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 100 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 22:22:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No! That means more roads, more towers, and the inability to shut out distractions for a few minutes.

Correspondence ID: 101 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,01,2017 22:33:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly urge NPS to oppose the addition of communications infrastructure. Yellowstone is one of only a handful of spectacular places where we are unburdened by our devices. Cell service would create a glut of people living behind their phones

instead of truly seeing the beauty and wonder the park has to offer. If we want our children to truly appreciate the majesty that is Yellowstone, they must have the true experience. Without it, they won't feel compelled to protect the lands. In addition, the relatively i disturbed wildlife population could react negatively. Please don't allow Verizon, who does not support conservation, to line their already deep pockets on OUR lands.

Correspondence ID: 102 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,01,2017 23:54:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support expanded cell coverage in Yellowstone.

Correspondence ID: 103 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,02,2017 08:34:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am older and have lived a good portion of my life when cell phones had yet to be invented, so the idea of having cell phone reception in Yellowstone National Park, or any other National Park is not important to me. I would actually prefer it if Yellowstone had no cell phone service. So please know that I disapprove of these proposed changes.

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 104 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Edelen Marketing Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Feb,03,2017 07:55:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yellowstone National Park,

I have just finished reviewing all of the documents and pictures and simulation of proposed cell towers.

As an avid user of the park multiple times each year, I strongly urge you to not add additional cell towers and service to Yellowstone. Yellowstone is a place to unplug and get away from the phone and outside world. Adding new towers and service would add new and un-natural towers that take away from the natural beauty of the area.

In addition, given the narrow roads and current natural beauty distractions while driving, adding text and cell service would only add to increased accidents on the roads as drivers are distracted

by incoming emails, text messages and cell calls.

Keep Yellowstone as natural as you can and don't add these new towers around the park.

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 105 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,03,2017 16:07:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE expand telecommunications capabilities in the park. We come every year and have had numerous family, health and just plain scary situations where we were unable to communicate until after leaving the park. It would enhance the visit by giving peace of mind. I have seen several visitors crying because they needed help or contact.

Correspondence ID: 106 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,03,2017 16:54:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The towers are very unattractive. I have been going to Yellowstone for years and spend at least a week each time. If I need to use my cell phone, it is possible to do so.

I prefer a minor inconvenience instead of ugly cell/microwave towers and seeing people walking around with their noses in their cell phones or having to listen to them talk on their phones while I want peace and quiet.

Yellowstone is a National Park. I value it as a place to withdraw from daily distractions such as cell phones and the numerous interruptions they facilitate. I prefer we put a higher priority on preserving the pristine and natural beauty of the park and its inhabitants, than the unnecessary and intrusive need for visitors to use a cell phone everywhere in the park.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 107 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,04,2017 06:50:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A few years ago I would have been opposed to this proposal. However now that I work in the park, I have found that one can barely even make a phone call during the day, let alone check email, or communicate to the outside world. I am in favor of upgrading capacity on the network.

Correspondence ID: 108 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,04,2017 06:57:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please limit all use of cellular (and wireless internet) in the park. There is nothing worse than trying to enjoy nature while someone next to you is yelling into their phone or hiking down a trail and being run into by someone staring at their device. If people want cell service that badly they can stay in the other 99% of the country.

Correspondence ID: 109 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,04,2017 11:50:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: seriously, if people are so concerned about being able to have their noses buried in their cell phone while they are in the greatest national park in the US, they really should pick some place else to go for vacation ! leave the park they way it is where it can hold onto what little of it's old time charm it has left, I go there to enjoy being disconnected from my cell phone, computer etc. not having to spend my entire trip watching for people who are on their cell phones while driving or yacking while I am trying to enjoy peace and quiet , I have to deal with that on a daily basis at home !

I say no to additional cell phone towers

Correspondence ID: 110 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,04,2017 16:12:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support this upgrade to the cell phone antennas and system. With the enormous numbers of people currently visiting the park, better communications over the area is needed for reporting of accidents, law enforcement needs, and information on weather and road conditions. Visitors are frequently lost or in need of help and a wider coverage will serve this need. The proposals seem to address the issues of preserving the natural views and not spoiling the natural appearance of the park.

Correspondence ID: 111 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,05,2017 06:01:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would rather not see cellular coverage "improved" or expanded at Yellowstone. I think it is part of the wilderness experience to be away from cell connectivity.

The other aspects of this project are fine by me.

Correspondence ID: 112 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Ms. Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Feb,05,2017 09:41:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Really? People who are coming to the Parks, are there for the beauty and Nature. Cell phones have no place in these areas. If a person is that connected to their cell phone, then they need to stay close to civilization and not inflict their calls on those of us who go to these areas for calm and beauty.

Correspondence ID: 113 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,05,2017 13:46:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've lived in Montana for 48 years. It is a fabulous, beautiful place including the majestic Yellowstone National Park. I've spent many many hours and days of fun, peace, and tranquility in Yellowstone and I choose not to have more cell phone service in the park because I don't care to hear someone else's business conversations while I'm trying to enjoy the peace and tranquility of the park. I don't like to have my personal space invaded by someone talking on the phone laughing, joking, arguing, conducting business,etc. whatever the case may be on their phones while I'm there to enjoy what the park was created for...the Public's enjoyment of the animals,the scenery,the beauty all that nature has to offer in this beautiful place. Do not cause more stress for the wildlife and do not add more danger to driving through the park by allowing more service so more idiots can try texting & driving instead of watching for wildlife or people!! Please do not disrupt the remaining places of tranquility and peace in this beautiful place by expanding the cell phone service to include more of the tranquil parts of the park. I am a senior citizen and I believe that I have a right to some peace and quiet in the places that I can access. As you expand your cell phone service further and further that gives me less and less accessible places that I can get to that aren't being disrupted by cell phone use. Thank you so much for allowing me to comment. I pray and hope that you will not allow further cell phone expansion in the park. The wildlife and I thank you.

Correspondence ID: 114 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,05,2017 14:01:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: One of the best reasons for going to the mountains is the quiet and undisturbed atmosphere. I worked in Yellowstone for the summer in 1984. The thing my co-worker and I value the most was the lack of the noise of civilization. No TV or radio blaring from some one campsite or camper. Just being in the grocery store or any other business listening to people share their personal information and one sided conversation is bad enough. But to endure this in some of the most iconic of Yellowstone vistas is inane. Please do not do this. Since the back country is exempt,there is no argument for safety. Please give us one place

where humanity must limit it verbosity.

Correspondence ID: 115 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,05,2017 19:03:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support keeping Yellowstone WILD. Improvements to cell service are not congruent in maintaining a Wilderness setting where people focus on the landscape, environment and the wildlife. I do not support improving/including "updating" any of the cell service/Internet communication systems in Yellowstone. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 116 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,05,2017 22:28:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's an excellent idea to upgrade our communications in the park. It would be beneficial for emergency services, as well as greater bandwidth capabilities for guests and employees alike. This project is long overdue to be implemented.

Correspondence ID: 117 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,07,2017 06:35:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having been to many pristine places over the years and not having cell service is generally fine. But for the case of emergencies it would give peace of mind. I will also be out there camping this summer with my two little ones and having the ability for them to call their daddy and send him pictures while they are super excited would be amazing for them and for their daddy who we have to leave at home (he's working to pay for this trip after all ĎŸ~Š). I say updating what is there and adding a little more to an area already set up will not hurt anything. To be honest, I never even noticed when we were at Yosemite two years ago. And I know they made it easier for people there too.

Correspondence ID: 118 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,07,2017 15:06:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed improvements as written. I agree that better communication for park staff is sorely needed. However, the last thing we need in our National Parks is more cellular accessibility. The whole purpose of going to a park is to get closer to nature and get away from civilization. The modern world may be wired and programmed, but I should not have to endure crowds of people on their cell phones talking to someone in a national park. It is already bad enough with the cellular coverage spilling out

into the back country. Please, do not make it worse! I would request that you take a look at your plans again and limit communications to only park staff and essential emergency services. Do not make it accessible to the general public. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 119 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,07,2017 16:28:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan is very well thought out. It brings much needed new communications to the sections of the national park which have millions of visitors. This plan takes into account the new communication towers and works to hide them in the forest. Most of the park visitors will not see the communication towers that provide the vital service.

I applaud the National Park by making cellular communication available through out the park. Most visitors will want to use these new services as soon as they are available. These services will make the Park much safe, by providing cellular communications.

Correspondence ID: 120 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,12,2017 09:36:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the new antenna structure is a good idea, as it will improve our overall guest service levels in the park. My only concern is the closing of the Washburn and Chittenden Road trails. If it is at all possible, having only one closed at a time would be optimal. That would allow the fire lookout area to always be accessible by guests throughout the summer season.

Correspondence ID: 121 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,12,2017 19:30:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love that the park doesn't have cell reception most places. I find that it's a good place for people to go to get away from all those distractions. My main concern for having more cell towers, though, is people who are going to use their phones while driving. There isn't really a way to stop them from doing that and traffic gets clogged up due to bison jams and the like already.

I would be worried about the future of the park if we continue to put more technology in and lose the nature that people like me go there for. I ask that you consider that there isn't cell service there for a reason and I think we should keep it that way.

Correspondence ID: 122 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** Feb,13,2017 20:06:25**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: As one of the last frontiers, I think putting more towers in Yellowstone is ridiculous. I have guided backcountry trips where the dings of cell phones crossing over passes takes the whole experience to a different (and unwanted) level. My clients have enough cell range at the intended locations of these towers. People visiting Yellowstone, our clients in particular, are trying to get away from it all. Their work e-mails, facebook, etc. is what they want to ditch while on holiday. Just because you are getting complaints doesn't mean you should act. If it's a real problem, tell people they need Verizon, not ATT, in Yellowstone for best service. Giving these city folk more towers would be a sore sight in Yellowstone. "For the benefit and enjoyment of the people (future generations)." I don't think the founders of the Park intended for visitors to be locked to screens like in their everyday life. Give them a break from the masses!

Correspondence ID: 123 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2017 07:38:23**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I come to Yellowstone to experience a part of the U.S. at its very best - mostly unspoiled. Although many people visit during the summer, the feeling of being away from the hectic city life is still there. For me the very beauty of Yellowstone is its history - the comeback of the beautiful bison almost extinct at one time, the American symbol bald eagle seen very often in Yellowstone, being the first national park, the wolves, its Native American history in the area. Please do not let part of its history become the sight of towers dotting the hillsides and thoughtless human beings wandering around texting with no thought for the people near them who may have come for quite a different experience. I come in the winter because I want to be with winter nature and scenery. If I want to listen to someone blab on their cell phone I will stay home. Before too many years go by Yellowstone will be just another tourist attraction where someone can talk/text on their phone, take lots of selfies in front of some hot spring and basically experience very little. I have traveled a lot and seen this all over the world, including sadly at Auschwitz - the world's largest cemetery. I want more than this for my favorite place in the U.S.!! I have even been twice in the winter and had no problem being reached at Mammoth if my family needed me. Please keep Yellowstone the remarkable unusual natural place it is, and cell towers and phones, although invading every crack and crevice of our lives, are not natural nor beautiful. Thanks for opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 124 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2017 07:38:33**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the proposed improvements and expansion to telecommunication service inside Yellowstone Park!!! I appreciate the ability to leave texting and scrolling through the web behind when visiting the park. Not having the service available encourages visitors to actually LOOK UP from their devices and appreciate nature. It could also

be more dangerous for visitors - have you seen people walking down streets and crossing roads all while looking at their smartphones? These people will just take a wrong step on a trail, and over the cliff they will go.

Correspondence ID: 125 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Year Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Feb,14,2017 07:48:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a great plan. Our visit last summer was great. However at age 76 it was a little unnerving not to have 911 access via cellphone.

Correspondence ID: 126 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 07:55:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As someone who frequently takes "workations" and who loves visiting Yellowstone at least once every two years, I vote yes for the improvements to cellular reception!

Paula Galland

Correspondence ID: 127 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 07:56:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Improving cell service should not be a priority for NPS at YNP. The Yellowstone experience is about looking around, not looking at your phone. Please do not improve cell service

Correspondence ID: 128 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 07:58:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I appreciate the efforts to leverage existing telecommunications as much as possible, people visiting the National Parks should expect whatever cell service is available, which is going to be limited in wilderness areas. I am discouraged that extensive upgrades are planned instead of informing visitors that cell service will be sporadic and they should plan accordingly. If there is opportunity, please count this comment as against upgrading the cell service in general. The whole point of national parks is to unplug.

Thank you for considering.



Correspondence ID: 129 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 07:58:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I travel a lot. I see cell towers in Florida, California, and other tourist areas that are disguised as palm trees or other natural objects. I'm sure you can do something like that so you can improve the cell signals yet not bring development to the beauty of Yellowstone. I have been visiting Yellowstone over the last 20 years and am always impressed how it has stayed the same and not been over developed. Great job by the parks dept!!!! Keep human footprint at a minimum.

Correspondence ID: 130 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:05:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: When considering a project like this, you have to ask yourself one question, "What would John Muir do"

Correspondence ID: 131 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:09:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Like the idea of improved safety for everyone. Hopefully this will be done with a bare minimum of disturbance to this beautiful park.

Correspondence ID: 132 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:22:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with the proposal to improve cell phone tower reception in YNP, as I believe it is imperative to boost communication capability for visitor's safety in the park. Also a huge benefit to report problems with other visitors who break rules (as seen in 2016 summer months), which appears to be getting worse with the increasing numbers in the Park each new year.

Correspondence ID: 133 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Greatwest Images Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: OfficialRep

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:23:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the proposed new construction of cell service and components with Yellowstone NP. I believe it will benefit the Park's many visitors with broader opportunity

for conversing with family and friends while visiting the park, and also provide for communication between individuals within groups that are at work or play within the park. As a regular visitor to the Park, I would see this project as a welcomed addition to the amenities of Yellowstone, and not detract in any way from the experience of the park. Thank you for your time and consideration. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 134 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:28:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for taking my comments. We visited Yellowstone in September 2016. It was one of the most beautiful experiences I have ever had - I have traveled extensively. One of the BEST things about Yellowstone is NOT having cell service! What a breath of fresh air it is to NOT have visitors constantly looking at cell phones at tables in restaurants, campgrounds, hikes and visitors centers! Yellowstone is a nature experience, not a technological experience!

What I would like to see is ELECTRIC SERVICE at all campgrounds where generators are allowed. We were APPALLED BY THE POLLUTION from generators - including the smell and especially the noise at the large campground near Yellowstone Lake. We couldn't wait to get out of the campground! Its archaic! There is electric service there - just not everywhere.

Skip the money you will spend on cell service - spend it on CLEAN ENERGY!

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 135 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:34:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I are in favor of improving cell service in the park. As frequent visitors we believe it is important for two reasons; First of all it is a safety issue to call for help when needed and communicate with park officials when we observe someone not making good choices. Secondly, It helps communicate with family at home. This fall while visiting my mom became ill and requiring a hospital stay. It would have been nice to know sooner.

Correspondence ID: 136 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:47:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a safety tool I believe it to be extremely important

Correspondence ID: 137 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:49:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Go for it.

Correspondence ID: 138 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:53:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We drove from home to Yellowstone and back last May and visited a dozen of our National Parks, Monuments, and Historic Sites along the way. We stayed at the Old Faithful Inn while in Yellowstone for three days. It was a truly enjoyable trip.

When I think of what has been built by man in Yellowstone, I am thankful for the foresight that was put into planning and building a marvelous support infrastructure that allows us to visit and see this magnificent natural attraction.

In evaluating what the impact of adding cell towers to Yellowstone would mean to the quality of the experience there, one must consider what technology would be able to bring as potential enhancement to the visitor's experience as well as the added safety of rapid communication in times of need. With the ability to build cell towers that can blend into their environment, their scenic impact would be similar to what is there now.

I am a retired engineering geologist and appreciate the ways nature has made our surroundings. While much of Yellowstone is wilderness, there is much of it that has been developed to enable us to see it. Those wilderness areas will not be substantially impacted by this project, and the developed areas will not likely be returned to wilderness.

I support this project.

Correspondence ID: 139 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: One of Rick McIntire's Volunteers Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Feb,14,2017 08:54:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In the interest of fairness and accessibility a requirement should be established that ensures users of at least the three major cell phone carriers (AT&T, Verizon and TMobile) get equal access to the tower signals. Last year I spent more than two months in Yellowstone primarily observing wolf packs and witnessed the frustration of many people when one carrier could get a signal and others could not. Also this proposed upgrade should be publicly bid to the lowest cost supplier who can meet the requirements in accordance with Federal FAR procurement regulations that apply to infrastructure upgrades like this which are funded with taxpayer dollars. Thank you

██████████

Correspondence ID: 140 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Mr Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Feb,14,2017 08:55:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As much as I enjoy the use of my cell phone, I am against any additional cell towers in the parks. It is nice to be in the wild without any confrontation from a ringing cell phone. My idea when pack backing if necessary to rent or purchases a satellite cell phone.

I also believe due to the tourism the increase of cell towers would cause a disruption to the wild life. It would be annoyance issue to the animals. It would be like hearing up to 1 million ringing cell phones in an eight hour period on a good tourism day. Do you know how annoying that is? Most of the animals will hear these ring tones from one mile away.

Correspondence ID: 141 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 08:58:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think for park employees and visitor safety this is an important upgrade. We usually visit YNP yearly and have enjoyed the lack of service, to be un-tethered is liberating. However, I think the safety issues override my personal preferences. Gee, I can turn my phone off? I didn't know that! LOL

Correspondence ID: 142 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 09:04:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of improving cell service in the Park.
- Communications is always a good thing to help with family/friend safety
- Cell service is a modern safety net for visitors and hikers that venture off alone
- Cell service should extend to all areas of the Park for safety net
Every effort should be made to hide the towers, but some trade off is acceptable in the interest of safety.

I spent 2 weeks in the park, by myself, last June. Keeping in touch with family back home was not easy and a source of worry. Being able to let family know I was OK while hiking alone would have been a great source of comfort.

Make it better, try to hide it, make it look nice if you cant hide it.

Thanks

Correspondence ID: 143 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 09:05:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comment for Greater Cell Coverage within Yellow Stone NP

If it is a need for safety then this is important to the visitors and workers within the park. If it is only a matter of better cell coverage then it should be understood by visitors a temporary loss of cell coverage should be a fact of life in the forest. We have lived for many years without being tied to a phone. It is seldom that we do not see a passing car and if you have a problem then then flag down someone to alert services necessary. If not then you should consider where you are and why you do not have use of the phone. If being in contact is that important, please reserve a sat phone before entering the park. The park dollars are not limitless and should be spent to improve whatever is most necessary.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 144 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 09:05:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I enjoy visiting Yellowstone and other National Parks partially because of the ability to disconnect from the hassles of everyday life - including work. Having cell service means my place of work will expect me to stay in contact with the office while visiting a park with Internet service.

The same goes for televisions in the park hotels. I choose to stay in the National parks as a way to disconnect from the news. If park lodging has television and Internet, then why not stay off property, especially if I can find one without these services.

If people can't live without Internet or cell service, then they should find something else to do rather than go to a National Park.

DON'T DO IT!

Thanks.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 145 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 09:23:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please improve the cell service in the park. As long as the antennas a

reasonably well hidden, this will improve the overall park experience. People want to be able to show those back home what a good time they're having while at Yellowstone. They also need to be reachable in case of an emergency back home.

As an example of the current situation, the last time I was there in 2016, there was one place in the Old Faithful complex where I could get a working cell signal with AT&T. Now that I am on Verizon, it should be better, but the previous situation was not acceptable.

Correspondence ID: 146 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 09:27:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Any improvements to the wireless telecommunications infrastructure is a great investment at Yellowstone. In the plans, I see great care is being taken to limit any impact on the scenic views, particularly in the Lake area. We are beyond the point of needing this upgraded infrastructure, as the pay phones at the park have been removed, and I no longer have a calling card. Most of us have become reliant on our wireless devices for communication. There is no need to cover all areas of the park, as there is still an incentive to be "off the grid" when exploring the park and back country. The upgraded system will allow me to enjoy the park during the day, and when I return to my camper at the Fishing Bridge RV facility in the evening, be able to better communicate.

Correspondence ID: 147 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 10:08:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

First, before I get into details I would like to say as my wife and I are retired citizens I enjoy the beautiful surroundings without the visual impact of the hardware to make these services function and I am in support of making necessary upgrades that benefit the safety of the visiting public while maintaining a low impact on the environment.

I am very pleased to see and hear that there is a plan developing to improve the cell service within the Yellowstone National Park. I have visited there three times in the past 5 years and found it very frustrating not being able to check in on my handicapped wife while out and about in the park fishing.

I have AT&T service and last year while staying at Fishing Bridge RV site all the way up in the back had no cell service around the campground. Even down at the registration building I did not have service on our smart phones. But we did notice people with Verizon had service and making calls from the campground. This was the same for many areas within the park.

Canyon Village had some signal for AT&T but was iffy at best. I had to make several attempts to call a vendor over in the West Yellowstone area and the call was dropped six times when I was

able to connect to complete a very important call for my wifes medical condition and needs. Driving over more than an hour away from Fishing Bridge was not acceptable.

If your going to make improvements, please be sure to include ALL major carriers in discussions and that ALL must be allowed to be included in on the improvements. I would encourage all carriers be obligated to contribute to this projects success.

Thank You for allowing us to present our opinions on this very important matter.



Correspondence ID: 148 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 10:16:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm going to leave the decision on these telecommunication improvements to those most directly involved as I understand there is an issue of guest and employee safety and comfort. But I would like to say that it was my honor and privilege to serve in the Air Force in Montana in the 1960s and 70s and so I was able to spend a great deal of time in Yellowstone, the Tetons, and Glacier. I swear all these years later a part of my soul still lives there. I've been able to return a couple of times and I'm thrilled to say that God willing and the creek don't rise I'll spend two weeks with younger family showing them the sites in all three parks, plus some of the Canadian Rockies as well, this September. But what I wanted to say was this. The day of the first moon landing, was it July 23, 1969?, I could look it up but this is close enough, I was in Yellowstone with friends. Of course no car radio or TV anywhere and so many decades before cell phones. We were parked next to the Morning Glory Pool this in the day when if you are old enough you know that the road and the parking spaces came within maybe fifty feet or less of the pool. Parked there looking at that beauty a German tourist with a shortwave radio joined us and we heard the key moments of that incredible landing while sharing a few beers and thanking the good Lord for allowing us to be there that day, any day, and wishing for more days.

And so you ask, why is this old timer (I don't really think of myself as old and in my head, away from mirrors, I'm forever 25 sitting/hiking in the parks) using this comment space for other than the topic we brought up. It is only this: be gentle, be cautious, be alert, be conservative (only time you'll hear me say that), be aware, be protective, think long term and don't be railroaded into anything. It is all too precious, too fragile and can never be replaced. The current administration and all the talk of privatizing the parks or whatever they call it, scares me a great deal. People say, Oh, well it can't happen here. Well, we'll see. I hope they are right. Anyway, best of luck with your project. You'll get all sorts of negative comments that don't think any progress is good. I'm not that set in stone, but you know somehow having camped and hiked in all three parks I've mentioned, I don't think I ever once regretted not having a radio or TV to distract me. If I can do it, this September while there I'm going to try and not even look at a cell phone and hopefully can convince my younger family members (not that young really, in their

fifties) to not look either. If God ever created landscape that begs not to be ignored while looking at a cellphone it is Yellowstone, the Tetons and Glacier. Thanks for listening. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 149 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 10:23:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings;

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to voice my comments on the proposed upgrades to Yellowstone's wireless electronic services.

While I do understand that these modern methods of communication are now the standard by which most people conduct their daily lives, I would very much like to see places like Yellowstone National Park offer NO cellular service whatsoever. Though my spouse is fully equipped, I do not own a cellular telephone nor do I intend to acquire one, as I consider them generally tiresome and often obnoxious irritations that inevitably mesmerize their users to the point where they are not only oblivious of others, they tend to ignore their surroundings regardless of how beautiful or peaceful.

My spouse and I are journeying to Yellowstone this year to re-experience the beauties and grandeur of Yellowstone, and renew our relationship that blossomed there 29 years ago, not to watch cat videos, play Words With Friends, talk loudly in public settings with invisible correspondents, see what's on TV, excoriate or extol Donald Trump, take endless "selfies," or even post pictures of every meal we eat. Why come to this magnificent place to obsess about mindless drivel?

I do understand that personal telephones can serve useful, and even life-saving purposes, and it would probably be a good idea that Yellowstone's staff are capable of communicating with each other (and/or emergency services) on a reliable moment to moment basis. But as far as Yellowstone's visitors are concerned, I think it would be wonderful to promote the notion that visiting the park is like taking a trip back to the 19th century.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 150 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 10:23:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I very much appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on this proposal. The beauty of Yellowstone is in the unblemished landscape, views and natural environment. I challenge the 'need' for enhanced cell service and strongly oppose installation of any cell towers.

The whole point of coming to and enjoying Yellowstone is to get away from the trappings of technology.

Correspondence ID: 151 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 10:37:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in the parks a lot during the spring and fall seasons. I just want better connection with ATT. Verizon is not the only cell phone company. I hope these updates solve this problem

Correspondence ID: 152 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 10:37:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Read over the Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan for YNP. Looks good. I have been tent camping since 1950's at Fishing Bridge & Honeymoon there in 1969. Was also at Old Faithful in Dec. of 1987. My wife & I worked at lower store for Delaware North at Old Faithful for 3 1/2 months in 2013. Last year 2016, camped at Canyon campground (no electricity) for two weeks in August. Will be back at Canyon camping July 21 for two weeks. Even in summer 2013 for 3 months at Old Faithful Area the cell phone (Sprint) was weak. Also around spots in Canyon Lodge area in 2013 was questionable & sporadic. Your plan looks well thought out & towers out of view of visitors to park. Appreciate the ability to make comments on your telecommunications Plan. You certainly have your work cut out to maintain this beautiful jewel called YNP.

Correspondence ID: 153 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 10:40:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If the Park Superintendent thinks this is necessary for better park management, please go through with the plan.

However, if this plan is for the public, don't do it - save your money for other, more worthy projects. People come to Yellowstone to get away from technology and get back to nature.

Correspondence ID: 154 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 10:41:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Extending cell service defeats the idea of wilderness in general. This I know..if I am to be in a park surrounded by cell phones I will have to go elsewhere. I am disappointed in many of the actions of recent. Is Yellowstone to become another tourist trap? No to more cell phones. Go to Disney World.....

Correspondence ID: 155 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 10:52:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the proposal.

As a self-employed business owner, it is important when we stay at Old Faithful during the winter to have internet access. Hence, my usage splits between 90% data, 10% voice.

In the Snow Lodge, I have seen cell phone users behave courteously given that in most areas, it is fairly quiet anyway.

At this stage of internet dependency, improved access would make The Park more attractive for those of us whose lack of access may result in their inability to experience what The Park has to offer. Limited deployment as proposed is reasonable.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Correspondence ID: 156 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:01:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an annual visitor, I support improving telecommunication capability within the park. It's a safety issue.

Correspondence ID: 157 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:09:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think adding Cell signal support is vital to the ongoing safety and enjoyment of Yellowstone Park. Several times on our last visit (2015) we saw events that could have been avoided had signal been available to contact a ranger. We witnessed a gentleman out on the Canyon edge (well outside of any safely marked trails) but had to spend a good 15 minutes looking for a ranger by which time we'd lost sight of the gentleman. We observed, on multiple occasions visitors who were way to close to Bison, but due to no cell signal there was not much we could do. During our week long visit we saw several motor vehicle accidents where

the people involved had to leave to get help since they could not call for assistance. Having Cell signal in a wider area would also allow people to access weather and road conditions as well as navigation apps on their phones. The park can also use the increased coverage to further the goal of safety by allowing day hikers better coverage to call for help if they get lost or injured. Many of the people to Yellowstone struggle to function without modern conveniences and while I wholeheartedly agree with keeping Yellowstone wild I think that increasing coverage would not detract from that goal but would make life for those who live and work in Yellowstone much easier and better!

Correspondence ID: 158 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:12:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not favor changes to "improve cell phone reception." This is a National Park wilderness area. Those who choose to visit should be able to enjoy the park and nature without having to listen to people on their cell phones. Being in wilderness areas is a chance to "get away" from digital devices and things that distract one from enjoying the beauty around them. People have survived for years without gadgets intruding on the experience in National Parks. Not only will more cell phone connectivity detract from the users' experiences but it will also negatively affect non-users' experiences.

Correspondence ID: 159 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:17:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: One of the reasons we go to Yellowstone each year is the lack of cell phone coverage. It is wonderful going to a place where people are not on their phones like everywhere else. It's also great that people can not get in touch with you. Eliminate all cell phone coverage within the Park.

Correspondence ID: 160 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:31:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it is wise to improve communication services within Yellowstone National Park. From the proposal, it seems that the same locations would be used, only they would be upgraded with better antennae. Also, the upgrades would not be visible to the public which is great.

Correspondence ID: 161 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:41:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have visited the park several times, once alone with my young child. I would love to continue visiting, especially with my children in tow. Additional towers would interrupt the wild feeling and ability to disconnect a bit, but it would be made up for by the ability to call in an emergency. I support this effort, specially since it seems efforts will be made to keep the wild vistas unmarred by the towers.

Correspondence ID: 162 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 11:52:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, please, please do this as quickly as possible! Better service is important for safety and other purposes. In fact, if you could add coverage at Madison Junction, Mammoth, and the other major junctions that would also be very helpful. Do not forget to include AT&T and not just Verizon and others. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 163 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 12:24:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the WHOLE park should have cell access.

If a bear comes out of the woods & acts aggressively, I want to be able to call for help, no matter how far out I am.

Especially if I'm out far.

If I'm close to a road, there likely would be enough people around to deter an attack, or at least help afterwards.

It's out in the wilderness where people get into trouble & need help.

Perhaps if you want to limit things, then only emergency signals getting through would be enough.

Correspondence ID: 164 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 12:30:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This comment is late,since much planning has been done, but for me , the rare visitor, I can only hope that any improvements are for the help of the staff, and not the visitor. As a visitor, we are hoping to still find raw or semi raw nature. If everyone is running

around with a cell phone ringing, or somebody on their i-pad, this would not be Yellowstone.

Places in this country must be left as is, or our future generations will never be able to experience nature at its best.

Correspondence ID: 165 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** Feb,14,2017 12:35:20**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Thanks for allowing my comments. I have been a visitor the last 3 years and have struggled with cell service in Yellowstone. It is simply inadequate for a large park with thousands of visitors. The sooner this plan is implemented, the better. We were going to camp at fishing bridge last year but there was no cell service, even though the AT&T website indicated there was.

Correspondence ID: 166 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2017 13:18:50**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am opposed to the communications upgrade. I am trying to balance the need for this with the importance of providing a tranquil environment to all the Yellowstone guests. I have always enjoyed that at Yellowstone, as opposed to at many other park options, that lack of constant communication allows a quiet experience, and you don't have to deal with everyone talking on their phone in a natural environment. To me, with all the hits the National Park Service is taking, the ability to remain a quiet, nature focused area should be a primary objective. I've seen employees with walkie talkie/radios - it appears they work so I hope that is indeed the case - that lets the employees do what is needed, and keeps busloads full of people off their phones. I have worried for several years this was coming and I hope that it is stopped.

Correspondence ID: 167 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2017 14:21:45**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I understand the safety issue, but before long we will be dealing with other people's conversations constantly. No matter what. The whole experience will be irrevocably spoiled by people on their damn cellphones. I don't care what signs you put up about cell-free zones, etc.- - people will stop reading and use their phones anyway. PLEASE, PLEASE dont' do this. Save us from this hell of being held captive by someone else's phone conversation while we are trying to enjoy one of our greatest national parks.

Thank you for listening.

Correspondence ID: 168 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2017 14:25:54**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of increasing cell reception through out the park. As long as the current construction is achieved with as little impact as is appropriate. The best communication is in the interest of all park users.

Correspondence ID: 169 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 14:55:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yellowstone is wilderness. Even though it would help first responders and visitors, let the wilderness rule. For most of its history, Yellowstone has taken care of itself. Let's help this magnificent area by letting it alone and not interfering. When a wildfire starts, it's left alone. Visitors should know that they are entering a wild and untamed area. Let's leave things alone!!

Correspondence ID: 170 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 15:08:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comment is: "NO" One of the few things we have in our Parks system is nature's beauty. Face in the phone? or Face out the window?

I can see it now: "Download the new Yellowstone App.This app will guide you thru and to all of the sites there are to see. Watch web cams scour the bowels of Old Faithful....."

All of the power upgrades, larger power generation bldgs, and the need for better roads to permit the increased need to attend to these improvements.

It's a PARK for a reason. If I can't turn-off electronics in a National PARK, then I have no real reason to be there. I reaffirm my NO vote to expand/increase cell coverage in Yellowstone National Park.

Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 171 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 15:43:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This seems to be a reasonable proposal that will enhance security and safety in Yellowstone Park

Correspondence ID: 172 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 16:45:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are currently planning our trip to Yellowstone for this summer and are somewhat dismayed to learn of the sketchy cell service. We have elderly parents that we need to stay in touch with and didn't anticipate this being such a problem while traveling in the United States. It seems that the proposal would be a win-win situation.

Correspondence ID: 173 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 17:06:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Will the cell reception for cell carriers other than Verison improve after the improvements described in the documents, simulations and drawings are complete? Will the only cell phone service working at Yellowstone be Verison when these improvements are done leaving all visitors using other cell carriers with out communication except for the few land lines in hte park?

Correspondence ID: 174 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual


Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 17:20:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the proposal to improve cell phone service in the park with the understanding that the required infrastructure will be "hidden" to the extent possible. I look forward to my next visit to the park! Thank you.

Sincerely,

, 5-time visitor to Yellowstone (the last two visits with a cell phone)

Correspondence ID: 175 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 18:49:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been visiting Yellowstone for almost 40 years. One of the beauties of visiting is that it provides an opportunity to disconnect from daily living and enjoy the outdoors. I can say that cell service has come to Old Faithful, the experience has greatly diminished in viewing one of the earth's marvels. In walking around the main viewing area, you now have tens if not hundreds of people talking on the phone and walking around...clearly not paying attention to where they are going. I can only imagine what it would be like if everyone had internet....everyone would be looking at their phones instead of the geyser.

I am strongly opposed to increasing cellular service around the park, especially with internet capabilities. I live in the Denver area and the number of distracted drivers is staggering. If think

driving around Yellowstone with people that have never seen snow before or have never driven over a mountain making driving around the individuals very challenging as you don't know what they are going to do! Add in an animal along side the road in the peak season and there is sometimes complete chaos until rangers arrive. If these already dangerous conditions are compounded by drivers that are talking on their phone, or searching the web while there is an animal on the side of the road, I can only imagine the increase in accidents (with both vehicles and pedestrians) and the increase in fatalities.....I truly believe this will happen. Just look at the number of pedestrians that were killed in 2016 by motorists in Colorado. I believe a similar situation would play out in the park. Although I do agree that increased cell service would greatly assist in emergency situations, I believe the overall benefit would be substantially less than the negatives that result. For instance, increased cell service would allow rangers to be called to report people getting run over by cars with distracted drivers. The driver was talking to their family in Florida and telling them about the bear that is on the side of the road.

Lastly, I want to add that society existed for a very, very long time without cell service. Yellowstone, along with other remote parks, should contain to keep it wild and have limited or no cell service at all.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



Correspondence ID: 176 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,14,2017 19:07:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People have become so dependent on their cell phones that they don't know what to do without them. The hundreds of visitors wandering around the park staring at their phones, instead of the scenery and where they are going, is a distraction at best, and possibly even a hazard when they do this on narrow and crowded boardwalks near thermal features.

Yellowstone is a rare environment that would be better protected by keeping it wild. Those of us who appreciate the few remaining wild places really hate to see them overrun by large groups that just want to take a "selfie" and tell the world that they were there, even though they never took the time to understand and appreciate those places for what they are.

I am not in favor of the cellular expansion. If communication is required by the rangers, I would rather see radio repeaters installed instead of cell towers. Keep Yellowstone somewhat wild. Those who cannot be without their cell phones for a few days while they visit Yellowstone will never appreciate it for what it is. The park would be better served if people who cannot live without their cell phone decided to stay home, leaving more space for those who really want to know and understand Yellowstone.

Correspondence ID: 177 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,14,2017 19:31:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do everything you can to ban internet and wi fi in the park. It's a time to get away from all screen time. Make it special.

Correspondence ID: 178 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Feb,15,2017 07:08:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to a telecommunications structure in Mount Washburn, and other state park areas. Let's keep our National Parks as pure as possible and not construct additional towers to support cell service. There is no need.

Correspondence ID: 179 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,15,2017 09:22:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love Yellowstone park. I shake my head when I see people hiking or driving with their nose in a cell phone. (Especially children). They should be coming to the park to get away from that.

I have no doubt that my thoughts are correct but that they will be ignored in the name of progress. By increasing cell service you are helping these people to miss the whole point of Yellowstone.

Correspondence ID: 180 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,15,2017 10:34:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yellowstone is a special place where visitors should be encouraged to experience its sights, smells, sounds and views without the distraction of constant internet connections. WiFi at the Old Faithful Lodge and Mammoth Lodge is sufficient connectivity for those needing to pay bills online or check for critical email information. There are many places where people can distract themselves, and others, with personal electronic devices. Let that not include Yellowstone National Park.

Correspondence ID: 181 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,15,2017 13:57:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I admire the designs of the towers in disguising them to blend in with the environment. I think stronger cellular service would help in the safety of visitors and staff in the

parks, as well as making the cell phone applications pertinent to the parks experience more user friendly. I hear the service currently is spotty at best. I am looking forward to my upcoming trip to Yellowstone.

Correspondence ID: 182 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,15,2017 14:41:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In my opinion, anyone who truly appreciates Yellowstone for what it represents is less than concerned with 'enhanced' cellular capabilities.

Correspondence ID: 183 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,15,2017 15:43:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support expanding and modernizing the telecommunication services in Yellowstone Park. For me, the biggest issue for doing so is safety. Since we have fabulous communication technologies available, I deem it on the brink of negligent not to use them to help save visitors and staff from injury and possibly death. An added bonus, is the improved visitor experiences, which the young generation now expects. I visited Yellowstone four times during my 65 years, each one unique and so memorable that I actively encourage people to visit themselves. A modern system in Yellowstone would makes it easier, and safer for families to discover all the wonders of this national treasure. I wish you well. Very Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 184 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,15,2017 16:11:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO, we do not need more cell towers in YNP. People need places to go to escape from technology. I am grateful that these places still exist.

Correspondence ID: 185 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,15,2017 18:54:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support this proposal as long as it improves the ability to make calls at the listed areas. I certainly do not want to be out hiking and have to listen to someone's conversation. From what I have read about this proposal it will improve service only in the areas where it is already available. We visit Yellowstone several times a year and have a need to call and check on my elderly father while we are there. Often we can not make a connection. We usually try to call when we are at Canyon, Mammoth or Old Faithful and most often at Old Faithful because we probably visit there most frequently. From what I have read, there should be minimal impact

on these areas as existing infrastructure will be replaced in most of the areas. We heard about this proposal on our recent trip to Yellowstone and wanted to voice our support for this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 186 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,16,2017 11:59:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Desperately needed.

Correspondence ID: 187 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,16,2017 15:01:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for providing this information. I am avidly in favor of greater cell service that does not diminish the wilderness experience. I am a relatively frequent visitor to Yellowstone, and would like to have functional cell service to contact family and in case of emergencies.

Correspondence ID: 188 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,16,2017 15:37:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our family and extended family, are longtime visitors of YNP- -- -50 years plus. We try to visit at least once a year, including this year. We have enjoyed the park during all four seasons. We are members of Yellowstone Forever. YNP is dear to our hearts.

PLEASE limit cell phone service to "emergency only, i.e 911 service."

We truly believe that the "wilderness experience" of Yellowstone National Park will be denigrated by allowing increased cell phone calling and texting in the park.

We support whatever is necessary to achieve emergency, 911 cell phone service, including antennas on Mt. Washburn.

Correspondence ID: 189 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,16,2017 20:40:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not place cell phone towers in Yellowstone National Park. I have thoroughly enjoyed being able to disconnect from reality when I go to Yellowstone, knowing full well that if there was an emergency, that I could find a ranger to get assistance from. Not only would a cell phone tower degrade from the beauty of the natural landscape, it would only allow

our society to continue to be connected to things with a screen! Please do not put this into effect.

Sincerely,



Correspondence ID: 190 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: SELF Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Feb,17,2017 16:09:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a monthly supporter and a Life Estate Supporter of Yellowstone Park. I have been to the park on a number of occasions and participated in a number of the special gatherings of the Yellowstone Foundation, now Yellowstone Forever. One of the things I love about the park is its serenity. Cell phone use will destroy that peace and quiet. Individuals will not refrain from chattering on there cell phones while touring the park in group functions. Keep Yellowstone the way natured intended it to be.

Correspondence ID: 191 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,18,2017 11:06:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No construction should be permitted on Mount Washburn when the fragile Bighorn Sheep population is raising their newly born lambs on the mountain. While the population has become habituated to people and the vehicles that go up the mountain, heavy and loud construction equipment is a completely different situation. It would appear from the plans submitted that major digging and possibly blasting along with a myriad of construction people and vehicles will probably be necessary. In recent years the lambs have been subjected to pneumonia and other diseases to further stress these animals to a massive construction project so people can have improved cellphone service is not in keeping with the ideals of the National Park System.

Correspondence ID: 192 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Feb,18,2017 21:04:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to see more cell phone service in Yellowstone. I am the sole owner/ veterinarian in my practice. Like it or not, I must be accessible when on vacation. We really like to stay at Canyon and Lake but it is hard for my staff to reach me. I have been to Yellowstone 19 times and plan to go more. We love it!!

Correspondence ID: 193 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: Feb,18,2017 21:08:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I applaud your efforts to increase cellular coverage in Yellowstone. We feel more secure with the family engaging in different activities when we can communicate. I have been 25 times and plan to go more!

Correspondence ID: 194 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,19,2017 10:43:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plan. It seems well defined and would meet needs of visitors. I have lived and worked at Canyon for 5 seasons and the telecommunications access for public and staff was dismal.

Correspondence ID: 195 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,19,2017 14:37:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It looks to me that you plans appear well designed and thought out.

I support your ideas whole heartedly.

We will be there May 27th thru June 10th.

We are looking forward to our visit.

Correspondence ID: 196 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,19,2017 19:46:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am all for improving communications in the park. I believe this is essential in the world we now live in. I just hope that they camouflage the towers and equipment to minimize the visual impact. There are several towers near my home in California and they are not so bad. PLEASE do NOT put up just a concrete/metal tower.

PLEASE improve communications in the park.

Correspondence ID: 197 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,20,2017 16:16:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I find the "argument" over cellphone service to be short sighted, and,

stoneage. Those who wish to remain without the convenience of cellular service can simply turn off their phone. PEER does not vacation in the park and quite honestly, Yellowstone is far from "wilderness". Having stayed in Yellowstone several times, mostly in Canyon Campground, I detest having to pay for wi-fi to check on emails and/or send pictures. When I stay in The Grand Tetons I often get cellular service from Jackson and there does not seem to be an outcry. The argument over expanding/modernizing service is pathetic as all things, since 1876, are a scar upon the wonders of a former wilderness now turned tourist trap. A cellphone tower is no more a detriment to PEER than the numerous stores and visitors centers that scar the land....

Correspondence ID: 198 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,21,2017 06:45:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support new towers that will allow more cell phone service in Yellowstone. I think this is necessary for the safety of the public. I hope something will be done to improve cell phone operation in the Norris Geyser Basin soon also. It is very poor in that entire section of the park.

Correspondence ID: 199 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,22,2017 13:17:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree that better service is needed, however would hate to see both sides of Mt Washburn restricted at the same time. This is a very popular hike. Would be nice if only one side is closed at a time. ie if Chittenden road side was closed, people could still hike the other side. Also the proposed antenna system looks like it swallows the fire tower. Is that healthy for the ranger? Thanks for allowing input. I know this is a huge project. Yellowstone is a beautiful place. Almost hate to see modernization.

Correspondence ID: 200 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,25,2017 11:17:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I generally enjoy the isolation found in the national parks; being of the grid. I don't see that the proposed changes are necessary. Proper preparedness eliminates the need for contacting emergency services. Furthermore, cellular today's are unsightly and destroy the natural beauty of a national park.

Correspondence ID: 201 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,25,2017 22:41:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a first time visitor to Yellowstone this coming June, I would say that these upgrades would be a great help to the staff and patrons in the park, and should proceed. The use of cell phones has become so mainstream, and such a huge part of everyday life, that even though the "philosophy of the reason for the visit to the park might be violated, good access to communication, in the case of an emergency should be available. If there were only a way to limit the service to texts, so as not to disturb the peace and quiet of attractions within the park, that would certainly be a big plus, allowing emergency communication, but limiting loud phone conversations. Just one guy's opinion. DB

Correspondence ID: 202 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Yellowstone Park Service Stations, Inc. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Feb,26,2017 18:57:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS:

Yellowstone Park Service Stations operates the seven gas/convenience stores and four automotive repair/towing facilities inside Yellowstone and is the current concessioner.

We would like to express our support for the improvements being suggested in the telecommunications infrastructure upgrade.

We increasingly live in a data driven society. We will only become more connected over time. The backbones of entire businesses (including those in Yellowstone) depend upon the transfer of this data. This is not business functions or employees that are accessing social media. These are essential businesses that are trying to obtain real time information that are indispensable to the service of the Park visitor.

Some of these daily functions for our operations that are dependent upon data for example are:

- Credit Card processing with EMV capability
- POS (point of sale) network monitoring and information transfer
- real time fuel inventory
- line leak detection and fuel monitoring options for environmental compliance
- temperature monitoring of refrigerated units including buildings
- obtaining updates for POS including security enhancements for customers
- accessing pertinent repair information for customer's vehicles (this information IS NOT available via hard copy.) ALL vehicle repair information is only available online.
- determining auto parts delivery time frame and costs
- obtaining correct costs estimates (labor time guide) to correctly inform the customer
- provide employee training via modules for correct repair and towing procedures
- acquire correct towing and recovery options for customer vehicle
- voice system overload due to capacity issues and customers with a true concern such as a disabled vehicle or accident are unable to complete an emergency call
- and many other innumerable daily functions

As the Park has increased exponentially with visitation, so have our needs as a concessioner to keep up with customer demands and technology. We appreciate the concern from folks who

desire to 'disconnect' and not have technology being prevalent in all areas of the Park. However; NPS personnel are addressing a much needed improvement to the data pipeline. To my knowledge, these improvements will not enhance the coverage in remote areas but only developed areas. This is critical to free up more bandwidth not only for visitors; but in our opinion and more importantly, for essential services to maintain connectivity to perform our daily, routine business operations.

Sincerely,

██████████

Operations Manager/Co-Owner

Correspondence ID: 203 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Feb,28,2017 11:23:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Expanding cell service would be a benefit... especially for those of us that are new to the area and need help knowing what trail to hike, etc. Also, it would be beneficial in a medical emergency. If my 75 year old mother falls and gets hurt on a hike, I'd like to be able to call 911 and get her help!

Correspondence ID: 204 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Forest Fire Lookout Association Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: OfficialRep

Received: Feb,28,2017 13:08:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ██████████

Chief, Branch of Cultural Resources, Yellowstone National Park

Subject: Proposed Telecommunications Infrastructure at Mount Washburn & Other Park Areas

Chief ████████,

Our organization has had a chance to review the proposed project and while we agree that improving communications reliability and accessibility is a public safety issue, the proposed structure affiliated with the Mount Washburn lookout tower, leaves something to be desired. These comments follow our analysis of the documents provided on the park planning website related to the project as well as key documents related to the 2008 Wireless Plan.

In the original 2008 Finding of No Significant Impact document the working proposal was for a single tower, near the northwest corner of the lookout, to house the new and future telecommunications equipment. Specifically; "While the preferred alternative included construction of a new structure to mount existing antennas already located on the Mount Washburn fire lookout building, the Park will consider all options to reduce visual intrusions on visitors and the historic structure, while at the same time addressing the safety and security aspects of the site's proximity to a highly-used visitor destination." It was also noted that any

future development of the project would undertake the appropriate consultation process. Namely with the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office; "The park will consult with the Wyoming SHPO and utilize the best expertise possible to try and reach an appropriate design for a Mt. Washburn wireless communications facility. The design will consider standards submitted by the Wyoming SHPO during Section 106 consultation."

In reviewing the information provided on the park planning website, and submitted by the wireless contractor, it appears that contrary to the original proposals, the structure now under consideration is a "steel lattice structure" surrounding the north, east, and west sides above the upper floor of the lookout, with support towers in four places around the lookout. While the goal of removing the antennas from being directly attached to the lookout, for historic integrity sakes and safety, is laudable, our primary concerns are as follows:

- The lattice structure is overly intrusive and with two of the support poles in the middle of the tower the view is obstructed. Additionally, it is unclear when this new structure approach was developed and what other alternative were considered and why those alternatives were not presented as a viable option.
- There is also the concern that with the amount of open space remaining on the currently proposed lattice structure, the opportunity to continue to add equipment presents itself. The chief concern from our organization is that with this aspect is that eventually there will be so many pieces of communications equipment that it is no longer healthy to staff the lookout, or potentially allow visitors to the summit.
- Once the new communications equipment is installed, what incentive is there to preserve the historic lookout/visitor structure given that it has been kept staffed and maintained to help serve as a communications vista. With many deferred maintenance issues in the National Park Service and at Yellowstone, a concrete building on the top of a 10,000 foot mountain may or may not be a high priority and it may be more expedient to remove the structure at some point if the view shed and accessibility has been impaired, not to mention if the lookout is uninhabitable.

Given the above issues, our organization would advocate for a centralized tower, in the northwest corner near the tower, as far away as possible, consistent with the 2008 Wireless Plan. Additionally, a better option would be to site the tower away from the lookout entirely, potentially at the northern extent of the parking area, at least 100 feet.

Mount Washburn is the last remaining staffed lookout tower in Yellowstone National Park, and a historically unique structure. It also possesses a commanding view of nearly the entire park and as such draws over 250 visitors every day during the height of the summer season. This is a site then to be respected and dealt with sensitively. Our organization would advocate for the solution that reduces the appearance and footprint of the communications equipment through the most minimal above-ground structure possible. Given the mountain's strategic location for communications however we are not advocating for the removal of the equipment and recognize its importance. The need for additional equipment would indicate that now is the time to relocate existing and new equipment to a dedicated tower onsite rather than completely covering the historic lookout.

Finally, we look forward to working with the contractor and park staff to develop a modified support structure located away from the current lookout itself. Additionally, in the future our organization will proactively and collaboratively with the NPS natural and cultural resource managers at Yellowstone to help ensure the retention and preservation of the park's lookouts.

Thank you for your attention on these issues!

For follow up please [REDACTED]

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 205 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,01,2017 07:09:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: why is verizon wireless not paying rent to the taxpayer for the exclusive use of common ground? ranchers pay per head of livestock on a grazing allotment. lumber pays per acre for timber harvest. the carrier should pay fair market rent as if on private property. a long term lease per acre, per antenna, or percent royalty like mineral extraction should be amended to the land use approval, any notice to proceed, or certificate of occupancy.

Correspondence ID: 206 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,01,2017 12:24:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If the primary purpose of the proposed communication infrastructure is to improve cell phone reception throughout the park I wish to object against any such proposal. One of the wonders of Yellowstone is the relative tranquility we enjoy when we observe wildlife. Better cell phone service could result in a plethora of noisy selfie, movie or telephone conversation activity.

Correspondence ID: 207 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: PEER Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Mar,02,2017 09:05:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Proposed Telecommunications Infrastructure Expansions at Mount Washburn and Other Yellowstone National Park Areas

Comments submitted by

Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER)

March 2, 2017

Introduction

Yellowstone National Park has announced its intent to authorize a massive commercial cellular expansion that would result in a more than a fifty-fold increase in bandwidth, bathing the park and much of its remote backcountry with 4G signals to enable video streaming, music downloads and online gaming. Planned work is so extensive that one of its most visited venues, Mt. Washburn, will be closed to the public during construction.

The sixteen slated telecommunications augmentations include -

- A new 90-foot cell tower at Canyon (the park's first "monopine") and a new Verizon microwave tower at Lake, next to a tower that hosts a Qwest microwave dish;
- A new industrial "antenna support structure" at Mt. Washburn, wrapped around three sides of the historic fire lookout tower (which is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places); and
- Facilities to support "increased bandwidth for voice and data" at Old Faithful.

As detailed below, PEER urges that this planned project be withdrawn because, among other flaws, drawbacks and adverse effects, it -

- Improperly impairs park resources and values;
- Illegally avoids statutorily required environmental and historical preservation reviews;
- Violates several National Park Service (NPS) rules to protect scenery and soundscapes and to ensure required public notice and involvement;
- Makes improper use of park resources for purely commercial uses; and
- Diverts substantial resources away from priority YNP infrastructure needs.

COMMENTS

I. This Project Conflicts with Yellowstone's Very Purpose

The NPS Organic Act (16 U.S.C. Â§1) provides that -

"...the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein..."

The Purpose Statement for Yellowstone declares that its mission is to "preserve and protect the scenery, cultural heritage, wildlife, geologic and ecological systems and processes in their natural condition" [<https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/management/protecting-yellowstone.htm>]. Vastly expanding the network of cell towers inside Yellowstone contravenes these purposes. It enables visitors to bring the electronic ties of the modern world into the temple of nature,

displacing the natural sounds and cadences with the ubiquitous chirps, buzzes and ringtones of human artifice.

Further, NPS Management Policy 8.6.4.3 provides that "As with other special park uses, telecommunications proposals must meet the criteria listed in sections 1.4.7.1 and 8.2 to prevent unacceptable impacts. In addition, when considering whether to approve, deny, or renew permits, superintendents will... consider whether the proposal would cause unavoidable conflict with park's mission, in which case the permit will be denied."

Policy 1.4.7.1 defines unacceptable impacts as "impacts that, individually or cumulatively, would:

Be inconsistent with a park's purpose or values, or

Unreasonably interfere with... the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or the natural soundscape maintained in wilderness and natural, historic, or commemorative locations within the park."

In short, this massive expansion of microwave and cellular infrastructure in sixteen locations throughout the park is anathema to Yellowstone's very purpose.

II. Yellowstone Project Presentation Designed to Deceive the Public

YNP's minimal statements on the exact nature of this project have ranged from cryptically opaque to outright deceptive.

Its principal explanation is contained in a press release of January 30, 2017. This describes the project as "proposed telecommunications infrastructure" at Mt. Washburn and other Park Areas. Nowhere does it admit that this proposal would authorize at least three new cell towers.

Even when it cites a specific location, YNP obfuscates exactly what is being proposed. For example, the release mentions "an antenna mounting structure" at Mt. Washburn instead of calling it what it is: a new wrap-around, three-sided cell tower at Mt. Washburn.

The press release also states that "multiple antennas" would be relocated to the new structure, but does not mention how many. It also fails to mention that more antennas and microwave dishes would be added to the structure, so there will be more there in the future than there are now.

There are currently at least 35 antennas and microwave dishes on the Mt. Washburn fire lookout. It is never specified how many antennas and microwave dishes will be on the new cell tower when this project is complete.

Perhaps YNP's central deceit is the absurd claim that "This proposal is consistent with the 2008 Wireless Communications Service Plan." Not surprisingly, the Park makes no attempt to explain this more than curious position.

Moreover, the Park's position ignores the history and origins of the Wireless Plan. The Park agreed to produce such a document not eagerly and willingly, but begrudgingly, only after a

wave of negative publicity in 2004 about the highly visible Old Faithful cell tower caused public outrage and strongly-worded editorials against the Park's position. (One such editorial, from the Idaho Mountain Express, was headlined, "Old Faithful cell tower is unfaithful blight.").

The Park ultimately responded with an Environmental Assessment (EA) for its Wireless Plan, leading to a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) which strongly emphasized limiting cellular service in the park. YNP's press release on its final Wireless Plan in April 2009 stated:

¶ "The plan restricts towers, antennas, and wireless services to a few limited locations in the park, in order to protect park resources and limit the impact on park visitors."

¶ "No cell phone service will be allowed in the vast majority of Yellowstone."

¶ "Cell service is currently limited to the immediate vicinity of Canyon, Grant Village, Mammoth Hot Springs, and Old Faithful."

The Wireless Plan FONSI added this statement (p. 35): "limiting cell service was one of the primary means for the Wireless Communications Services Plan to protect park resources and visitor experience."

Yet the January 2017 announcement takes the complete opposite tack by declaring the need to "increase the availability of cellular telecommunications that currently limits park operations, visitor safety, and visitor experience." Although the basis for this statement is not explained, it is no way "consistent" with the restrictive 2008 Wireless Plan.

III. YNP Proceeding in Violation of NEPA

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that federal actions with environmental significance undergo a specific review process. This project obviously is a significant federal action that should trigger NEPA review.

For example, the projects proposal for Canyon is clearly for a new, free-standing cell tower. If approved, this will be the Park's sixth cell tower. Yet, this proposal was not in any way described or analyzed in the Wireless Plan EA or FONSI.

Similarly, the construction for new wireless structures at Mt. Washburn would be so extensive as to limit, and in some periods totally preclude, public access to one of the most visited site in the Park. Moreover, the project requires that two 2,000-gallon underground tanks be installed 50 feet from the generator on Mt. Washburn. Nowhere is the potential environmental danger of such tanks from leakage, explosions, or other causes even mentioned, let alone analyzed.

Nonetheless, YNP contends that NEPA review is not required because this multi-site project was already analyzed nine years ago in its comprehensive Wireless Services Communications Plan EA. That is plainly not the case.

A. Cumulative Impacts Ignored

YNP does not explore the impacts of the massive bandwidth expansion being proposed. A February 3, 2017 article in the Jackson Hole Daily estimated that this project would expand cellular capacity in the park from "4.5 megabytes of data per second" at Lake to "600 megabytes

of new capacity at Old Faithful and Grant, Canyon and Lake village areas..." That's a dramatic increase, with consequences for the way people use their phones in the Park, none of which was analyzed in the 2008 Wireless Plan.

Nor did that 2008 Wireless Plan predict the exponential growth of smartphones, since the iPhone was first released in 2008. Thus, the impacts of this technology on such topics as "Visitor Use and Experience," "Park Operations," and others were not discussed in that Wireless Plan.

B. Not All Projects Included

Records obtained by PEER under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) indicate that AT&T wants to put more of its antennas on the new structure at Mt. Washburn. This AT&T equipment is not part of the current proposal.

The Park wants to get permission for the structure before they "finalize" how many antennas will be up there. If even today YNP does not know how many and what type of structures it is authorizing, how can it contend these impacts were already analyzed - back in 2008, no less.

The evolution of wireless technology suggests that YNP will keep augmenting its infrastructure in a piecemeal fashion without any assessment of cumulative or even reasonably anticipated impacts. In fact, chances are good that there will never be a "final" version of this proposal, with more and more antennas being "needed" with each passing year.

C. Categorical Exclusion Is Inappropriate for This Construction Project

In its January 2017 news release, YNP states that "A Categorical Exclusion would be prepared for any changes requiring additional National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) compliance." However, YNP does not bother to indicate the category under which this proposal fits. In fact, reliance on a Categorical Exclusion (CE) for this project would be wholly inappropriate and would not withstand legal review.

NPS Director's Order (DO) 12 governing application of NEPA precludes use of a CE for construction projects except for minor construction projects. However, the scope of work entailed by this project covering 16 sites could hardly be called minor.

Moreover, the DO-12 Field guide bars use of a CE for any project which has "the potential to be controversial because of disagreement over possible environmental effects" - an apt description for this multi-site, massive wireless expansion.

In addition, the principal rationale cited by NPS for using a CE (the same bureaucratic device infamously used to green-light the BP Deepwater Horizon operations in the Gulf of Mexico before its disastrous 2010 spill) is that any environmental effects were already analyzed back in 2008. This rationale, as explained above, does not hold water.

IV. Project Does Not Comply with the National Historic Preservation Act

As there have been no assurances that this project would not have adverse effects on historic or cultural resources, the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) have yet to be met.

The regulation (36 CFR 800.2) outlining implementation of the public involvement section (Section 106) requires consultations with "participants" which is defined to include the public. This project has not been subject to any public input on its impact on historic resources - and these impacts are undeniable.

One of Yellowstone's most iconic features is Mt. Washburn. Its historic fire lookout tower is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Mt. Washburn is now festooned with at least 35 antennas and microwave dishes, many of them relating to cellular service in the Park. These have all been added since 1980 (the cellular antennas were added starting in 1996), yet there has been no NHPA analysis performed by the Park, and certainly no examination of the "cumulative effects" of such a conglomeration on the scenery at Mt. Washburn or on the viewshed from this historic structure.

The Park's January 2017 press release ends with this cryptic line: "Yellowstone is also consulting with the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office on the proposed designâ€" That statement in no way suggests that YNP is complying with Section 106 in this public comment period.

Park officials are undoubtedly aware that Section 106 review requires public involvement "commencing at the early stages of project planning," yet YNP has been working privately on on the Mt. Washburn part of this proposal with various telecom companies for more than eight years. In all that time, the Park has not allowed the public a meaningful opportunity to comment, as required by Section 106.

In fact, the NHPA Section 106 review has not even begun on the Mt. Washburn portion of proposal. On three occasions since late 2008, the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer has written to the park to inform them that they are unable to concur with any "no adverse effect" determination without having a specific proposal to review. However, no specific proposal has ever been submitted to them, until now. Yet even now, YNP keeps moving the goal-line with an ever-expanding number of new proposed antennas, dishes, and other structures proposed at Mt. Washburn.

V. A Blot on Park Scenery

When U.S. Army General William Tecumseh Sherman climbed to the summit of pristine Mt. Washburn in 1877, he wrote:

"Any man standing on Mt. Washburn feels as though the whole world were below him. The view is simply sublimeâ€"

Today's hikers would surely agree about the view, but there is one dramatic change to the summit itself: the massive industrial-age structure that General Sherman would certainly not recognize. From the simple fire lookout built in 1939, in the past few decades it has become an ever-growing eyesore, transforming scenic Mt. Washburn into Yellowstone's primary telecommunications hub.

Since 1916 when Congress created the NPS, Yellowstone officials have been required to

"conserve the scenery" of the Park and manage it "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." YNP's treatment of Mt. Washburn serves as a prominent exception to this nearly century-old mandate.

While the steady desecration of Mt. Washburn has spanned decades, in just the past few years Yellowstone has allowed an array of at least 35 microwave and cellular facilities to be installed. This project would authorize even more visual damage.

VI. Soundscape Effects Improperly Ignored NPS Management Policies provide that -

"The Service will take action to prevent or minimize all noise that through frequency, magnitude, or duration adversely affects the natural soundscape or other park resources or values "(4.9)

Notwithstanding that policy, YNP is now advocating actions that would increase ring-tones, music, movie soundtracks, electronic game noises, and all manner of beeps and buzzes throughout the Park by multiplying the bandwidth and coverage of wireless signals.

Moreover, the contention that because YNP seeks to limit cell coverage to developed areas does not preclude impairment of natural soundscapes. While the Old Faithful district is considered developed, the sounds as well as the sights and smells of the geysers are dominant. Due to YNP decisions, the whoosh of a geyser may be punctuated by cell chimes or the sound of a person blaring music or loudly hunting Pokémon. The project would magnify this impact by dramatically expanding bandwidth in this area. In short, this project shows that YNP continues to ignore directives that it is supposed to protect the natural soundscape.

VII. Even More Cell Penetration into Backcountry

This project will bring the clangorous sounds of electronic communication to a much bigger portion of Yellowstone, perhaps to the point where it will be difficult to find a remote corner that is inaccessible to cell phones.

Nor has YNP posted a coverage map on its PEPC site that gives any idea what additional coverage each project component will bring to YNP and where. Moreover, YNP has not displayed a cumulative coverage map depicting the total effect of the project's expanded coverage and signal strength.

Previous coverage maps analyzed by PEER indicate that commercial cell towers located inside Yellowstone Park now send signals to much of its wild backcountry, contradicting official assurances that signal spillover outside developed areas would be kept "to a minimum" and coverage would not reach "the vast majority of Yellowstone."

Approximately two-thirds of Yellowstone, including much of its backcountry, already has cellular coverage. In short, Yellowstone has become wired. This project would increase the bandwidth of signals an estimated fifty-fold. As a result, this project can be expected to increase the adverse effects on natural soundscapes and further disturb the possibility of solitude in the

once wild lands of Yellowstone.

VIII. Process Employed by YNP Violates NPS Manual

As required by NPS Reference Manual (RM-53, Special Park Uses, Rights-of-Way, Wireless Telecommunication Facilities, Appendix 5, Exhibit 6, Page A5-48), an SF-299 written application must be submitted by a wireless company to construct a new cell tower on land inside YNP. The SF-299 must contain all of the following:

"full description of the requested land or facility use in the park, including equipment and antennas (including structures) to be located at each site."

"maps showing the 'before' and 'after' service levels and signal strength for the proposed WTF site."

"maps showing all other WTF sites and their coverage operated by the applicant up to a 15 mile radius (or other distance determined appropriate by the superintendent)."

"propagation maps from the applicant showing its proposed buildout of sites within a 15 mile radius of the proposed site within the next five years (or other distance or time frame determined appropriate by the superintendent)."

a "copy of the FCC license authorizing the applicant to provide wireless telecommunications services for that area, along with a map showing the boundaries of the authorized service area and the relationship of that area to the park's boundaries"; and

a "realistic photo-simulation acceptable to the park depicting what the proposed WTF(s) and access, if applicable, would look like after installation."

RM-53 (Page A5-51) also requires the park's written response (either a yes, no, or maybe) following receipt of the SF-299 application, as well as notice to "other Telecommunication companies and other interested parties." In addition, that notice must be sent to the Park's "list of potential interested parties" (if the Park has one), or to "a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area and/or in the nearest metropolitan area newspaper."

YNP appears to have ignored all of these required procedural steps. For example, the Canyon proposal does not even have a current SF-299 posted at PEPC and no "before" and "after" coverage maps are provided. (They were provided to PEER in a FOIA request.) The Mt. Washburn proposal does not have a complete SF-299 posted. For example, there are no "before" and "after" coverage maps provided.

The reason this Rule requires that all of this must be provided is so that the public can determine the impact of a cellular proposal. In this project, YNP appears to want to keep the public in the dark about its impacts.

IX. Inaccurate, Unsupported Safety Claim

In its January 2017 release, YNP also alleges that "the availability of cellular

telecommunicationsâ€” currently limitsâ€”visitor safetyâ€” It does not explain this claim but it appears to be utterly specious.

YNP states that it wants to limit cell coverage to developed areas. Yet, it is unlikely that visitor safety in crowded areas of the Park depend upon cell coverage. Moreover, it is unclear why expanded bandwidth is needed to make an emergency call.

Moreover, when YNP officials contemplated cell tower placement as part of the 2008 Wireless Plan, they specifically declined to provide coverage to its main roads due to the added dangers of distracted drivers. Grand Teton National Park, for example, has blamed driver distractions for collisions causing the deaths of numerous large mammals.

In fact, this project has nothing whatsoever to do with visitor safety. As YNP official Bret DeYoung recently explained to the Jackson Hole Daily, the Park apparently wants more bandwidth to meet the prime time online banking needs of employees and visitors.

X. Questionable Use of Scarce Funds

Although Yellowstone has a billion-dollar maintenance backlog - the biggest infrastructure deficit of any national park - it is prioritizing investments in telecom, such as spending nearly a quarter-million dollars to bring Wi-Fi into the Old Faithful visitor center, over needed sewage upgrades and other basic needs.

Documents obtained by PEER through FOIA also detail other costs of this project. For example, at Mt. Washburn, the project -

Will require a "huge increase in power consumption" because of this new infrastructure, according to Northwestern Energy (the Park's power provider). Providing the new power infrastructure is slated to cost \$685,000;

Nearly a mile of power line replacement will be necessary; and

There is expected to be damage to the road up to Mt. Washburn. One consultant queried on April 27, 2016 writes: "Not sure how sensitive the trees are butâ€”"

By expediting bandwidth expansion over other needed infrastructure investments, YNP is exhibiting skewed priorities.

XI. Inappropriate Commercial Use of Public Land

As explained above, there is no demonstrated park purpose for this proposal. It is obvious that the real purpose of this project is to expand these commercial carriers' 4G coverage to their subscribers. Verizon's website states that 4G LTE gives its subscribers -

"â€”the ability to do moreâ€” Watch movies and TV without delay; Enjoy music without awkward pauses; Seamlessly play multi-player games."

With its never-ending noise and human-centered entertainment, 4G "activities" serve no legitimate park purpose. Instead, this proposal is simply a way to help a commercial operation increase its subscriber revenues. As such, it should have no place in a national park.

Adding injury to this insult, the project work is so extensive that the popular hiking trail up to Mt. Washburn will be closed to the public during construction. Excluding or restricting hikers and other members of the visiting public in order to accommodate work for commercial interests is especially inappropriate in a national park.

XII. Yellowstone Should Robustly Explore Alternatives

It was the Telecommunications Act of 1996 that opened the door to cell towers on federal lands. But that law merely required the President to establish procedures for executive agencies to use when considering applications for telecommunications facilities on federal lands. The Telecom Act does not require YNP or any other park to approve a single tower. In fact, the legislative history makes it clear that parks have full authority to reject any proposal submitted.

Section 704(c) is the part of the Telecom Act that discusses the placement of cell towers on federal lands. Members of the House Commerce Committee added Section 704(c) to the telecom bill through an amendment on May 17, 1995, and they made it very clear what they had in mind:

"The Committee recognizes, for example, that use of the Washington Monument, Yellowstone National Park, or a pristine wildlife sanctuary, while perhaps prime sites for an antenna and other facilities, are not appropriate and use of them would be contrary to environmental, conservation, and public safety laws." (Emphasis added)

YNP officials appear to act as if they are required to grant commercial wireless carriers rights-of-way. To the contrary, YNP has several options - including outright rejection of this proposed project as well as any further wireless expansion inside Yellowstone.

###

Correspondence ID: 208 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Individual Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Mar,02,2017 14:30:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Living just outside of Yellowstone National Park we feel any new towers would be an asset. We always turn our phones off when going into the park. There are millions of guest and no service. We all know what these guest are capable of. Also accidents. We need service over the park to be able to report any problems. Wildlife harassment would be my first and foremost complaint to be able to call in.

Then speeding. Would live to go in the park leaving my phone on to use my apps on wildlife , weather, flora identification. Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 209 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,03,2017 10:17:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please consider expanding cell phone coverage. While I understand the importance of unplugging, cell phone coverage could greatly improve the safety of the back country.

Correspondence ID: 210 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,11,2017 15:35:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a current Forest Service lookout in Oregon, a past NPS rescue ranger and a longtime fan (since I was 8 yrs old and currently 61 yrs old)of Yellowstone NP I feel the proposed communications upgrade to Mt. Washburn Lookout is unbelievably huge, ungainly and unsightly. As a lookout I fully realize the importance of communications for the NPS and the rescue and firefighting resources on a typical incident. Please count this note as two no votes (my wife Linda Freimuth as well)for the current design of this commo array. I can't believe that a robust improvement can't be designed or relocated away from the lookout to achieve your goals. I found out about this document from the FFLA group that represents current and past lookouts and their fans. Best regards, [REDACTED] - High Ridge Lookout

Correspondence ID: 211 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,14,2017 11:15:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With regards to new facilities at Lake:

Scoping does not explain why more structures are needed at Lake, so soon after the construction of the Lake cell tower above the Lake residential area.

Piecemeal planning plus continual expansion of human activities and structures is a grave threat to Yellowstone, the famous "death by 10,000 scratches" described by David Hallac (former head of Resource Management).

New antennas and support buildings every 5 years at Lake and other areas are a concern to me, indicating a never-ending but vague pursuit of "better". I question the assumption that more cell equipment will benefit the 'visitor experience'. I also question the assumption that merely keeping structures "hidden from public view" makes them environmentally acceptable, and the assumption that the only public you need to consider are those on the increasingly crowded roads.

I am also concerned about the exclusive privilege granted to Verizon by the Park. As a long-time user of a Trac phone, I was astonished to find that the only place with a cell tower (in the western US) where my phone does not work is at Lake. By contrast, it works fine around Canyon and Grant Village.

If you must expand communication facilities, please ensure the services they provide are not restrictive and tied to certain companies. If Verizon has been favored by Park decisions, the

reasons for this and the nature of the Park's relationship with this company should at least be made clear to the public.

Correspondence ID: 212 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,14,2017 11:50:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Upgrading cellular communications to enhance telecommunications for search and rescue is an important undertaking. The attached documents illustrate that the NPS has taken every step to ensure tower structures are disguised as well as possible in order not to distract from the visitor's unobstructed view of the park. The use of monopine tower structures has been incorporated in many parks and along the interstate highway system, unbeknownst to many who pass by them. I applaud, and support, the NPS in its effort to upgrade communications and safety of Yellowstone Nat'l Park, so long as all efforts are made to not detract from the park visitors experience are conducted.

Many of the Nat'l Parks should remain untouched and pristine, affording all Americans the chance to "visit and escape the ravages of a connected society." We can always turn off our phones if we want to disconnect, or if service is unavailable, but it's always comforting to know that if we truly need to communicate, especially during emergencies, that powering up your phone will certainly bring the help that's needed.



Correspondence ID: 213 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,15,2017 05:47:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This proposal seems designed to have minimal visual impact.I am impressed by the planning behind it. I feel the safety impact of having better communications throughout Yellowstone are massive. It is important to take advantage of the available technology To protect the public as well as aiding in management of the Park.

A thank you to the Park and Verizon staff for their hard work on this. A further note is that these are not immutable changes. They can easily be reversed in the future if some even less invasive method of communication (such as satellites) becomes available for ordinary cell phones.

For now, this is a good approach. I only wish they were doing something at the Northeast Gate ranger station near Silver Gate/Cooke City as well.

Correspondence ID: 214 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,15,2017 07:59:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My grandfather helped build Yellowstone Park's first roads, arch bridge,

the water system at Mammoth, and more. Every summer, he hitched Pet and Babe to a sheep wagon and drove about 100 miles into the Park, where he worked summers for many years. His work helped people access Yellowstone, so I ask myself: Would Grandpa approve cell phone towers in the park? Here is a clue: he once grew angry at a man who traveled from West to speak at his church in the Big Horn Basin. Not for what he said, but because: "No one should drive through Yellowstone Park in one day." Why? Because he wanted people to enjoy the park for its natural phenomena. Grandpa is long gone but I am of the same view. I have toured many visitors, Why do I want people to visit Yellowstone Park? Because it reminds us what we are, not who but what. We should immerse ourselves in the sights, sounds, smells that are unique. Cell phones and all the social media get in the way, blocking the depth of experiences.

I urge you to reduce, not expand, cell services in Yellowstone. I can see that cell phones aid traffic management and other functions of park employees, so limit the service to them. I read the plea that expanded cell service would make it easier to do banking, etc.; another way of saying that some people want to make a visit to Yellowstone ordinary, like those who want to see everything but never get out of their car. Somehow, even before cell phones, people got such things done. A trip to Yellowstone should be an unforgettable time spent with Nature.

Down with the towers. That is my wish.

Correspondence ID: 215 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,15,2017 09:33:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support improving telecom infrastructure in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 216 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,15,2017 09:46:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in support of the proposed changes to Mount Washburn and other areas of the park to allow for better cell phone coverage. Yellowstone is an exceptional wilderness area because of its popularity, accessibility and attractiveness to international, national, and local tourists. Many of these folks are phone dependent and having cell phone access helps them feel safer in the park. We want folks to enjoy the park and if cell phone access helps tourism in the park I am all for it. We need more people experiencing wilderness and talking about it in order to ensure a future of public spaces. Yellowstone helps people understand and imagine wilderness. We want them texting and writing and tweeting about their great experiences and the need to preserve wild places.

Correspondence ID: 217 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,15,2017 14:24:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the effort to upgrade and improve cell service and associated infrastructure in YNP. As a contractor who has worked in the park for 20 years, having adequate cellular communication is critical. During the peak months - mid June thru mid-September - and peak times of day, cell phones simply do not work. I support any and all improvement to the existing system and continued improvements in the future.

Correspondence ID: 218 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,15,2017 22:44:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are three distinct parts to Yellowstone's new telecom proposal:

1. a new, free-standing cell tower at Canyon;
2. a new "antenna mounting structure" at Mt. Washburn, so that antennas and dishes currently on the historic fire lookout can be relocated to the new structure; and
3. a bandwidth enhancement project that includes new microwave dishes at Mt. Washburn, Grant, and Canyon, and a new microwave tower and dish at Lake.

I will discuss each part separately because each has a different history and each has a defined process to follow.

First, however, I will start with a comment about the National Historic Preservation Act's Section 106 regulations, since those are central to consideration of all aspects of this proposal. Under 36 CFR 800.2(d)(2), ("Providing Notice and Information"), YNP must "provide the public with information about an undertaking and its effects on historic properties and seek public comment and input." If YNP wants to use the NEPA process for section 106 purposes, it must notify "in advance the SHPO/THPO and the Council that it intends to do so" and meet the standards provided in 800.8(c). In my view, the current "public comment" period does not qualify as notice that the Park is accepting Section 106 comments at this time, for the following three reasons:

1. The Park notified the public of this proposal by issuing a press release and posting documents at the NPS Planning website (PEPC) on January 30, 2017. But the Park's press release does not mention Section 106 at all. In November 2012, when this same "notice" issue arose during consideration of the proposed Lake cell tower, the Park extended the comment period and issued a second press release with this line (which was not part of the initial release): "Information relating to the proposal, including documentation regarding compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act,... can be found online" YNP recently extended the comment period in this case, but did not issue a press release or explain why (at least in any forum that I am aware of), and did not describe the current public comment period as related to Section 106.
2. You have not sought to tie the NEPA and NHPA processes together pursuant to NHPA's

Section 106 regulations, as 36 CFR 800.8(c) requires.

3. The two letters from YNP to historic preservation authorities that are posted at PEPC were posted four days after the press release was issued. A member of the public who was interested in this proposal could have checked the documents posted at PEPC from January 30 to February 3, 2017 and missed the two documents describing Section 106 aspects of this proposal.

A separate Section 106 process is warranted here anyway. The Park has put forward a complex proposal that may impact as many as eight historic properties. The public should be given an opportunity, at a later time, to focus on this specific aspect of the proposal.

Part 1: A new cell tower proposal at Canyon:

I have seven comments on this proposal:

1. The Canyon cell tower proposal is contrary to the plain language of the Wireless Plan of 2008, and must be withdrawn.

YNP's press release of January 30, 2017 claims that every aspect of the Park's infrastructure upgrade is "consistent with the 2008 Wireless Communications Services Plan." This is clearly false with respect to the proposal at Canyon. While cellular coverage is permitted at Canyon, and coverage may even be "improved," the Wireless Plan limited such Canyon improvements to upgrades of the facilities at Mount Washburn. Here is the relevant language of the Wireless Plan:

First, on page 19 of the Wireless Plan (the foldout page), the Alternative C summary provides as follows: "Improve cell coverage at Canyon and Tower-Roosevelt with equipment upgrades at Mount Washburn."

Then, on page 102 (Alternative C: Cultural Resources), the Wireless Plan provides that "Cell service would also be improved at Canyon and Tower-Roosevelt due to upgrading of the existing facilities on Mount Washburn."

On page 108 (Alternative C: Health and Human Safety), the Plan provides that "â€ improvement at Mount Washburn would improve cell phone coverage at the Tower-Roosevelt and Canyon developments."

Finally, on page 112 (Alternative C: Park Operations), the Plan provides for improvement of cell phone coverage at Canyon, but only "as a result of changes in the Mount Washburn cell antennas,â€"

Even the rejected Alternative D, which called for a "Substantial Increase in Wireless Services," did not authorize a new free-standing cell tower at Canyon, but instead stuck to the same language as Alternative C: "Improve cell coverage at Canyon and Tower-Roosevelt with equipment upgrades at Mount Washburn" (see p. 19 of the Plan).

2. Describing this new cell tower proposal at Canyon as "consistent" with the Wireless Plan is

also at odds with past statements made by Park officials.

On October 15, 2012, YNP was working towards final approval of a new cell tower at Lake (which was specifically provided for in the Wireless Plan), and offered these thoughts in a press release: "The Lake/Fishing Bridge area is the only location in the park where construction of a new cell tower was permitted under the park's Wireless Communications Services Plan Environmental Assessment (Wireless Plan EA)."

A month later (November 19, 2012), the Park issued another press release on the proposed Lake cell tower and repeated its position that the "Lake area is the only location in the park where construction of a new cell tower was permitted under the park's Wireless Plan"

When asked about the Lake tower proposal, Bret DeYoung, YNP's Branch Chief of Telecommunications, repeated the Park's position that it would be the "last tower" to go in at Yellowstone for the "foreseeable future." "That'll be it," De Young told the Jackson Hill News & Guide for a story that appeared on October 18, 2012. "All the ones that are detailed in the Yellowstone Communications EA are already in existence."

YNP cannot change its long-held position without a formal amendment to the Wireless Plan.

3. Your new position on a cell tower at Canyon not only contradicts the Wireless Plan and previous statements by Park officials, but also is alarming on its face. Your new thinking can be summarized as follows: if there is cellular coverage in a given area, then any new cell tower (or other installation) is allowed, as long as Park officials conclude that it would be "unobtrusive" and would not "diminish the physical or visual integrity of cultural resources." (See, e.g., "Remarks from the Committee" in the "Proposal for New Wireless Service" at Canyon in the 2016 Annual Report of the Wireless Committee.) Under this theory, the Park could approve one, two, or even ten new cell towers at Canyon and at every other "developed" area of the Park and call it "consistent" with the Wireless Plan. This is directly at odds with the very essence of the Wireless Plan, whose second sentence (p. ii) reads:

"This plan would protect park resources and values by limiting the types and locations of wireless services and infrastructure in Yellowstone National Park."

"Limiting infrastructure" is the opposite of allowing potentially unlimited new infrastructure.

4. Even if the Wireless Plan provided for a new cell tower at Canyon, which it does not, you have failed to provide the public with the detailed information required under NPS Reference Manual 53 (Special Park Uses, Rights-of-Way, Wireless Telecommunication Facilities), which is the policy that governs the process in these cases. For example:

- Where is the correct Standard Form (SF) 299 application filed by Verizon? The one you have posted at PEPC is dated November 10, 2015 and states that Verizon "will be installing antennas and a MW dish on the existing CenturyLink tower." This is not even the proposal under consideration. The Canyon proposal is for a new cell tower, not the co-location proposal described in the posted SF-299.

- -Where is the "fundamental" information that must accompany each SF-299, including the "before" and "after" coverage maps for the Canyon cell tower? YNP has made some serious claims in its press release, including that the Canyon tower would "limit spillover into the backcountry"; the public must be given the opportunity to closely examine these claims. (The Wireless Plan FONSI, p. 31, specifically mentions the importance of coverage maps: "Signal coverage maps will be required to be submitted as part of the application process" to "ensure the desired coverage area is obtained while minimizing spillover of the signal beyond the intended area.")

- -Where is the letter to the applicant indicating "whether the park's answer will be a yes, no or maybe"? This is required within the first ten business days of the process. If such a letter exists, it should have been posted at PEPC.

- -Where is the "notice to the park's list of potential interested parties advising receipt of the application, if the park has developed such a list," or, if you do not have such a list, the "notice of receipt" published in "a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area and/or in the nearest metropolitan area newspaper"? I do not see either one of these posted at PEPC, and yet those actions were required "no later than 10 days after receipt of the application."

5. Another issue with the new cell tower proposal at Canyon revolves around the serious factual discrepancies in Verizon's proposal. For example, the SF-299 posted at PEPC states that "Nine (9) existing trees will be removed." Yet the drawings provided (p. C-3) indicate that the applicant will "remove (16) trees as shown on plan view." This is not a minor detail, given that photo simulations of the proposed free-standing tower show significant visibility of the structure above the treeline (see "Northwest Elevation from Point 002 with 55mm lens"). Which number is correct? Do the photo simulations take into account the trees to be removed? Will these missing trees and the tower's clear visibility above the treeline create an "adverse effect" on the nearby historic districts pursuant to Section 106 of NHPA?

How far above tree height will the proposed tower be? This question is critical, and needs more examination. Yet there is uncertainty in the documents on this issue, too. The "Proposal for New Wireless Service" form dated November 2015 states that the "tower will extend approximately 20' above the dense canopy of trees." But the Park's February 3, 2017 letter to the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer (WY SHPO) states that the "proposed additional tower at Canyon would be approximately 25 feet taller than the existing telecommunications tower." No mention is made of the proposed tree-cutting in the Park's letter to WY SHPO, and no information is provided on how much above the soon-to-be less dense canopy of trees the tower will be. But as Park officials know, any cell tower "taller than 20 feet above the surrounding tree height would require a detailed explanation of why a shorter installation is not feasible" (see p. 44 of the Wireless Plan). Such a "detailed explanation" is not presently in any of the documents posted at PEPC.

6. Here's another mystery concerning the Canyon proposals: Verizon's SF-299 application for the co-location proposal is dated November 10, 2015, while Verizon's "Proposal for New Wireless Service," requesting permission to build a new free-standing cell tower at Canyon, is dated

November 16, 2015. Why would Verizon propose two different projects at Canyon within six days of each other? Is the "November 16, 2015" date on the Verizon free-standing proposal a typo? If not, why did the Wireless Committee fail to act for more than a year on this proposal, with Superintendent Wenk signing off in early January 2017? Why was there no compliance with RM-53 from the earliest stages of this proposal, as required?

7. Finally, you will need to provide additional NEPA and NHPA documentation for any new cell tower proposal at Canyon, which will then trigger the requirement of a Federal Register notice to alert the public to the availability of the new compliance information (see RM-53, App. 5, Exhibit 6, Page A5-53). The Wireless Plan incorporates this RM-53 requirement on p. 38: "For [Wireless Communication Facilities] that require a right-of-way permit (currently cellular communications towers and associated infrastructure), the park would issue a notice in the Federal Register per the requirements of NPS DO/RM-53"

Part 2: A new "antenna mounting structure" at Mount Washburn:

Here are my six comments on the Mt. Washburn proposal:

1. The Mt. Washburn fire lookout is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. In 1997, NPS filled out an "Historic Structure Survey Form" that included this comment on what was already an antenna-laden eyesore: "While the accumulation of an excess of telecommunications equipment is unfortunate, it does not significantly detract from the lookout's integrity, and the equipment and antennas may not represent a permanent alteration to the building." "Unfortunate" indeed. If the NPS writer only knew the extent of the "excess" to come in 2017: a multi-sided industrial "antenna mounting structure" laden with lots of additional microwave dishes needed for the Park's "bandwidth expansion."

2. What about the "cumulative effects" of NPS actions at Mt. Washburn? The first telecommunications antenna was placed at the summit in 1980. There are now an estimated 35 antennas and microwave dishes there. How many will be there if this proposal is approved? Is there any limit to the number of antennas and dishes that you will approve for Mt. Washburn? If ever there was a need for an examination of the "cumulative effects" of NPS actions over past decades, it is here at Mt. Washburn.

3. NEPA compliance to date has been skimpy at best. For the Mt. Washburn structure, there is a one-sentence description of the project in the Wireless Plan (p. 28):

"A new antenna mounting structure would be constructed at the summit of Mt. Washburn to relocate the existing antennas and microwave dishes from the fire lookout structure (Fig. 8)." The Figure 8 referred to was a "photo simulation concept for an antenna platform at Mt. Washburn."

That's it for a description. Now, eight years after the Wireless Plan FONSI, the Park has published a press release with five single-sentence bullets describing the Mt. Washburn project, and posted 16 separate documents online (maps; drawings; photos; computer simulations; etc.), only five of which relate to Mt. Washburn. That, the Park concludes, is sufficient NEPA. Not

only that, the Park believes that a Categorical Exclusion is justified for this multi-faceted proposal. I disagree.

First, let us remember that NEPA is required for "plans," and more NEPA is required for the individual projects that fulfill the plans. That's exactly the case here. In the Wireless Plan, you introduced the idea of a new cell tower at Mt. Washburn, and "approved" it; now you must present the actual proposal, with specificity and additional analysis. As the NPS NEPA Handbook (2015) makes clear on p. 14, NEPA is "Ultimately Site Specific" For site-specific actions, this means site-specific detail For example, adoption of a general management plan (GMP) may be a broad-based decision informed by a NEPA review that is often correspondingly broad. However, implementation of a particular action called for in a GMP such as construction of a visitor contact station, will often require an additional, site-specific NEPA review that is tiered from the GMP."

And what kind of documentation is required under NEPA? Is it acceptable to issue a brief press release with a few Mt. Washburn details, then post 16 unorganized documents and call it sufficient? No! NEPA requires a coherent and concise document "at a level of detail to that necessary to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in significant environmental impacts" (see p. 17 of the Handbook). While you "should strive to keep an EA to no more than 50 pages," an EA may be longer than 50 pages where the issues involved are controversial or very complex In all cases, the length of an EA should be sufficient to demonstrate that NPS has taken a hard look at the environmental impacts of the proposed action and any alternatives."

Where is the documentation that "NPS has taken a hard look at the environmental impacts of the proposed action and any alternatives"? You have not provided any commentary on the maps, drawings, photos, and simulations provided at PEPC, but have simply tossed them out for the public to digest, without any assistance at all. This is wrong, and a violation of the letter and spirit of NEPA. You need to provide a supplementary NEPA document that coherently explores the complex Mt. Washburn proposal (including the bandwidth enhancement portion) in detail. Then it will be time to ask the public to comment on the proposal.

4. As it is, the Mt. Washburn documents that you have provided at PEPC are full of contradictory and confusing information:

The SF-299 posted at PEPC states that a "new 39'6" self support tower will be constructed" by Verizon, as if it is one big structure, but the diagram on p. T1 states that "four (4) self support towers" will be constructed. Which description is true? It is also impossible to tell how many antennas and microwave dishes will be on the structure when it is complete. The Park's press release of January 30, 2017 focuses on the "multiple antennas" that will be relocated from the historic fire lookout, but ignores the more important fact that twelve new panel antennas and five new microwave dishes will be added, with two more of the latter structures proposed for "future installation" (see p. T1). Lots of antennas will also be "relocated" to the new structure: "twelve (12) existing omni antennas, three (3) existing di-poles, three (3) grid dishes, [and] one (1) existing GPS antenna." Nowhere in these diagrams do we learn the purpose of all of these antennas. More importantly, one has to wonder whether the Park will ever stop adding to the new structure, once it is built. How can the public (and Wyoming SHPO) judge the project's visual

impact when we cannot be assured that additional telecommunications infrastructure will not be added at some future date under the auspices of this proposal?

The Wireless Plan (p. 106) mentions "the existing microwave dish on Mt. Washburn," as if there was just one when the plan was written in 2008. But the computer and photo simulations provided at PEPC clearly show multiple microwave dishes at the "existing" site, contradicting the language of the Wireless Plan. Were these highly-visible dishes added after the Wireless Plan was released in 2008? If so, when were they added, and what formal approval process did they go through?

If p. T1 is correct that there will soon be seven microwave dishes at the summit, how is that not a violation of the NPS Organic Act, which requires NPS to "conserve the scenery" and leave it "unimpaired" for future generations?

In any event, the serious factual discrepancies highlighted above reinforce the need for a concise supplementary NEPA document that provides the public with all of the details on the proposal at Mt. Washburn.

5. Let's now examine Yellowstone's unfulfilled promises for Mt. Washburn:

So many people took issue with the hideous structure YNP first proposed for Mt. Washburn (Fig. 8 in the Wireless Plan) that the Park amended the Plan and twice promised to do better in the FONSI:

(p. 3): "In response to comments, this FONSI modifies the preferred alternative to reconsider the design of a new antenna mounting structure at the summit of Mt. Washburn to relocate existing antennas and microwave dishes from the fire lookout structure. While the preferred alternative included construction of a new structure to mount existing antennas already located on the Mount Washburn fire lookout building, the Park will consider all options to reduce visual intrusions on visitors and the historic structure,â€"

(p. 29): "To respond to comments, further site design must be completed for Mount Washburn. While the preferred alternative included construction of a new structure to relocate the existing antennas already located on the Mount Washburn fire lookout building, the Park will consider other possibilities to minimize or reduce visual intrusions for visitorsâ€"

I have reviewed all of the maps, diagrams, photos, and simulations posted at PEPC, but cannot find any documentation that the Park has considered "all options" or "other possibilities" at Mount Washburn. Where can the public find such documentation? If there is no such documentation, then you have an obligation to consider all other "options" and "possibilities" now, and report to the public on your findings, before moving ahead with the current proposal.

6. YNP is also not complying with the mandatory procedures of RM-53, which the Wireless Plan states the Park "will comply with" for "any proposed project" (see p. 37). For example:

- Where are the "before" and "after" coverage maps for the Mt. Washburn proposal?;

- The relevant SF-299 application posted at PEPC is dated June 4, 2015. If this is the current application, where is the "notice to the park's list of potential interested parties advising receipt of the application, if the park has developed such a list," or, if you do not have such a list, the "notice of receipt" published in "a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area and/or in the nearest metropolitan area newspaper"? I do not see either one of these posted at PEPC, and yet those actions were required "no later than 10 days after receipt of the application";

- Where is the letter to the applicant indicating "whether the park's answer will be a yes, no or maybe"? This is required within the first ten business days of the process. If such a letter exists, it should have been posted at PEPC.

- How can this SF-299 application be considered "complete" when the critically important co-location details are not provided? AT&T's antennas at Mt. Washburn will need to be relocated onto the new structure; these details are an integral part of this proposal. Other wireless companies licensed to do business in Wyoming may also want to place antennas on the structure. How can we (the public) judge the impact of a proposal when we do not know the most important details? Also, the photo and computer simulations apparently include only Verizon's antennas, and this gives the viewer a limited and insufficient sense of what the final structure would look like.

Part 2a: The Mt. Washburn proposal and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act:

Although I believe that a separate Section 106 public comment period is necessary (see my previous comments), I offer the following thoughts on the photo and computer simulations provided at PEPC and whether they show an "adverse effect" on the historic Mt. Washburn fire lookout tower.

The Northwest Elevation Simulation (PS3) and Southeast Elevation Simulation (PS5) both show more visual harm to the site from the new infrastructure, not less. The South Elevation Simulation (PS 7) would be an improvement over the existing view. But PS 7 and PS 9 seem to contradict each other (both are labeled "South Elevation Simulation," but PS 7 does not show the highly visible cellular antennas).

The computer simulations (showing only Verizon's antennas, I assume) are also shocking to the eyes, when one considers that the summit of Mt. Washburn was once one of the premier scenic attractions in the park: the "North Side" (proposed), "Southwest Side" (proposed), "South Side" (proposed), and "Northwest Above" (proposed) are all far worse visually than the current situation. "West Side" (proposed) is dramatically worse. The "East Side" (proposed) is not as bad as the others, but still not an improvement.

Let's look at the definition of "adverse effects" in the Section 106 regulations (36 CFR 800.5(a)(2):

Examples of adverse effects:

(iv): "Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance."

(v): "Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;

Both of these examples are on point. YNP's only option is to come forward with a finding of "adverse effect" and then seek to resolve that effect pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6. This would entail another public comment period so that members of the public could "express their views on resolving adverse effects of the undertaking."

Part 3: The bandwidth enhancement proposal, in general:

1. YNP has bundled the proposed "antenna mounting structure" at Mt. Washburn with an above-ground "bandwidth expansion" proposal that will permanently impair one of Yellowstone's most spectacular summits. At the very least, these proposals should be separated and dealt with individually, to facilitate greater public understanding of, and participation in, the review process.

2. The Wireless Plan "approved" bandwidth expansion without providing any specifics. The additional documents at PEPC add nothing to our understanding of the impacts it might have on park visitors, administrators, soundscapes, and other topics. More analysis is needed pursuant to NEPA and NHPA.

Part 3a: The bandwidth enhancement proposal as it relates to a new free-standing microwave tower and dish at Lake:

1. You have failed to provide enough details about the Lake proposal. All we know is that the tower will be 105' tall, with one 6' microwave dish on it. It will be located adjacent to an existing microwave tower of the same height.

2. What process must the Park follow to approve a new microwave tower? The 2008 Wireless Plan (p. 38) states that "DO-53 Paragraph 10.3 and RM-53 Appendix 5 are not applicable to microwave facilities," but this appears to have been superseded by the updated Director's Order 53 of 2010 (Section 10.2.2), which defines "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities" as "including, but not limited to cellular, microwave, television, and radio." That section provides that "applications for personal wireless communication facilities must be processed, as closely as possible, according to the timeline and steps enumerated in RM-53."

The procedures of RM-53 should apply to the Lake tower proposal. It is a proposal made by a wireless company, and its purpose is to expand the cellular network in the park.

3. The only NEPA done so far for this proposal is what you have posted at PEPC (a few photo simulations and some "Preliminary, Not For Construction" Drawings). The SF-299 for the Mt. Washburn proposal does contain any details about the proposal at Lake, except to mention its \$50,000 cost.

4. A "Categorical Exclusion" is inappropriate for a new 105' microwave tower that will stand adjacent to a similar structure.

Part 3b: The bandwidth enhancement proposal and historic preservation:

1. The Wireless Plan's Design Standards, and WY SHPO's Design Standards, are being ignored. Here's what the Wireless Plan provides (p. 43):

"To ensure that impacts are kept at or below 'minor' as described in this EA, WCFs would not be located in a manner that adversely affects a building, district, or element eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." How is the placement of a growing number of microwave dishes at Mt. Washburn consistent with this provision?

WY SHPO has also provided YNP with "Design Standards and Construction Requirements" (see Betsy H. Bradley's letter to Superintendent Lewis dated December 10, 2008), and some of these would be violated by the current proposal:

"To minimize impacts to the viewsheds, the tower should be sited to be some distance from the existing tower." The proposed new wrap-around structure will not be "some distance" away.

"The location of the large brown drum antennas should be carefully considered. The roof of the new tower could be an appropriate location since they would read at a distance as the tower roof."

This last suggestion is especially relevant (and should be considered at length in a supplementary NEPA document) given the increasing number of microwave dishes required for the "bandwidth enhancement" proposal.

Final thoughts:

The current proposal is far too complicated to move forward as one big package. It requires supplementary analysis pursuant to NEPA and NHPA, none of which NPS has done to date. Also, the procedural requirements of RM-53 have not been met for any aspect of this package. You should withdraw this proposal and start fresh with a simple proposal for a new structure at Mt. Washburn, whose sole purpose would be to get the existing antennas and dishes off the historic fire lookout. My guess is that most members of the public would support doing something to ameliorate the industrial eyesore at the summit.

Correspondence ID: 219 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2017 09:21:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a semi-retired medical provider in Bozeman. For the last four decades,

I have hiked, backpacked, climbed, and traveled by skis, snowshoes, and canoes in all backcountry and frontcountry areas of YNP, and have camped in the Park in all seasons. YNP has massive needs for funds and personnel to protect natural and historical resources, provide law enforcement and interpretive services, and maintain needed infrastructure. Federal funds available to meet these needs are only a fraction of the dollars needed to protect and preserve YNP for future generations. Reviewing the projected "improvements"- moving buried electrical lines, excavating underground chambers for antennas, installing new generators, and erecting new antennas above-ground, I am dumb-struck by the waste of extremely scarce funds on expensive, unnecessary telecom technology that does nothing to further the core missions of the NPS. This egregious waste of money and staff time on improving smartphone performance also undermines the support you could expect from the sectors of the public most committed to protecting YNP- those who use and visit the Park frequently, repeatedly, year after year, at all times of year, and who cherish it. Many of us communicate regularly with our members of Congress and other elected officials. We are unlikely to urge more funds be allocated to NP protection when we see Yellowstone NP administration undervaluing its mission to safeguard the natural resource itself. Funding such telecom projects is similar to a homeowner who has a leaking roof that threatens the structural integrity of the house, but invests their money not in a new roof, but in the latest high-tech alarm system, or in new wireless telecom control of thermostats, lights, entertainment devices in their house. This project deserves comprehensive and detailed study of all the impacts and ramifications of using scarce resources for technology that does nothing to protect the Park itself.

Correspondence ID: 220 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2017 11:46:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If the proposal to increase YNP Cellphone Service is something that would cost a single dime of Park funds, I urge very strongly that the proposal be turned down. Being cut off from screen time and the inanities of social media is an important part of the experience of being in a place like Yellowstone. If I want to listen to people shouting into their phones, I can go to a Walmart. I don't want to be continually dismayed by the sight of kids texting like entranced zombies when they are surrounded by the beauties and the wonders of YNP.

If the Park Employees and Emergency Services need cellphone upgrades, then keep those upgrades isolated for those purposes alone.

Thanks for your attention in this matter.

Correspondence ID: 221 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Teton Amateur Radio Repeater Association Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Mar,19,2017 17:32:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yellowstone National Park
Proposed Changes to Mount Washburn

Public Comment from the Teton Amateur Radio Repeater Association
March 18, 2017

I am writing to request your consideration for allowing Amateur (Ham) Radio capabilities in the "Proposed Changes to Mount Washburn" now being developed for Yellowstone National Park.

As the president of the Teton Amateur Radio Repeater Association and the Jackson Hole Area Amateur Radio Club located in Jackson, Wyoming, each year I receive several messages from Amateur radio operators requesting information about what Amateur radio services are available when they travel in Yellowstone National Park. Many of these requests are from people who are going to be accessing the back country areas of the Park. Currently, the answer to these questions is that there isn't anything. We hope to be able to change this answer to be able to say that there is a good amateur radio system in the Park.

Frequently people have checked with me by radio once they have gotten into the area to let someone know they will either be in the back country or climbing. On multiple occasions I have personally been a vital radio link between some of these Amateur radio operators and the rescue rangers of Grand Teton National Park for emergency rescue operations.

For many years amateur radio has been an important source of communications during times of emergency. Some of those include the disasters on September 11, 2001 and Hurricane Katrina. With emergency communications in mind, having a network of amateur radio repeaters in Yellowstone National Park would serve very well as a communications back up to the Park's normal communications, as well as integrating the Park with surrounding communities for emergency purposes. With many Amateur radio operators interested and trained in emergency communications, the availability of an Amateur radio system within the Park would make available a large amount of additional resources for the Park to be able to call upon in time of an emergency or disaster situation. The gate communities would also be able to benefit from this VHF system on Amateur frequencies.

We would request that there be included in the YNP proposed changes to Mount Washburn the ability for an amateur radio repeater in the Park. We would like to have permission to "co-locate" our system with change to the proposed changes to Mount Washburn site. I feel that allowing commercial operations to increase their operations should also include a non-commercial operation - ham radio to be able to have a space for their operations.

Amateur radio has a grand tradition from the 1910s onward. There are 660 thousand Amateurs in the United States and 2.5 million worldwide. Amateur radio (or "ham" radio) is a non-commercial hobby and volunteer emergency service that encourages radio communications and experimentation. Amateurs are prohibited from any commercial activity or monetary gain when they operate their radios. Amateur operators are licensed by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission or the equivalent authorities in other countries (foreign Amateurs also visit the park each year) to operate on assigned frequencies.* Average numbers of Amateur radio operators in a population for countries by region are: North America (1 per 546), South America (1 per 2,800), Oceania (1 per 926), Scandinavia (1 per 819), Northern Europe (1 per 1,500), Southern Europe (1 per 2,100). (The number of Amateurs licensed in a population is slightly greater where

the population density is less, such as the American west, according to a detailed examination of Amateur activity by State within the U.S. There is no evidence that this affect is related to the difficulty of antenna placement, but rather to an overall felt need to "stay connected").

Amateur radio operators routinely help out in emergency and public-service communications and can operate "mobile" from hand held VHF radios and vehicle mounted radios, to line-of-sight repeaters, that 'repeat,' or retransmit, the transmitted signal, thereby extending the range and usefulness of these radios for emergency communications. VHF frequencies are used for these communications because the signals, while limited in range, are clearer and stronger than long-distance radio frequencies, and the VHF transmitters are smaller and more portable.

Once again, I feel that allowing commercial operations to increase their operations should also include a non-commercial operation - ham radio to be able to have a space for their operations. Given the popularity of Amateur radio within the US and around the world, and the demonstrated usefulness of Amateur radio in times of emergency, plus the usefulness to surrounding communities and the ability to use an existing tower site already in the Park on Mount Washburn, we urge serious consideration and approval of the inclusion of Amateur radio repeater services as outlined in this letter, within Yellowstone National Park.

Very truly yours,

[REDACTED]

Teton Amateur Radio Repeater Association

Correspondence ID: 222 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,22,2017 00:14:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to increasing cell service in Yellowstone National Park. There are more and more people visiting every year, and that means more traffic. Aren't the drivers erratic and unpredictable enough without throwing a cell phone into the mix? I believe the park is a sacred place, one of the last places where a gathering of people can enjoy the place and everything it offers. I don't want to hear ringing phones, elevated voices talking on those phones, and being subjected to listening to a conversation I have no interest in hearing. It is an intrusion on my experience, for the convenience of people who can't live without their phone for a few hours. We have gotten along for many, many years without cell service in the park; do people who visit the park really expect all the conveniences of home? Let's keep the park as pure an experience as possible.

Thank you for your time,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 223 **Project:** 70097 **Document:** 77286
Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Mar,22,2017 20:35:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: March 22, 2017

Mr. Daniel N. Wenk
Superintendent,
Yellowstone National Park
Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190

Re: Proposed Telecommunications Infrastructure at Mount Washburn & Other Park Areas

On behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments specific to the Proposed Telecommunications Infrastructure at Mount Washburn & Other Park Areas Project (proposed project). In order to better assess the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project on natural, cultural, and historic resources, NPCA encourages the National Park Service (NPS) to further review this proposal through an Environmental Assessment (EA).

Since 1919, NPCA has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System, working together with our over 1.2 million members and supporters to preserve our nation's natural, historical, and cultural heritage for present and future generations. NPCA has a long history of advocating for the protection of national parks and park resources. We are particularly interested in the proposed project and its potential impacts on Yellowstone National Park (YELL) and park resources.

Proposed Telecommunications Infrastructure at Mount Washburn & Other Park Areas Project

The NPS is evaluating a proposal by Verizon Wireless to increase and modify telecommunications infrastructure and bandwidth for voice and data at the following sites within YELL: Mount Washburn, Canyon, Lake, Old Faithful, and Grant. The stated purpose of the proposed project is "to improve safety for personnel maintaining the telecommunications and two-way radio equipment on Mt. Washburn; mitigate concerns over too much infrastructure affixed to the exterior of a historic structure; and address a severe shortage of telecommunications bandwidth in the park that is currently limiting park operations, visitor safety, and visitor experience."

On Mount Washburn, the proposed project would consist of constructing a new steel lattice structure at the fire lookout and relocating existing radio antennas and associated hardware from the fire lookout to the new structure. The steel lattice structure would surround the north, east, and west sides of the existing historic fire lookout. At the base of the fire lookout two new vaults, designed to conceal and protect four new four-foot and six-foot diameter microwave dish antennas, would be constructed. In addition, the existing 4,000 linear feet of buried electrical service from a power source to the summit of the fire lookout would be replaced. The new service would be buried beneath an existing access road.

The proposed project would also consist of constructing two new telecommunication towers in the Fishing Bridge and Canyon developed areas directly adjacent to existing towers. Currently, each location has a cell phone tower. The current tower at Canyon, owned by CenturyTel, is 70 feet tall. The proposed tower at Canyon would be approximately 25 feet taller than the existing tower to provide sufficient cellular coverage to the developed area.

Need for Further Environmental Review

NPCA is concerned that the material released for public review does not provide enough information as to the extent of the proposed project or the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project to allow for meaningful public review. In order to provide a better assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project on visitor experience, as well as natural, cultural, and historic resources, NPCA encourages NPS to develop an EA. The EA should include and consider the no action alternative. What are the implications if the proposed project does not occur?

The National Park Service Management Policies section 8.6.4.3 specific to Telecommunications Sites states: "In recognition of the growing prevalence of wireless telecommunications, the manner in which the park will manage the technology and related facilities should be addressed in an appropriate planning document." NPCA believes that this statement justifies the development of an EA to further assess the impact of the proposed project.

Further, the following text from section 8.6.4.3 should be considered specific to the need for an EA:

- "As with other special park uses, telecommunication proposals must meet the criteria listed in sections 1.4.7.1 and 8.2 to prevent unacceptable impacts. In addition, when considering whether to approve, deny, or renew permits, superintendents will...consider whether the proposal would cause unavoidable conflict with the park's mission, in which case the permit will be denied."
- "Superintendents will require the best technology available. For example, consideration should be given first to co-locating new facilities, constructing towers that are camouflaged to blend in with their surroundings, and installing micro-sites. New traditional towers (i.e., monopole or lattice) should be approved only after all other options have been explored. If a traditional tower is necessary, it should not be visible from any significant public vantage point."

One of the stated purposes of the proposed project is to address a severe shortage of telecommunications bandwidth. An increase in telecommunications bandwidth could increase the amount and type of use of cellphones and other electronic devices in YELL. Section 1.4.7.1 states: "Therefore, for the purposes of these policies, unacceptable impacts are impacts that, individually or cumulatively, would: be inconsistent with a park's purposes or values, or...unreasonably interfere with the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or the natural soundscape maintained in wilderness and natural, historic, or commemorative locations within the park."

Concerns and Questions:

NPCA would like to raise the following additional questions and points of concern that we hope NPS will address through further review:

Potential for Increased Spillover into the Backcountry

The alternative developed in the Yellowstone Wireless Communications Service Plan sought to "allow cell phone access in all major developed areas while keeping to a minimum any spillover of service into the backcountry areas of the park." The new cellphone tower that is being proposed at Canyon is 25 feet taller than the existing tower to provide better coverage. Will this expanded coverage further increase spillover into the backcountry? The NPS should work with the applicant to develop a current coverage map and a proposed signal propagation map in order to assess how the new proposed infrastructure could impact cell coverage and bandwidth in the backcountry. This should be developed not just for the new tower at Canyon, but for all of the proposed infrastructure changes and additions.

Additional Issues of Concern

Is the proposed project in line with the intent of Congress? Congress provided guidance in the 1996 Telecommunications Act (47 U.S.C. 332). Section 704(c) requires the executive branch to establish "procedures by which federal departments and agencies may make federal land available on a fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory basis" for the siting of telecommunication towers. Their intent specific to 704(c) and National Parks was clarified in Section 107 of the House of Representatives Committee Report on the bill:

"The Commission is directed to develop and issue procedures to make available to the maximum extent possible the use of Federal Government property, rights-of-ways, easements and any other physical instruments and appropriate assets that could be used as CMRS facilities sites that do not conflict with the intent of other Federal laws and regulations. The Committee recognizes, for example, that use of the Washington Monument, Yellowstone National Park or a pristine wildlife sanctuary, while perhaps prime sites for an antenna and other facilities, are not appropriate and use of them would be contrary to environmental, conservation, and public safety laws."

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input during this comment period. We hope NPS will further consider the impact this project could have on the unique natural and visual resources that attract millions of visitors to Yellowstone through the development of an EA.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
