

Public Comment Summary Report

**Standards for Sustaining the Historic
Character of the Mineral King Road
Cultural Landscape District**



Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks

October 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
The Comment Analysis Process	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Content Analysis Report.....	8
Table 1. Summary of Issue Topics, Codes, and Number of Comments Received Regarding the Draft Standards for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District	8
Table 2. Correspondence Received by State or Country	9
Table 3. Correspondence Received by Commenter Type	10
Table 4. Type of Correspondence Received.....	10
Public Scoping Comment Summary Report.....	11
CR1000 Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	11
CR7000 STANDARDS: General Comments	11
CR7020 STANDARDS: Executive Summary.....	16
CR7030 STANDARDS: Introduction	18
CR7040 STANDARDS: Purpose and Need.....	20
CR7050 STANDARDS: Assumptions	22
CR7070 STANDARDS: Feature Descriptions.....	25
CR7082 STANDARDS: Mineral King Road.....	25
CR7083 STANDARDS: Mineral King Road Associated Features.....	27
CR7084 STANDARDS: Access Roads, Driveways, and Trailheads.....	28
CR7091 STANDARDS: Cabin Cove	29
CR7092 STANDARDS: West Mineral King	30
CR7093 STANDARDS: East Mineral King.....	31
CR7103 STANDARDS: Retaining Walls	31
CR7104 STANDARDS: Signs	32
CR7111 STANDARDS: Lookout Point.....	32
CR7112 STANDARDS: Atwell Mill	32
CR7113 STANDARDS: Ranger Station	32
CR7120 STANDARDS: Historic Character Guidelines	33
CR7130 STANDARDS: Guidelines.....	33
CR7131 STANDARDS: Buildings and Structures.....	33
CR7132 STANDARDS: Exterior Walls.....	34

CR7133 STANDARDS: Roofs.....	35
CR7134 STANDARDS: Windows.....	37
CR7136 STANDARDS: Shutters	38
CR7137 STANDARDS: Chimneys and Stovepipes.....	38
CR7138 STANDARDS: Foundations	38
CR7141 STANDARDS: Decks, Porches and Patios	39
CR7142 STANDARDS: Outbuildings	40
CR7143 STANDARDS: Treatments for Retaining Walls.....	41
CR7144 STANDARDS: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel.....	41
CR7145 STANDARDS: Fences and Hedges	42
CR7146 STANDARDS: New Construction.....	43
CR7150 STANDARDS: Treatment for Outdoor Accessories and Features	43
CR7152 STANDARDS: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such	44
CR7154 STANDARDS: Clotheslines	44
CR7155 STANDARDS: Tarpaulins.....	44
CR7160 STANDARDS: Pets and Wildlife Attractants.....	45
CR7170 STANDARDS: Food Storage.....	45
CR7180 STANDARDS: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas	47
CR7181 STANDARDS: Planters and Plantings (NPS).....	47
CR7182 STANDARDS: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal	47
CR7183 STANDARDS: Hazard Fuels Identification and Removal	48
CR7184 STANDARDS: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems.....	48
CR7185 STANDARDS: Exterior Signs	49
CR7186 STANDARDS: Landscape Ornaments	50
CR7190 STANDARDS: Treatments for Access and Transportation Features	51
CR7191 STANDARDS: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)	51
CR7192 STANDARDS: Access Roads.....	52
CR7193 STANDARDS: Cabin Driveways and Parking.....	52
CR7195 STANDARDS: Trails and Pathways.....	53
CR7196 STANDARDS: Spontaneous Paths	54
CR7200 STANDARDS: Treatments for Utilities.....	54
CR7203 STANDARDS: Trash Disposal and Recycling	54
CR7204 STANDARDS: Energy Storage	55
CR7206 STANDARDS: Exterior Lighting	57

CR7220 STANDARDS: Acknowledgements	57
CR7240 STANDARDS: App. A Definitions	58
CR7260 STANDARDS: App. C Preservation Assessment Form	60
CR7270 STANDARDS: App. D Approved Paint Color Palette	60
CR7320 STANDARDS: App. I Exempt Undertakings	61
CR7330 STANDARDS: App. J Project Submittal Procedure Decision Tree	62
IS100 ISSUES Special Park Uses	62
IV200 ISSUES - Access: MK Road; Do Not Pave	63
APPENDIX A – Correspondence Indexes	64
Table 5. Index of Organizations	64
Table 6. Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters	65
APPENDIX B – Index by Organization Type and Individuals	66
Table 7. Index by Organization Type	66
Table 8. Index by Unaffiliated Individuals	68
APPENDIX C – Index by Code	73
Table 9. Index by Code	73

Introduction

Consultation is a crucial component to carrying out the Section 106 Process for undertakings. The Mineral King Management Plan and Environmental Assessment (MKMP) and the Standards for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District are considered undertakings, since both have the potential of affecting cultural resources and therefore meet the definition of an undertaking for National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) compliance. Consultation is part of the planning process related to Section 106. In addition, consultation is a stipulation (part II, sections A-D) of the nation-wide Programmatic Agreement for Section 106 compliance between the National Park Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers

Formal public comment for the Standards for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District and associated Mineral King Management Plan and Environmental Assessment (MKMP) period occurred from April 15 to June 30, 2010. A scoping letter was sent via mail or email to approximately 400 individuals, tribes, organizations, and agencies. On April 19, 2010 a news release was distributed to approximately 135 media contacts announcing the public scoping comment period, and providing information on scoping meetings. Scoping information was available on the National Park Service (NPS) Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks website, and on the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website.

Consultation and coordination with the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) began on November 2009 with an onsite field trip to Mineral King to view the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape Historic District and discuss associated “Standards for Treatment” (Draft Standards). Consultation with the Mineral King Preservation Society (MKPS) regarding the Draft Standards began in early April 2010. Cultural resource consultation is ongoing with both the SHPO and the MKPS.

On May 19, 2010 letters were sent to the Tribal Chairs of the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tribe, Tule River Indian Reservation, and Table Mountain Rancheria per Executive Order 13175 which addresses consultation and coordination with Indian Tribal Governments.

Consultation and coordination with other primary concerned parties included the Mineral King Preservation Society. Meetings in Visalia were held on April 29 and June 9, 2010 to discuss issues related to the Standards for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District.

Public scoping meetings were held for the MKMP May 6, 11, and 12 in Visalia, Three Rivers, and Bakersfield, California respectively. There were a total of 41 attendants at all the meetings; 20 in Visalia, 17 in Three Rivers, and 4 in Bakersfield. The meetings were conducted the same at all locations. Mineral King Management Plan informational posters and literature were set up around the room, the park’s Environmental Protection Specialist gave a presentation on the MKMP, there was a question and answer period, followed by an informal open discussion period with park staff and an opportunity for the public to read the posters and literature. The meetings were held from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. each night. The participants were encouraged to send comments to the park via many avenues, including email, website, fax, mail, or hand delivery.

The following information was disseminated to the public at the meetings:

- Printed and CD copies of the Draft Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District Standards (Standards)
- Mineral King Management Plan and Environmental Assessment Planning Participant Workbook (Included: background, purpose and need, draft objectives and issues, draft timeline, and general questions about Mineral King)
- “Guide to using PEPC” and “How to Comment” handouts
- General park brochures and newspapers
- CD copies of the park’s Final General Management Plan - 2007

Also, a webpage dedicated to the MKMP was developed during public scoping and was shared at the meetings. The website is available for the public to download documents and public information related to the MKMP. The website address is: <http://www.nps.gov/seki/parkmgmt/mkmp.htm>.

A final informal public scoping meeting/potluck was held at Mineral King Ranger Station on June 12, 2010 from noon – 3p.m. The potluck was followed by an open discussion about the MKMP and the Draft Standards. Approximately 40 individuals, mostly cabin owners, attended the meeting.

While the formal public comment period ended June 30, late comments were also reviewed and incorporated into this report. The park received 35 pieces of correspondence; two from government entities, 6 from interest groups, and 27 from unaffiliated individuals. Commenters provided input through a variety of methods, including letters, emails, faxes, website link, and responding to the planning participant workbook. The full text of all comments received was entered into the NPS PEPC web-based system and are a part of the public record. Each comment letter was reviewed by park staff to assist in the determination of potential issues and impact topics related to the proposed project. Substantive comments were extracted from the correspondence. This report provides an analysis of the public scoping comments received.

Comments received on the Draft Standards are analyzed and will be addressed below. However, comments received on the Standards that relate to water resource issues will be addressed in the MKMP Comment Analysis Report and are not incorporated in this summary.

To better clarify the purposes of this document, the title “Guidelines for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District” has been replaced with “Standards for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District.”

The Comment Analysis Process

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and correlate similar public comments into a format that can be used by decision makers and the MKMP team. Comment analysis assists the team in organizing, clarifying, and addressing technical information pursuant to NHPA regulations. It also aids in identifying the topics and issues to be evaluated and considered throughout the planning process.

The process includes five main components:

- developing a coding structure
- employing a comment database for comment management
- reading and coding of public comments
- interpreting and analyzing the comments to identify issues and themes
- preparing a comment summary

A coding structure is developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. The coding structure for the Standards is derived from an analysis of the range of topics presented in the draft document. The coding structure is designed to capture comment content rather than to restrict or exclude ideas.

The NPS PEPC database is used for management of the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic and issue. Some outputs from the database include tallies of the total number of correspondences and comments received, sorting and reporting of comments by a particular topic or issue, and demographic information regarding the sources of the comments.

Analysis of the public comments involved the assignment of the codes to statements made by the public in their letters, email messages, faxes, and website submissions. All comments were evaluated as public input to the planning process; however, only substantive comments have been analyzed in this report. In this phase of the planning process, almost all comments are treated as substantive. In cases where no comments were received on an issue, the issue was not identified or discussed in this report.

Although the analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, this content analysis report should be used with caution. Comments from people who chose to respond do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public. Furthermore, scoping comments are not a vote-counting process, and the emphasis is on the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment is received, or whether a comment supports or opposes the project.

Definition of Terms

Primary terms used in the document are defined below.

Correspondence: A correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. It can be in the form of a letter, email, written comment form, note card, open house transcript, or petition.

Comment: A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It could include such information as the use of a potential management tool, to request or provide additional data regarding the existing condition, to provide information on laws and regulations, or debating the adequacy of an analysis.

Code: A grouping centered on a common subject. The codes were developed during the scoping process and are used to track major subjects throughout the EA process.

Concern: Concerns are subdivisions of codes. Codes can be further separated into several concern statements if necessary to provide a better focus on the content of comments.

Non-substantive Comment: Information not related to the issues or impacts; corrections that have no bearing on the analysis; information outside the scope of the plan; information on other projects not related to the document; opinion, personal judgments, grievances, and complaints; support or opposition for a project (including mass mailings of form letters or petitions), factual information with no bearing on level of impacts, and editorial or format changes.

Substantive Comment: Bring forward an issue or a question on the analysis, purpose and need, or project objectives; provide new information related to a law, regulation, policy; provide new information or studies that can assist with the analysis, or other projects that may be affected by the alternatives; provide mitigation measures or suggest best management practices that may reduce environmental concerns or impacts.

Guide: This report is organized as described below.

Content Analysis Report: This is the basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code. The first section of the report provides a summary of the number of comments that were coded under each topic. The second section provides general demographic information, such as the states where individuals live, the number of letters received from different categories of organizations, etc.

Public Scoping Comment Summary: This report summarizes the substantive comments received during the scoping process. These comments are organized by codes and have been taken from the text of the public's comments.

Correspondence Index of Organizations: This table provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types as defined by PEPC (and in this order): businesses; conservation/preservation groups; federal government; university/professional society. Each piece of correspondence was assigned a unique identification number upon entry into PEPC. This number can be used to assist the public in identifying the way NPS addressed their comments.

Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters: This table provides a listing of all of the individuals who submitted comments during the initial public scoping period. Like the previous index, each correspondence was assigned a unique identification number which can be used to assist individuals in identifying the way in which NPS addressed their comments. This list is organized alphabetically.

Index By Organization Type: This list identifies all of the codes that were assigned to each individual piece of correspondence and is arranged by organization type. Individual commenters are also included in this report and are identified as Unaffiliated Individuals.

Index by Code: This table lists which commenters or authors (identified by PEPC organization type) commented on which topics, as identified by the codes used in this analysis. The report is organized by code, and under each code is a list of the authors who submitted comments that fell under that code, and their correspondence numbers. Those correspondences identified as N/A represent unaffiliated individuals.

Content Analysis Report

Table 1. Summary of Issue Topics, Codes, and Number of Comments Received Regarding the Draft Standards for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District

Code	Description	# of Comments
CR7000	Standards: General Comments	31
CR7020	Standards: Executive Summary	10
CR7030	Standards: Introduction	14
CR7040	Standards: Purpose and Need	15
CR7050	Standards: Assumptions	10
CR7060	Standards: Process and Procedures	3
CR7070	Standards: Feature Descriptions	8
CR7082	Standards: Mineral King Road	10
CR7083	Standards: Mineral King Road Associated Features	6
CR7084	Standards: Access Roads, Driveways, and Trailheads	2
CR7090	Standards: Cabin Communities	3
CR7091	Standards: Cabin Cove	3
CR7092	Standards: West Mineral King	7
CR7093	Standards: East Mineral King	2
CR7103	Standards: Retaining Walls	2
CR7104	Standards: Signs	1
CR7111	Standards: Lookout Point	2
CR7112	Standards: Atwell Mill	1
CR7113	Standards: Ranger Station	2
CR7120	Standards: Historic Character Standards	2
CR7130	Standards: Standards	1
CR7131	Standards: Buildings and Structures	5
CR7132	Standards: Exterior Walls	5
CR7133	Standards: Roofs	13
CR7134	Standards: Windows	1
CR7136	Standards: Shutters	1
CR7137	Standards: Chimneys and Stovepipes	2
CR7138	Standards: Foundations	4
CR7141	Standards: Decks, Porches and Patios	7
CR7142	Standards: Outbuildings	1
CR7143	Standards: Treatments for Retaining Walls	4
CR7144	Standards: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel	5
CR7145	Standards: Fences and Hedges	4
CR7146	Standards: New Construction	4
CR7150	Standards: Treatment for Outdoor Accessories and Features	1

CR7152	Standards: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such	5
CR7154	Standards: Clotheslines	1
CR7155	Standards: Tarpaulins	2
CR7160	Standards: Pets and Wildlife Attractants	2
CR7170	Standards: Food Storage	9
CR7180	Standards: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas	4
CR7181	Standards: Planters and Plantings (NPS)	1
CR7182	Standards: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal	3
CR7183	Standards: Hazard Fuels Identification and Removal	2
CR7184	Standards: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems	4
CR7185	Standards: Exterior Signs	10
CR7186	Standards: Landscape Ornaments	3
CR7190	Standards: Treatments for Access and Transportation Features	3
CR7191	Standards: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)	3
CR7192	Standards: Access Roads	4
CR7193	Standards: Cabin Driveways and Parking	8
CR7195	Standards: Trails and Pathways	1
CR7196	Standards: Spontaneous Paths	1
CR7200	Standards: Treatments for Utilities	6
CR7201	Standards: Septic and Wastewater	17
CR7202	Standards: Water Storage and Delivery	15
CR7203	Standards: Trash Disposal and Recycling	6
CR7204	Standards: Energy Storage	10
CR7206	Standards: Exterior Lighting	1
CR7220	Standards: Acknowledgements	5
CR7240	Standards: App. A Definitions	15
CR7260	Standards: App. C Preservation Assessment Form	3
CR7270	Standards: App. D Approved Paint Color Palette	3
CR7320	Standards: App. I Exempt Undertakings	10
CR7330	Standards: App. J Project Submittal Procedure Decision Tree	1

Total: 350

Table 2. Correspondence Received by State or Country

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondences
CA	94%	33
UT	3%	1
British Columbia, CANADA	3%	1
		Total 35

Table 3. Correspondence Received by Commenter Type

Organization Type	Number of Correspondences
Interest Groups (preservation/conservation)	6
State Governments	2
Unaffiliated Individuals	27
	Total 35

Table 4. Type of Correspondence Received

Correspondence Type	Number of Correspondences
Web Form	6
Fax	2
Letter	12
E-mail	15
	Total 35

Public Scoping Comment Summary Report

These correspondences were scanned and copied from letters, emails, faxes and web comments received during the initial public comment period through July 5, 2010. They have been paraphrased or modified to clarify content, and to correct grammatical or spelling errors, but the intent of the comment has not been altered.

Comments referencing more than one topic/issue may have multiple subject codes. Corresponding codes are provided as appropriate under the first occurrence of the comment. Refer to Table 1. which describes all code abbreviations.

CR1000 Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws

Correspondence Id: 29 Comment Id: 144045

Comment Text: My seventy six-year relationships with the Mineral King Valley and the cabin owners, leads me to conclude that the very best caretakers for the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District, are the cabin owners themselves. Supporting the continuation of this responsibility fits well with the National Park mission, preserving cultural resources.

CR7000 STANDARDS: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141381

Comment Text: The draft contains many items that are very remotely connected to preservation of the historic structures.

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143826

Comment Text: The draft now contains guidelines which affect the Park Service, the cabin owners, and the general public - but the provisions applying to those three very different audiences are scattered throughout the document. I'd suggest that final document be divided into parts, chapters, sections or some other type of grouping, both to make the document easier to read and to allow the reproduction and distribution to permittees of those portions which directly affect their interests. For example, the text might be organized somewhat like this: Part One - General (including everything now on page 1, line 1. through page 6, line 6); Part Two - Feature Descriptions; Part Three - Guidelines Applicable to the National Park Service; Part Four - Guidelines Applicable to Permittees; and, if there are any provisions unique to visitors to Mineral King (and not applicable to other parts of the Park), Part Five -Guidelines for Other Visitors to Mineral King.

Correspondence Id: 22 Comment Id: 143225

Comment Text: We think the Secretary of the Interior's Historic preservation guidelines are adequate to maintain the historic character of the area. (Repairs no larger than one square foot). What you have already works?

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143033

Comment Text: When 1942 was determined to be the cut off date for historic designation, it should be updated to include other structures that reach 50 year old historic status.

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143032

Comment Text: Permittee obligations should be the subject of our permit agreements and not integrated into the historic guidelines

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143031

Comment Text: Guidelines for sustaining the historic character of the Mineral King area should stick to that subject only.

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143020

Comment Text: These are permittees rules and should not be a part of this document.
Page: 30 Paragraph:

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 142988

Comment Text: This draft is full of laws, regulations and current park policy, none of which are cited or identified; many have no place in a document for preserving and maintaining a cultural landscape. For example, the draft states twice that a certain subject is "beyond the scope of the document" and then proceeds to go into depth on the matter. Why not let the cabin owners use common sense to follow the existing guidelines and building codes for historical communities? This document creates another layer of bureaucracy by requiring permits for virtually anything done in the cultural landscape district. Rather than write a new document and create more regulations, why not use the existing guidelines that have been followed since inclusion in The National Register of Historic Places?

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142957

Comment Text: 1 - Cover & Pg 3 Title,(p3) 27,28: Title page indicates "Guidelines;" page 3 indicates the need to develop a specific management plan. Is the document to be a guideline or a management plane? Issues addressing the appearance of the historical community should be guidelines. Also note that the description of "guidelines" is used frequently throughout the document

Page: Cover & 3 **Paragraph:** Title & 27,28

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142941

Comment Text: This draft document is a well-written, comprehensive plan for providing guidance to Park management and Permittees for preserving the character of the Mineral King historical district. It addresses the substantive issues that the various stakeholders have some ability to control, and thus is likely to be a usefully tool for preservation management of the historic buildings. The concept of long-term management is evident throughout the document, which, if applied consistently over time, will yield a sustained historic community maintained to the appropriate standards. Long-term management is key. I do have concern that this document is rather lengthy and that limits its usefulness as a 'working' document. I would suggest that the excellent sections (A-D) that describe the historic nature of the district be removed and established as a separate document or appendix of the general management plan. It would be very desirable to also have a least an outline of the larger Management Plan for the valley to see how this documents fits in and to be assured that there are no overlaps or contradictions. What other policy related documents would be a part of the larger Management Plan? Since the nature of the document is "guidelines", it might be more appropriate to remove specific quantitative requirements, which are not based in law, so that their implementation can be more flexible in application to the widely varying styles of the facilities of the valley. The use of quantitative requirements generally leads to a much more rigorous, uniform style that i

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142919

Comment Text: Since the nature of the document is "guidelines", it might be more appropriate to remove specific quantitative requirements, which are not based in law, so that their implementation can be more flexible in application to the widely varying styles of the facilities of the valley. The use of quantitative requirements generally leads to a much more rigorous, uniform style that is certainly not characteristic of the facilities in the valley, and would not want to be imposed, as it would be contrary to its existing historical nature

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142917

Comment Text: I do have concern that this document is rather lengthy and that limits its usefulness as a 'working' document. I would suggest that the excellent sections (A-D) that describe the historic nature of the district be removed and established as a separate document or appendix of the general management plan.

Correspondence Id: 13 Comment Id: 142437

Comment Text: The requirements of the "Guidelines for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District" should be reasonable and practical for both the NPS and all parties responsible for maintenance of both publicly and privately owned structures and sites in the District. The Guidelines should be developed so as not to become a management burden for the NPS, and the guidelines should allow for maintenance and repairs to be accomplished in a timely manner without deleterious delays created by various reviews and approvals.

Correspondence Id: 13 Comment Id: 142436

Comment Text: p. 3, lines 28-31, p. 29, lines 37-42, p. 30, lines 1-36, p. 31, lines 2-4 and 17-41, p. 32, lines 1-22, p. 36, lines 35-43, p. 37, lines 1-18, p. 37, lines 25-41 and p. 38, lines 1-24: The "Guidelines for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District" should address only those requirements that are applicable for sustaining the historic character of the District according to the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. It should not encompass or be expanded to include Park policy as it applies to contractual agreements between the Park and permittees. (Note the references are examples only and are not all inclusive).

Correspondence Id: 13 Comment Id: 142435

Comment Text: The "Guidelines for Sustaining the Historic Character of the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District" needs to be developed by working cooperatively and directly with the Mineral King Preservation Society (MKPS), representatives of the parties directly responsible for the maintenance of the cabins and other historic structures and sites in the District, and the California State Office of Historic Preservation.

Page: 1 & 5 **Paragraph:** 12-14 & 1-3

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 142431

Comment Text: Because the work that will be approved in the district must comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, NPS may want to consider mentioning the NPS bulletins for interpreting the standards, which are available on the Technical Preservation Services web page. Referencing these documents will help avoid the appearance of placing onerous and arbitrary restrictions on the cabin owners.

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 142429

Comment Text: How does NPS intend to define the county's role in this process and ensure that they comply with the Guidelines? It seems wise to include a discussion of Tulare County's responsibilities in the document and how they relate to the role of NPS in issuing permits.

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142428

Comment Text: We fully support the stated intent of preserving the historical significance of Mineral King Road and cabins.

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142419

Comment Text: It would be beneficial to break the guidelines into sections. For example, the road could be one section, the cabins another and the trail heads yet another. This would make the guidelines much more user friendly.

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142418

Comment Text: Permittees have maintained the buildings in historic fashion for these many years and obviously wish to continue to do so. Guidelines should assist where there are questions. Replacement in kind is the general rule. Permittees wish to work with the park to ensure the future of the cultural landscape district.

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142417

Comment Text: The Secretary of the Interior's Standards should be included as an appendix. It is essential to list the sources of the various policies and regulations to make them clearer.

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142400

Comment Text: This draft is excessively detailed. Permittees must be given reasonable ways to accomplish normal required maintenance.

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141392

Comment Text: Add: Historic Sites (Bedrock mortars; prehistoric campsites; historic relict communities; mining campsites; boilers; mill sites; mines)

Page: Contents ii **Paragraph:** A.5

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141382

Comment Text: The very broad net this new report casts goes way beyond what I consider to be the direct responsibility of the cabin owners and what we should be charged for in our permits.

CR7020 STANDARDS: Executive Summary

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141393

Comment Text: Add: The full text of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. (This is needed for understanding of the entire scope of the Interior's standards and as a basis for a full understanding of why the Standards for Rehabilitation were chosen for this document's guidelines.)

Page: Contents iv **Paragraph:** Appendix K

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143827

Comment Text: Change to read "...consists of 71 cabins and four other structures..." While only 59 of the cabins are contributing, there are a total of 71. See page 3, lines 13 - 14. All buildings are structures. The addition of the word "other" avoids the inference that cabins are somehow not structures.

Page: 1 **Paragraph:** 4

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143013

Comment Text: Yes. These guidelines should be the entire district. Park Service permittees and visitors alike.

Page: 1 **Paragraph:** 17-18

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143012

Comment Text: This is good. The Park Service should be working with the stewards of Mineral King including the cabin owners.

Page: 1 **Paragraph:** 12-13

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142921

Comment Text: While "rehabilitation" is defined with the Secretary's ten standards listed starting with line 27, the term "preservation" is not defined. Again, it would be useful for the first time reader if the terms were defined in a footnote to the Executive Summary

Page: 1 Paragraph: 25

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142920

Comment Text: Need to delete the words "to the" in order that the sentence make sense: 'These practices are applicable to contributing and non-contributing to the historic landscape district buildings and structures alike.' Even though they are defined later in the document, it would be useful to the first time reader if the terms "contributing" and "non-contributing" were defined in footnotes to the Executive Summary.

Page: 1 Paragraph: 18

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141397

Comment Text: This is a good paragraph. These standards seem to fit the district well.

Page: 1 Paragraph: 20-25

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141396

Comment Text: This is a confusing sentence. Especially in light of line 7 as written, and also without definition of the difference between buildings and structures.

Page: 1 Paragraph: 17

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141395

Comment Text: Addition: "the road's centerline, but it stretches out to encompass prehistoric and historic private and National Park Service land, sites, and buildings..." (As guidelines for sustaining the historic character of the entire landscape district, it is important to reach beyond park service buildings and leased cabins. Deterioration of privately held buildings, as well as prehistoric and historic sites would compromise the district.)

Page: 1 Paragraph: 7

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141394

Comment Text: Are the 59 buildings only those on land leased from the park? Considered contributing only? Doesn't the Cultural Landscape District include the non-contributing buildings also? Are the park buildings and private cabins the four "structures", or have they been left out of the count?

Page: 1 Paragraph: 3

CR7030 STANDARDS: Introduction

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141383

Comment Text: Permits were transferable under USFS.

Page: 3 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143829

Comment Text: Change to read "...for the first time since 1978...". Prior to 1978 permits could be and frequently were transferred to heirs or to others, when permittees died or cabins were sold.

Page: 3 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143828

Comment Text: Change to read "...as well as four other structures...", or perhaps describe the structures referred to. See above.

Page: 3 Paragraph: 14

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142931

Comment Text: As this document is designed to be a supplement to the larger Mineral King management plan, it would be desirable to see an outline of the larger document to see how this document fits in, where there might be overlaps or conflicts in direction, in order to fully assess the completeness or application of this document

Page: 3 Paragraph: 28

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142930

Comment Text: Relative to the cabins and their permits being transferred, I think it would be more correct to say, "By law, the cabins and their permits can be transferred?.", rather than saying "In theory, ?."

Page: 3 Paragraph: 25

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142929

Comment Text: I particularly like the acknowledgement that the Park is committed to ensure that the features of the historical district are "sustained over time

Page: 3 Paragraph: 15-18

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142927

Comment Text: It would be desirable if a note was made early in the Introduction that Appendix A lists definitions of terms used in the document, since terms don't always seem to be defined at first usage.

Page: 3 Paragraph:

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142902

Comment Text: We are cabin owners not cabin permittees. We have permit for the lot that is owned by the Park.

Page: 3 Paragraph: 16-17

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141403

Comment Text: This concept of the government functioning as a Home Owners Association with specific guidelines for private property may create problems. HOA CC& Rs are designed by the homeowners, not by an outside agency. I would avoid such a broad extra-legal classification. It could create confusion and actions inappropriate for National Register listed properties.

Page: 4 Paragraph: 12

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141402

Comment Text: Excellent placement of ancillary links to further information. Reference to specific applicable governmental standards, is important throughout this document.

Page: 3 Paragraph: 39-43

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141401

Comment Text: Revision: The present guidance document, focused on exterior building preservation and maintenance..."

Page: 3 Paragraph: 28

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141400

Comment Text: Revision: "Because of the cultural Landscape's local level of historic significance, the park is committed to provide guidance for ongoing maintenance and treatment..." (These guidelines are not just for permittees.)

Page: 3 Paragraph: 15-16

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141399

Comment Text: Delete "only": Substitute "one of the larger vehicle-accessible sub-alpine valleys in Sequoia National Park." (Vehicle-accessed sub-alpine valleys such as Crescent Meadows and Wolverton also exist.)

Page: 3 Paragraph: 8

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141398

Comment Text: "over-riding" may not be the best term; "most significant" may be better as the historic importance of the cultural landscape district is not something that should be overridden.

Page: 3 Paragraph: 7

CR7040 STANDARDS: Purpose and Need

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141384

Comment Text: MKPS and MKDA are not HOAS.

Page: 4 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143035

Comment Text: What criteria would be used to determine when one has incompatible additions? Who makes the determination?

Page: 5 Paragraph: 20-22

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142960

Comment Text: The term "Home Owner's Association" is used to describe the document/guidelines; how can the document be considered a HOA if the persons responsible for the cabins have no control of the document? The term HOA is misleading and is used frequently in the document.

Page: 4 Paragraph: 20

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142933

Comment Text: I fully subscribe to the concept of "partnering" with the permittees in the management of the historic district. I believe that it is embracing of this concept by all the stakeholders that will enable the full and successful application of the guidelines proposed

Page: 5 Paragraph: 1

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142932

Comment Text: I like the analogy of this document to Home Owners Association guidelines. I have lived in a planned community for over 30 years and have been an officer in the Home Owners Association. It has a strict set of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's), which are part of each property's deed, that controls the various aspects of the community and is the basis for the establishment of the Home Owners Association. Of course, the CC&R's have their good points and bad points, but in the long run, they are pivotal in the management of the community, as I see this document doing. The one thing that I believe is missing in this document, when compared to the model of a Home Owners Association controlling document, are the processes and procedures for the interactions among the stakeholders. There are generally by-laws for election of officials, rules and policies governing the operations, and so forth. In the case of Mineral King, we have the Park and the Mineral King District Association (representing the permittees) [and maybe the water associations, and general public related to the recreational aspects of the district], but the document doesn't specify how they interact? How the "partnership" is to operate. I would suggest that the "partners" work together to establish at least a rudimentary set of procedures for operating the "partnership". It doesn't have to be complete to start with, but it should specify some basic written rules of engagement that will facilitate communications, and changes to the management plans and guidelines. I have no problem with the processes for requesting approval of maintenance projects or the transfers of permits as they currently stand. They are good pieces of the rules of engagement.

Page: 4 Paragraph: 20

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142903

Comment Text: Please add owners' needs to this list.

Page: 5 Paragraph: 15-17

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142420

Comment Text: The section under Purpose and Need on page 4 is generally very acceptable. This is especially true of the last sentence of the first paragraph which recognizes "continued and changing uses ... " We would like to see an addition to item 5.), page 5 (lines 15,16, & 17). Add "and consistent with the historical use of the cabin".

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142402

Comment Text: Pg. 5, line 2: Partnering with MKPS in the management of the historic district is essential. It must be a full partnership with equal input and consultation.

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142401

Comment Text: Pg. 4, line 20: Homeowners Associations' guidelines are normally developed by the homeowners, themselves, as is usual in' other Historic Districts. There may be a legal problem with a government entity creating and enforcing these guidelines.

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141579

Comment Text: --line 11 such as? (is there an example); Line 13-not sure this can be practically translated this may turn out to be an ad hoc issue; line 16 "park legislation" does this differ from federal laws & statutes in that it is specific to parks? Maybe should say specific

Page: 5 Paragraph: 7, 11 & 13

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141574

Comment Text: P5 lines 1 & 2 are much better choice of words to elicit cooperation.

Page: 4 & 5 Paragraph: 42-43 & 1&2

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141405

Comment Text: Delete "over time". It is far too vague. This needs to be specific, such as "have been made after the determined period of significance ending in 1942."

Page: 5 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141404

Comment Text: Excellent clarification of the guideline's focus.

Page: 4 Paragraph: 25-43

CR7050 STANDARDS: Assumptions

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141406

Comment Text: This sounds like a threat, could initiate lawsuits, and isn't necessary in a document devoted to historic character rather than legal issues.

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143830

Comment Text: Delete this assumption. The 2005 legislation did not impose any condition upon the transferability of permits. The proposed language would make the cabins unmarketable, since no buyer would wish to purchase a cabin only to be told later that significant changes would be required simply because of the sale.

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28-29

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143034

Comment Text: Since all non-historic buildings fall under the same guidelines as historic and are mostly now eligible for historic status, they should be allowed to stay and not be removed.

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28-29

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143014

Comment Text: I don't feel this should be included in this document. All structures ? whether public or private may one day become historic and contributing.

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28-29

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142962

Comment Text: Text states the sale of cabins may trigger removal of non-historic structures, etc.; this should be reworded to the effect that structures not in character with the community may be required to be brought into character. The standards for rehabilitation allow for these types of buildings

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28, 29

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142934

Comment Text: I am a little concerned about the assumption that "Cabin sales or transfers may trigger an evaluation of the removal of non-historic buildings, structures and features." It is the general concept of "removal" that concerns me. While it is desirable that the historic district contains only historic buildings, structures and features, over the years since the period of historical significance (1915-1942), I suspect that some structures have been established to serve utilitarian purposes by the Park and by permittees alike, and whose removal would a problem, inconvenience, or loss of a utilitarian function by their owners. A case in point would be the Park's Tack Shed at the East Mineral King corral. I suggest that more thinking be done on the issue of "removal" and that specific criteria be established other than "sales or transfers

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142904

Comment Text: Remove - not needed or fair.

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28-29

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142403

Comment Text: Pg. 5, line 28: Cabin sales or transfers should have no impact on the historic significance of a building. That is a permit function. Historic compliance is determined by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141581

Comment Text: Line 30: how does this differ from line 35?

Page: 5 Paragraph: 28 & 30

CR7060 STANDARDS: Process and Procedures

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141585

Comment Text: I don't think the legislation really allows you to require this for transfer or sale. Is there some indication that this type of thing is being done in the management of Historic Districts?

Page: 6 Paragraph: 1

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143831

Comment Text: Delete the first nine words of this sentence, so that it begins "For upcoming projects...". The transfer of a permit or sale of a cabin is not an action which would effect a change in any protected cultural property. See Appendix C, at page 57.

Page: 6 Paragraph: 1

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142963

Comment Text: This item is a park policy/permit issue

Page: 6 Paragraph: 1

CR7070 STANDARDS: Feature Descriptions

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142421

Comment Text: We agree wholeheartedly with the statement by State Historic Preservation Officer M. Wayne Donaldson on page 7. We would like the road to remain as it is to the extent possible.

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142935

Comment Text: FEATURE DESCRIPTIONS: This is a very nice section describing the contributing features of the district, but I think it should be established a separate document

Page: 6 Paragraph: 8

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 142430

Comment Text: Beginning on Page 6, the document contains Feature Descriptions for the contributors to the district. It would be useful to begin this section with a discussion and/or a list of the contributors, or to attach it as an appendix and reference it on Page 6.

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142423

Comment Text: On Page 11 two creeks are referred to on line 12. Please point out the second creek, as we can find only one. Secondly, we suggest changing the word "west" to "northwest" and the word "east" to "southeast". Finally, why is there no reference to the former cabins at Conifer in section B?

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142422

Comment Text: Paragraph 3d on page 9 is interesting. We have yet to see an automobile drink from a trough! We have seen lots of horses and mules do so. Yes, the troughs were probably built after the introduction of automobiles, but they are most certainly a hold-over from horse and mule days.

CR7082 STANDARDS: Mineral King Road

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141385

Comment Text: The CCC's widened and improved the roadbed and constructed some retaining walls. The County of Tulare maintained and paved the road until 1978.

Page: 7 Paragraph: 3

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143834

Comment Text: Delete the word "paved". The suggestion that the few unpaved portions of the road should never be paved is preposterous. The character of the road may be maintained by not widening or straightening it; but paving may be the best way to prevent ongoing and expensive maintenance. The Park Service should not commit itself to a policy which might later preclude intelligent maintenance practices.

Page: 7 Paragraph: 13

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143833

Comment Text: Delete the sentence beginning "The two stretches of road that remain unpaved...". The sentence is factually incorrect. For most of the last century, until 1978, the road was maintained by the County of unpaved ... ". Tulare. During the 1950s and 1960s, whenever the County Road Commissioner, who was particularly fond of Mineral King, had spare funds at the end of a fiscal year, he would pave another small portion of the road. This work slowly extended the paved portion of the road, but never got past Camp Conifer. Quite some time later, the portions of the road running through Atwell Mill, Cabin Cove and Silver City, and from Faculty Flat to the end of the road, were paved - at least in part for dust control purposes. The most recent paving, by the Park Service, was of the 1 ½ mile stretch between Camp Conifer and Atwell Mill - but that was certainly not because the road had failed.

Page: 7 Paragraph: 8-10

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143832

Comment Text: Place a period after "(macadam)", and delete the rest of the sentence. Unless it can be established that the CCC paved the road, this is just speculation and does not belong in a historical summary. See next comment as well.

Page: 7 Paragraph: 2-4

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143015

Comment Text: Perhaps all of the pavement should be removed (just kidding!). The pavement helps with erosion and dust control.

Page: 7 Paragraph: 13

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142968

Comment Text: It appears the word "not" should be deleted, otherwise the sentence in which it occurs does not make sense

Page: 7 Paragraph: 10

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142964

Comment Text: The word "prism" is used to describe a feature of the roadway; what exactly does it mean? The word is used elsewhere in the document with inconsistent meaning

Page: 6 Paragraph: 40

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142905

Comment Text: Very good!

Page: 7 Paragraph: 13-15

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141588

Comment Text: 7-20 Prism, is jargon, used to describe a character attribute of construction - can another wording: eg "Construction Type"?

Page: 6 & 7 Paragraph: 40 & 20

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141407

Comment Text: But are they environmentally sound? See GMP p. 150. See also p. 3, line 6 in this document.

Page: 6 Paragraph: 35-36

CR7083 STANDARDS: Mineral King Road Associated Features

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141386

Comment Text: The original redwood troughs were for much needed stock water. Incidentally, there were level spots built into the road intentionally to provide resting spots for the teams.

Page: 9 Paragraph: 17

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 145002

Comment Text: The water troughs should have the graffiti (multiple park service spray-painted stenciled warnings) sandblasted off and proper signs identifying these significant cultural landmarks.

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143842

Comment Text: Change to read "These troughs were designed to allow many animals to drink simultaneously, as strings of livestock were frequently driven up or down the road each summer." This change would accurately describe the primary purpose of the watering troughs.

Page: 9 Paragraph: 20-22

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143839

Comment Text: Delete all after "1930s". Again, a historical narrative should not include speculation.

Page: 9 Paragraph: 16-17

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143838

Comment Text: Change to read "The four livestock watering troughs?". The watering troughs were primarily used for livestock, which were regularly driven up or down the road each summer. Were automotive watering the purpose, a 50 gallon drum would have sufficed - but to efficiently water a string of livestock, a much larger trough was required.

Page: 9 Paragraph: 13

CR7084 STANDARDS: Access Roads, Driveways, and Trailheads

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141409

Comment Text: Revision: All Mineral King access roads share a similar design. They are all unpaved roads that are between 7 to ten feet wide and have not been improved with a gravel base, except for the road to the corrals in east Mineral King that has been resurfaced with a gravel dirt mixture in recent years. (It is important to include all access roads here and be forthright in their recent maintenance.)

Page: 9-10 Paragraph: 43-2

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142936

Comment Text: Parking at the trailheads, given the substantial recreational usage of the valley by the hiking public, needs to be given some additional planning. In recent years, there has been a lot of roadside parking, especially in East Mineral King, which detracts from the scenic beauty of the areas and creates some traffic problems as the result of little passing room. I would suggest that consideration be given to either enlarging the parking areas, or initiating a scheme to limit the number of vehicles that can access the valley to support the hikers. Also see Pg 35, line 6. I think the guidelines need to be more specific in addressing this topic.

Page: 10 Paragraph: 12

CR7090 STANDARDS: Cabin Communities

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141410

Comment Text: Revision: Several were designed and built or rebuilt and improved from 1880s-1920s unpermitted cabins by the original permittees themselves..."

Page: 10 Paragraph: 23-24

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143844

Comment Text: Delete the sentence about kit homes. Kit homes were in fact available in the 1920s, and some examples of them are still in use in Visalia. But no one would transport all of the materials for such a home up the mountain, and there were never any kit homes in Mineral King.

Page: 10 Paragraph: 26-28

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143016

Comment Text: Should read north and south of the road.

Page: 11 Paragraph: 14-15 & 41-42

CR7091 STANDARDS: Cabin Cove

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143858

Comment Text: Change to read "All of the cabins date from the early 1900s ... ". All of the cabins were in place when the water system was built in 1926. Cabin 6 was built in 1909, and is believed to be the earliest. Cabins 1 and 2 were built in 1914 and 1916, respectively, by the same man, Roy Filcher.

Page: 11 Paragraph: 6-7

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143860

Comment Text: Change "west" and "east" to read "south" and "north", respectively. Both the Mineral King Road and the East Fork of the Kaweah River run east and west. All cabins above the road (furthest from the river) lie north of the road, while all cabins below the road lie south of it.

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 14-15

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143859

Comment Text: Change to read " ...a streambed ... ". There is only one streambed in Cabin Cove; it runs just east of Cabins 1 and 7. While there are other streams lying further up and down the road, none are close enough to be considered as a feature of the Cabin Cove area.

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 12

CR7092 STANDARDS: West Mineral King

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141408

Comment Text: This conflicts with the GMP, p. 150.

Page: 7 **Paragraph:** 13-15

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143861

Comment Text: Again, change "east" to "north" and "west" to "south". See above.

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 41-42

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142991

Comment Text: The term "standing seam" is not correct and should be replaced with lap seam (standing seam roof panels are 12 to 20 inch wide flat pan panels with thin vertical legs (1/4 to 1/2 inch) and are 1-1/2 to 2 inches high)

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 34

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142990

Comment Text: Incorrect spelling of "fenestrations" (spelled "fenetrations" in document)

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 32

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142989

Comment Text: The word "many" at the end of the line should be replaced with "some."

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 30

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141592

Comment Text: The Mineral King road runs predominantly E1W in the WMK cabin area. The cabins on the river side are on the South not East side of the road and those uphill on the North not West side of the road.

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 41-42

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141411

Comment Text: "The line of cabins east (or is it south?) of the road is immediately above the river and the line west (or is it north?) is at the base..."

Page: 11 **Paragraph:** 41-42

CR7093 STANDARDS: East Mineral King

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141412

Comment Text: "...associated with the San Francisco earthquake of 1906, was replaced with a store and post office and expanded into an expanded resort, only to be destroyed permanently in another avalanche in 1969. Crowley's cabin..."

Page: 12 **Paragraph:** 22-23

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142992

Comment Text: The Crowley cabin is on land owned by the Disney Corporation, the cabin is not owned by Disney

Page: 12 **Paragraph:** 23

CR7103 STANDARDS: Retaining Walls

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143002

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation

Page: 26 **Paragraph:** 9-17

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143867

Comment Text: Delete the first clause of the second sentence. Removal of terraces should not be a condition of transfers of permits or sales of cabins.

Page: 26 **Paragraph:** 14-15

CR7104 STANDARDS: Signs

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141413

Comment Text: Revision: NPS informational bulletin boards, traffic signs, interpretive waysides and signs associated with historic cabins.

Page: 14 **Paragraph:** 4-5

CR7111 STANDARDS: Lookout Point

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141387

Comment Text: The dangers of fire were real and well known - not perceived.

Page: 14 **Paragraph:** 42

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141414

Comment Text: Solar is approved for historic structures and sites?

Page: 15 **Paragraph:** 7-8

CR7112 STANDARDS: Atwell Mill

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141415

Comment Text: Addition: Tentative plans to make the Alles Cabin an interpretive center for the ecology of the area would detract from its historic character. The cabin is too important a part of the cultural landscape to deviate from its current interpretive functions. (See GMP p. 150, Vol. 1)

Page: 15 **Paragraph:** 37

CR7113 STANDARDS: Ranger Station

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142993

Comment Text: Delete the word "and" from the middle of the line

Page: 15 **Paragraph:** 39

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143864

Comment Text: Change to read "Mineral King Ranger Station. There was a ranger station at Atwell Mill, where the ranger's residence is now. To make the transition from Atwell Mill in the previous section, it would be helpful to point out which ranger station is being described.

Page: 15 **Paragraph:** 38

CR7120 STANDARDS: Historic Character Guidelines

Correspondence Id: 10 **Comment Id:** 142404

Comment Text: Pg. 16 - Many of the historic character guidelines are too restrictive and not practical. Permittees wish to protect the historic character of the cabins within reasonable means. The source of proposed regulations should be noted as to NPS regulations, Sequoia National Park Policy or National Register criteria.

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 142432

Comment Text: A discussion of the Guidelines begins on Page 16. In general, these guidelines are well written and agree with the Standards for Rehabilitation. While Page 6 mentions the process for applying for an NPS permit for transfer or sale or projects, what happens if the project does not meet the Standards is not clear. I assume the permit will be denied, but will NPS staff at the park work with the applicant to revise the project to meet the standards? Perhaps more importantly, what happens if a cabin owner makes a modification without prior approval, especially if it is not in compliance with the Standards?

CR7130 STANDARDS: Guidelines

Correspondence Id: 17 **Comment Id:** 142994

Comment Text: Home Owner's Association and guidelines occur in these lines in addition to "Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions (CC&R's) ? See previous comment regarding HOA and Guidelines. This document is not a CC&R document for the cabin community

Page: 16 **Paragraph:** 9-12

CR7131 STANDARDS: Buildings and Structures

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 141416

Comment Text: Revision: "...any non-historic modifications and additions made after the National Register period of significance (1915-1942), should be removed at that time. "Non-historic" needs to be defined.

Page: 16 **Paragraph:** 22-23

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143865

Comment Text: Change to read "foundations or major repairs due to avalanche". Minor repairs due to avalanche (primarily from roofs), trees (primarily limbs) or wind must be made each summer. Clearly minor repairs would not require research. The word "to" is required to make the sentence grammatically correct.

Page: 16 **Paragraph:** 24

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142995

Comment Text: "Permittees" at the beginning of the line should be changed to "Owners"

Page: 16 **Paragraph:** 35

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141596

Comment Text: What is and Who are the Park's "CRM Team". Should this not include representatives from the community, as is the practice for Historic districts (and was the vision set forth in the original standards)? Please define CRM and the composition of the team.

Page: 17 **Paragraph:** 4-5

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141595

Comment Text: Rehabilitation does not cover such items as replacing a board. The original Architectural standards covers these lesser types of repairs well, and are consistent with the Secretary's Standards-why abandon them, when they speak to a lesser dimension of repairs?? These were carefully crafted with representatives of Ash Mtn & Western Region (Michael Crowe who had managed historic districts for NPS)

Page: 16 **Paragraph:** 15-17

CR7132 STANDARDS: Exterior Walls

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141388

Comment Text: Most cabins with vertical board and batten are also framed and studded walls.

Page: 17 **Paragraph:** 11

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142996

Comment Text: The word "Hardiplank" should be changed to "fiber cement board siding" ? Hardiplank is a proprietary product of the James Hardie Company

Page: 18 **Paragraph:** 5

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142949

Comment Text: Almost all cabins have a sign on the side of their cabins that identifies the historic name/origin associated with the cabin and the year the cabin was built. These are an integral part of the historic district. Additionally, most cabins are set off the road and have an identifying sign close to the road that lets people know from the road whose cabin it is. I can't imagine excluding one of these. They both serve a purpose.

Page: 32 & 33 **Paragraph:** 33 - 04

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142947

Comment Text: Who is the "Park's CRM team"? I hope this is a collaborative effort between NPS, cabin owners and knowledgeable individuals about historic districts.

Page: 17 **Paragraph:** 4 & 5

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141417

Comment Text: Define "original". "Original siding or that in place during the National Register period of significance (1915-1942), should be repaired and retained.

Page: 16 **Paragraph:** 22-23

CR7133 STANDARDS: Roofs

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141389

Comment Text: Corrugated roofing is 2 ft. wide, not 6 ft. At one time the Forest Service specified that roofs in disrepair be replaced with metal for fire protection.

Page: 18 **Paragraph:** 13

Correspondence Id: 35 Comment Id: 145005

Comment Text: Allow cabin owners to replace wood shingled roofs with metal, especially if other cabins nearby have metal roofs. (p. 18, line 17)

Correspondence Id: 32 Comment Id: 145004

Comment Text: 2. Regarding cabins, I believe that cabins with shingle roofs should be allowed to replace the roofs (when they need re-roofing) with metal roofs. Many of the cabins in the area already have tin roofs and I believe this would cut down on fire danger.

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143213

Comment Text: Disagree.

Page: 18 **Paragraph:** 17-21

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143212

Comment Text: Metal Roofs are attractive, shed snow, and are far better at the fire resistance. Shingles are expensive, impractical and lack advantages of metal (above).

Page: 18 **Paragraph:** 7-14

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143036

Comment Text: There is an insurance issue with combustible roofs in mountain areas because of wild fires. Metal shingles are now available that look like wood and are non-combustible.

Page: 18 **Paragraph:** 17-26

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142937

Comment Text: Observation: Metal roofs, while not contributing to the architectural values of the historic district, do enable a lower snow accumulation (by virtue of the ability for snow to slide off more easily than from a shingle roof) and thus reduce the snow loading on the structure of the cabins limiting the possibility of collapse, and improving the longevity of the structures. Perhaps a consideration could be made to be more accommodating of metal roofs acknowledging the changing nature of structural safety considerations which required site/structural accommodations that are not met through the "preservation" standard (ref pg 1, line 23). At least one of the historic cabins had a metal roof at its inception.

Page: 11 & 18 **Paragraph:** 36 & 25

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142790

Comment Text: "The gradual return to non-metal roofs throughout the landscape district will be pursued". Over the years many cabin owners have replaced original shake type roofing with metal roof materials as roofs wore out or were damaged beyond repair. These metal roofing materials provide significantly better fire protection and a better support structure for winter snow loading concerns. Many of these metal roofs predate the listing of the Cultural Landscape district in 2003 and have been painted to attractively blend with the Landscape. Newly created historic guidelines should recognize appropriate metal roofing as a suitable alternate.

Page: 18 Paragraph: 11-12

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141597

Comment Text: Is the NPS Willing to assume the liability for fire damage due to this stated requirement?

Page: 18 Paragraph: 11-12

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141419

Comment Text: Revision: "...approximates the roofing during the period of significance (1915-1942),

Page: 18 Paragraph: 24

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141418

Comment Text: Revision: "...the exception being corrugated metal roofing where such material was the treatment in place during the period of significance (1915-1942) (The dating of all changes to existing exterior architectural facets must remain constant throughout the document!)

Page: 18 Paragraph: 11-14

CR7134 STANDARDS: Windows

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142997

Comment Text: These lines and their continuation on the following page should be deleted because they are not relevant to the document. Energy efficiency is not an issue of the cabins because most cabins are not energy efficient, have little insulation, and use wood stoves or fireplaces for heat.

Page: 19 Paragraph: 40-43

CR7136 STANDARDS: Shutters

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141420

Comment Text: Revision: ..."should match shutters that existed during the National Register period of significance (1915-1942)

Page: 20 Paragraph: 42

CR7137 STANDARDS: Chimneys and Stovepipes

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141600

Comment Text: This is a helpful comment. There should be an effort to incorporate this type of useful practical knowledge and guidance through these guidelines.

Page: 21 Paragraph: 31-33

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141602

Comment Text: I think this is a practical help to maintenance of the historic appearance

Page: 21 Paragraph: 40-41

CR7138 STANDARDS: Foundations

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141608

Comment Text: Appendix H - this type of resource, will prove to be the substantial facilitator of the maintenance of the Historic District's character.

Page: 22 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143866

Comment Text: Change to read "If significant digging ... ". Without a qualifier, this would require NPS approval even to use a trowel to flatten the ground beneath a foundation stone.

Page: 22 Paragraph: 28

Correspondence Id: 24 Comment Id: 143577

Comment Text: In my experience as a carpenter who has been repairing historic and non-historic buildings in the East Fork Canyon, I have found most of these buildings are under structured. Girders, floor joists, roof rafters are all over spanned. Which means these framing members are too small for their purpose. All of these issues can be addressed and repaired to overcome this problem without changing the outward appearance of these buildings. The most important part of a building is the foundation. Most of these buildings were built on post and pier type foundations, with flat rocks used as piers without any connection to the posts. This type of foundation is not stable. Wood on the ground rots, stones move. The best answer to long-term stability of these buildings is better foundations. Poured concrete piers with mechanical connections to the building would be best. I realize some perimeter footings and posts are visible and need to maintain an historic appearance but the ones under the buildings that cannot be seen without looking closely should be upgraded to modern standards.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142998

Comment Text: The text requires all digging to be reviewed by park management; minor hand excavation should be considered and allowed. Additionally, this is more of a park policy/permittee issue.

Page: 22 Paragraph: 28-29

CR7141 STANDARDS: Decks, Porches and Patios

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141421

Comment Text: Elsewhere indicates contributing structures can also use them. See p. 18g, lines 4-5

Page: 24 Paragraph: 19-20

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143000

Comment Text: Line states "Patios (and canopies):" ? Patios and canopies are very different features; why are they grouped together?

Page: 25 Paragraph: 6

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 142999

Comment Text: Line 20 references "these sustainability standards." What sustainability standards is this in reference too? Clarify the standards and where they can be referenced.

Page: 24 Paragraph: 19-20

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142940

Comment Text: Should probably say, "Decking "shall meet"? Shall is more appropriate for requirements. [The term "will" is often used elsewhere in the document and should be changed to "shall". I would think that the common usage would be that the permittee 'shall' and the NPS 'will'.] Also, I don't believe that the "sustainability goals and standards" are specified within this document. Perhaps a reference could be cited or the goals and standards included as an appendix.

Page: 24 Paragraph: 18

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142791

Comment Text: "Decks will not be covered or fully enclosed". The existing front "deck" of EMK # 1 is actually the remaining floor footprint from portion of the structure which was previously destroyed. This onetime interior floor space was converted to a temporary exterior deck following the removal of the damaged portion of the cabin. We would like to retain the option of rebuilding the damaged/removed historic structure in the future. The existing "deck" would become the footprint of the rebuilt historic interior floor. A narrow interpretation of this section could preclude our opportunity to rebuild this damaged section so we would ask that an exclusion or footnote be added allowing for a future historic reconstruction.

Page: 24 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141422

Comment Text: Define covered. By a full roof? Overhang?

Page: 24 Paragraph: 22

CR7142 STANDARDS: Outbuildings

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143001

Comment Text: Non-historic outbuildings are indicated to be removed over time; this should be reviewed and reconsidered. The Secretary of the Interior Rehabilitation guidelines allow for the addition of structures. Structures that are not in character should be removed or be rebuilt to be in character with the community. Outbuildings are a necessity for storage of cabin maintenance tools, supplies, and spare parts

Page: 25 Paragraph: 13-15, 22-23

CR7143 STANDARDS: Treatments for Retaining Walls

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141423

Comment Text: Note: Does this include terraces in place during the period of significance (e.g. the terrace created by the rock wall in front of the ranger station?)

Page: 26 Paragraph: 14-17

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143017

Comment Text: The terracing may be a historic feature. And transfer of ownership has nothing to do with historic preservation.

Page: 26 Paragraph: 14 & 15

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142405

Comment Text: Pg. 26, line 14 -17: same as comment on pg. 5, line 28: Cabin sales or transfers should have no impact on the historic significance of a building. That is a permit function. Historic compliance is determined by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141611

Comment Text: Same as comment #3. Some "terracing" may have been done for sound reasons. Identify Instances where terracing is causing some identifiable problem.

Page: 26 Paragraph: 14-17

CR7144 STANDARDS: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141424

Comment Text: Define "certified" and its perimeters. Certified by whom, and how?

Page: 26 Paragraph: 35-37

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144836

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation.

Page: 26 Paragraph: 27-28

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143868

Comment Text: Add a final sentence reading "(As an exception to policy, when only an occasional stone is required for a footing, local stone may be used.)" Virtually all cabins were built with some local stone, at least beneath footings. To require a cabin owner to go outside of the park to obtain one or two rocks for a foundation seems absurd. Moreover, it is unenforceable - no one rock removed from a streambed would ever be missed, nor would it be identifiable as having come from a particular location - and to place what seems to be a silly and unenforceable requirement in any regulation breeds contempt for the entire regulatory system. The suggested language would be a practical interpretation of the law, and add credibility to the guidelines.

Page: 26 Paragraph: 33

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143214

Comment Text: Driveways sometime need more than D.G. for a stable base. Gravel looks natural.

Page: 26 Paragraph: 39-40

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141616

Comment Text: This is an impractical and ill advised pronouncement. The probable erosion and access problems related to this are much greater.

Page: 26 Paragraph: 39-40

CR7145 STANDARDS: Fences and Hedges

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141425

Comment Text: Revision: Add "Any fences and unnatural hedges..."

Page: 27 Paragraph: 8

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143216

Comment Text: We assume you are not referring to "marmot" fencing to protect our autos from damage.

Page: 27 Paragraph: 18

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143018

Comment Text: I know the pack station is not in the historic district. However, it can be seen from the district. Are you going to remove its fences and site visitors who put marmot fences around their vehicles?

Page: 27 **Paragraph:** 8 & 9

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143003

Comment Text: Does not address the existing fences in the community

Page: 27 **Paragraph:** 1-14

CR7146 STANDARDS: New Construction

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141426

Comment Text: These New Construction guidelines are clear and workable.

Page: 27 **Paragraph:** 6 plus

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143004

Comment Text: If a structure is to be replaced, it is to be replaced "in kind" therefore the guidelines for building design are not relevant.

Page: 27 & 28 **Paragraph:** 32-42 & 1-15

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142792

Comment Text: "By regulation (43.CRF 21) the cabin reconstruction will be completed within two years." Because of the very short construction season and the logistical difficulties associated with work in Mineral King, two years could be a very minimal time frame in which to complete the work. Extensive reconstruction projects could easily span several seasons, or more. Time extensions should be allowed for these types of projects. Clarifying when the time begins would also be very helpful. We would suggest using the "start of construction" as the trigger.

Page: 27 **Paragraph:** 24-25

CR7150 STANDARDS: Treatment for Outdoor Accessories and Features

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144837

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation.

Page: 28-32 **Paragraph:** 17 & 22

CR7152 STANDARDS: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141427

Comment Text: If in place during the period of significance?

Page: 28 Paragraph: 38

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 142433

Comment Text: On Page 28, Line 35, I recommend listing the features in the order that they are mentioned in the following Guidelines. In this instance, Gazebos are mentioned before Hot Tubs, so the heading should reflect that order.

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142424

Comment Text: On page 29, line 2 (item 2c), some existing cabins have permanent type picnic tables built into their patios. They have become part of the cabin's historical significance. This sentence implies they must be removed and we do not believe this is consistent with the overall intent of the guidelines. We suggest inserting the word "new" after the word "Permanent".

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141428

Comment Text: If in place during the period of significance?

Page: 29 Paragraph: 2

CR7154 STANDARDS: Clotheslines

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143215

Comment Text: Clotheslines were numerous in old mining camp. Are very historic and suitable here.

Page: 29 Paragraph: 26

CR7155 STANDARDS: Tarpaulins

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143019

Comment Text: I agree that these tarps are very unsightly, I guess you will need to site visitors that use them around their vehicles for marmot protection.

Page: 29 Paragraph: 32-35

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143869

Comment Text: Add green or dark green as an approved color for tarpaulins. These colors would be no more obtrusive than brown or black, and in some locations might be less obtrusive.

Page: 29 Paragraph: 32

CR7160 STANDARDS: Pets and Wildlife Attractants

Correspondence Id: 12 Comment Id: 142434

Comment Text: On Page 29, Line 37 and 39, the outline numbering system is off. Following "H. Pets and Wildlife Attractants", the first point should be Number 1 instead of Letter a. I recommend checking the entire document for consistent outline numbering.

Page: 29 Paragraph: 37 & 39

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142906

Comment Text: Birdhouse in tree for 50 years - it in is self is historic - why remove?

Page: 30 Paragraph: 2-3

CR7170 STANDARDS: Food Storage

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141390

Comment Text: Very few historic cabins, if any, are bear proof and to make them so would destroy the integrity.

Page: 30 Paragraph: 24

Correspondence Id: 35 Comment Id: 145006

Comment Text: Create more reasonable food/garbage storage guidelines. A determined bear can get into most any cabin, anytime. It is unrealistic to remove all food/garbage or store it in bear-proof containers. In historic times, dogs ran free and the bear/deer weren't a problem. Pesky marmots would also be less of a menace.

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143872

Comment Text: Delete the words "within cabins". The type of container described here does not belong in cabins. See also comments 37 and 38.

Page: 30 Paragraph: 29

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143871

Comment Text: Change to read " ... such a manner that it will neither attract nor afford wildlife ready access to it." There are no cabins capable of preventing bears from breaking into them. The object is to avoid attracting them, by sight or smell, to food within the cabin. This can be done in various ways - by burning garbage, or sealing, it in glass or metal containers, or even refrigerating it, and by keeping food sealed in cans or other containers, or in refrigerators or ice chests, and keeping it out of sight between meals. (Meat or fruit left lying on a counter is one of the prime causes of cabin break ins.) The suggested language will be meaningful to cabin owners, without micromanaging their efforts to prevent wildlife access to cabins.

Page: 30 Paragraph: 23-26

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143870

Comment Text: Delete the first sentence of this paragraph. Very few permittees or visitors would even know where to look for 36 CFR 2.10, much less be familiar with its provisions. To suggest that the readers must abide by the regulations found there, without defining them, is an exercise in futility.

Page: 30 Paragraph: 13-14

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143217

Comment Text: We are not sure what this means. We have had no trouble with current procedures.

Page: 30 Paragraph: 28-30

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142908

Comment Text: When we dumped garbage on a rock at night, we had NO bear break-ins

Page: 30 Paragraph: 23-30

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142907

Comment Text: Please put trash dumpster in East M.K., hard not to use NPS trash receptacle when dumpster is 1+ miles - running a car back and forth is not in the best interest of the parks.

Page: 30 Paragraph: 32-35

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142406

Comment Text: Pg. 30, line 23-26: None of the buildings are bear proof and to make them so would destroy the historic character.

CR7180 STANDARDS: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141429

Comment Text: Again, the analogy to CC&Rs related to homeowners associations may be inappropriate here. They appear to be park regulations rather than homeowners' regulations.

Page: 30 **Paragraph:** 38

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143873

Comment Text: Place this language with other provisions affecting only the NPS. Since the provisions clearly apply only to the NPS, putting them in the middle of provisions which apply only to cabin owners is confusing - and risks leading a reader to believe that the remaining pages are inapplicable to permittees.

Page: 30 & 31 **Paragraph:** 38-15

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143021

Comment Text: These are covered in the permits and you should not muddy up this document by including them here.

Page: 31 **Paragraph:** 17-39

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141430

Comment Text: This entire section is confusing and contradictory (esp. paragraphs one and two.)

Page: 31 **Paragraph:** 2-39

CR7181 STANDARDS: Planters and Plantings (NPS)

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141431

Comment Text: Paragraph one says planting is prohibited. Paragraphs 2a-2d give guidelines to how to plant.

Page: 31 **Paragraph:** 2-15

CR7182 STANDARDS: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141619

Comment Text: There may be some serious legal questions about NPS liability when a structure is damaged by a tree declared to not be a hazard or persons injured, or killed by a tree similarly designated.

Page: 31 **Paragraph:** 24-32

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 143874

Comment Text: Delete this subparagraph. Since the Hazard Tree SOP is still under development, it is premature to describe here responsibilities and procedures which may change. The second sentence, in particular, is an oversimplification - the removal of hazard trees which endanger campgrounds as well as cabin areas, for example, should not be the permittee's responsibility. In any event, the second sentence is at odds with the current program of incorporating a share of removal costs in all permit fees, rather than billing individual permittees for the cost of removing trees from their cabin areas.

Page: 31 **Paragraph:** 27-30

Correspondence Id: 10 **Comment Id:** 142407

Comment Text: Pg. 32 (sic) [31], line 27-30: The park has the responsibility to remove hazardous trees on their land at their expense that may endanger any citizen.

CR7183 STANDARDS: Hazard Fuels Identification and Removal

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 141432

Comment Text: Similarly, hazard fuels and brush and sapling guidelines contradict the first paragraph prohibiting pruning and trimming.

Page: 31-32 **Paragraph:** 36-12

Correspondence Id: 21 **Comment Id:** 143218

Comment Text: As long as we can control "new growth" around the cabin from getting out of control.

Page: 31 **Paragraph:** 38-39

CR7184 STANDARDS: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems

Correspondence Id: 4 **Comment Id:** 141391

Comment Text: This statement seems to suggest that present access to water would be disallowed if the permit is transferred except, perhaps, in the West MK water system.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 18

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143022

Comment Text: This has nothing to do with historic preservation and should not be part of this document.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 17-19

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141620

Comment Text: There are several water systems in Mineral King. The water rights to these systems have been established.

Page: 32-34 **Paragraph:** 33-04

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141433

Comment Text: Not well stated as not being in keeping with historic character. Define "irrigation." Sprinkling of cabin lots was widespread during the period of significance in order to reduce dry plant fuels surrounding the cabins and for dust control and soil stabilization.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 21-22

CR7185 STANDARDS: Exterior Signs

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141434

Comment Text: Re: Exterior Signs. The Forest Service regulation stating these perimeters should be cited. It definitely was never followed and individualistic signs from the period of significance are part of the historic character of each cabin in the landscape district.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 33-36

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143875

Comment Text: Change second sentence to read "New signs should ... ". The qualifier makes this sentence consistent with the preceding and following subparagraphs.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 34

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143037

Comment Text: All signs should be evaluated. Most have been replaced since 1942 but still add charm as contributing objects.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 30-31

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143023

Comment Text: Signs: The Park Service should take a good look at some of the signage they have. Examples: Spray paint on historic troughs and no standing signage along the road, etc.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 33-42

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142793

Comment Text: "...permittees are allowed one sign to identify their respective cabins." Multiple historic signs (as currently exist) delineating the historical cabin ownership names/ dates should be allowed. This is in keeping with the Cultural Landscape District and provides a historical look back at the ownership history.

Page: 32 **Paragraph:** 33-34

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142409

Comment Text: Pg. 33, line 3: An additional sign should be allowed for current names, if needed.

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142408

Comment Text: Pg. 32, line 33-36: Historic cabin names rather than current owners' names are more suitable to an historic district.

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141623

Comment Text: There are signs which designate the historic origins of the cabins. Allow, at least those elements which contribute to the broader historic understanding of the area.

Page: 33-34 **Paragraph:** 33-04

CR7186 STANDARDS: Landscape Ornaments

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142425

Comment Text: We really like item 6a on page 33.

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144838

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation.

Page: 33 **Paragraph:** 1, 9-10

CR7190 STANDARDS: Treatments for Access and Transportation Features

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142948

Comment Text: A steep road subjected to the kind of winter weather Mineral King roads get, erosion and a number of other problems occur if the road is not properly cared for on an annual basis. Periodically using "gravel" or decomposed granite is a must

Page: 26 / 33 / 34 **Paragraph:** 39 & 40 / 42 / 17&18

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143877

Comment Text: Place this language with other provisions affecting only the NPS. Same reasons as above.

Page: 34 & 35 **Paragraph:** 6 - 21

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143876

Comment Text: Place this language with other provisions affecting only the NPS. Same reasons as comment 26 above.

Page: 33 & 34 **Paragraph:** 14 - 2

CR7191 STANDARDS: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141435

Comment Text: Note: (5-15mph) description contradicts the posted 25mph speed limit on the road.

Page: 33 **Paragraph:** 17-18

Correspondence Id: 32 Comment Id: 145003

Comment Text: 1. Since the road is part of the history of Mineral King, I suggest that it be maintained as it is with no further paving. Cars can slow down and enjoy the gorgeous scenery.

Correspondence Id: 9 Comment Id: 143454

Comment Text: The road from Three Rivers to Mineral King should be better maintained, including the County-maintained portion of the road.

CR7192 STANDARDS: Access Roads

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141625

Comment Text: Same comment as 13. This is impractical to allow no erosion preventing means.

Page: 33-34 **Paragraph:** 42-2

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142950

Comment Text: Does the NPS want the responsibility of maintaining access roads that go to some of the cabins? The cabin owners have done it for years, let them continue to be a partner with the NPS and handle this duty.

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 1

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142794

Comment Text: b. Access roads shall not be improved with paving or gravel base." Access roads have been graded with surfacing materials (typically DG) historically. Maintenance of these roadways with these historic materials needs to be specifically allowed.

Page: 33 **Paragraph:** 42

CR7193 STANDARDS: Cabin Driveways and Parking

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141436

Comment Text: Why limited to 3 vehicles if all are located within the driveway and parking areas of a given cabin? Park, state, or federal regulation regarding this should be cited.

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 31

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144840

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 12-17

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144839

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation.

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 38-40

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143219

Comment Text: What do you consider OK for driveway improvement?

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 17

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143024

Comment Text: Does the rule about 3 vehicles apply to the NPS historic structures as well?

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 31-33

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142951

Comment Text: If a cabin has the room to park multiple vehicles, what is the issue here? It seems like this would be an enforcement nightmare and not worth the upset it would cause

Page: 34 **Paragraph:** 31

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142410

Comment Text: Pg. 34, line 31: Number of vehicles allowed should depend upon space not numbers.

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141631

Comment Text: Same as 13 & 17 The 3 car limit is not justified! I would also suggest that you ignore the use of recreational vehicles as "guest homes"

Page: 17 & 18 **Paragraph:** 31-33 & 39-40

CR7195 STANDARDS: Trails and Pathways

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141437

Comment Text: Is this what is now known as the Nature Trail that runs up to the East Mineral King enclave? Or is it something different? Note: The "formal" trail above the corrals that runs to the head of the Mineral King valley as the first leg of the Franklin and Farewell Gap trails also existed during the period of significance as a forest service road. The section below the wilderness area is definitely historic.

Page: 35 **Paragraph:** 15-21

CR7196 STANDARDS: Spontaneous Paths

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143220

Comment Text: Historic pathways ? "social trails" in your words, have been there for many years with no more "damage" than deer trails.

Page: 36 **Paragraph:** 6-10 & 13-17

CR7200 STANDARDS: Treatments for Utilities

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142799

Comment Text: Although not included in this draft, provisions for the collection of solar energy should be incorporated.

Page: 38-39 **Paragraph:**

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144841

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation

Page: 36-38 **Paragraph:** 35 & 9

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142944

Comment Text: With regard to energy reception, I assume you are referring to electrical solar panels (photovoltaic arrays ? is the correct technical terminology). You might want to be specific. You could also address solar panels used for water heating, which are not photovoltaic arrays.

Page: 39 **Paragraph:** 38

CR7203 STANDARDS: Trash Disposal and Recycling

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142798

Comment Text: "Garbage must be stored in secured, hard-sided, animal-proof containers. Containers should be kept in a location, within cabins, so that they do not diminish the historic character of the landscape district." We are guessing this applies to containers which may be stored outside of cabins and not within as written. Cabin owners have effectively prevented wildlife access to garbage stored inside of cabins for years.

Page: 38 **Paragraph:** 33-35

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144844

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation

Page: 38 **Paragraph:** 22-40

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143885

Comment Text: Delete this subparagraph. Secured, hard-sided animal-proof containers, such as the NPS places in campgrounds, are impractical and unnecessary within cabins. Moreover, even if such a container could be built in an appropriate size to be kept in a cabin, the odor of garbage would still be an attractant? And from a cabin owner's viewpoint, once the bear is inside the cabin the damage is already done, whether or not the bear could get into the container.

Page: 38 Paragraph: 33-35

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143884

Comment Text: Delete second sentence of this subparagraph. The first sentence is adequate. As noted above, no cabin is capable of preventing a motivated bear from breaking in.

Page: 38 Paragraph: 30-31

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143028

Comment Text: These are permittee rules should not be a part of this document.

Page: 38 Paragraph: 29-43

CR7204 STANDARDS: Energy Storage

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141442

Comment Text: This is overly broad and restrictive. From where in the parks? Many park sources are also contaminated with pests and disease.

Page: 39 Paragraph: 32-33

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 144845

Comment Text: Applies more to park policy and permits than it does to preservation

Page: 39 Paragraph: 10-33

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143224

Comment Text: Local wood is totally impractical ? need chainsaws, log splitters, man power, etc. We will bring up already cut fire wood and save you may problems.

Page: 39 Paragraph: 21-33

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143030

Comment Text: I was always told that firewood could not be collected by anyone in a national park without a permit. Should not be a part of this document.

Page: 39 Paragraph: 21-33

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143029

Comment Text: Propane tanks have long been a part of the historic landscape of Mineral King. Including tanks owned by the NPS. Should not be a part of this document.

Page: 39 Paragraph: 2-16

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143005

Comment Text: Item does not address existing conditions/locations of propane tanks or the need for tanks to be within a certain distance for service trucks to refill tanks from an access road or the main road.

Page: 39 Paragraph: 3-7

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142953

Comment Text: As a cabin member I have had NPS employees tell me I cannot remove "down wood" and use it at my cabin. How is it that "all park visitors" all allowed to do this and cabin members are not? I also don't think placing in a formal document that it is ok for "all park visitors" to take wood from permitted residences is appropriate. Would this include the NPS facilities as well?

Page: 39 Paragraph: 21-22

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142943

Comment Text: A reference is needed for "code setback" requirements

Page: 39 Paragraph: 12

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142413

Comment Text: Pg. 39, line 21-22: Campground occupants should not be allowed to help themselves to a cabin's wood pile.

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141637

Comment Text: Propane tanks date back to the period of significance-they are not "contemporary"

Page: 39 Paragraph: 2

CR7206 STANDARDS: Exterior Lighting

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142414

Comment Text: Pg. 40, line 5: No buildings have exterior lighting.

CR7220 STANDARDS: Acknowledgements

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142415

Comment Text: Pg. 42, line 5: Actual consultation in preparation of these guidelines would have been appreciated rather than "after the fact" - as the-initial guidelines were prepared.

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143886

Comment Text: Change to read "... Tom Nave and the Mineral King Preservation Society ... ". If individual credit is to be given, and that is certainly appropriate, the efforts of the MKPS should also be recognized.

Page: 42 Paragraph: 13

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143039

Comment Text: who were the key members of the Mineral King Preservation Society that participated in this draft? Conversations with several board members did not reveal who participated as appointed representative of the society.

Page: 42 Paragraph: 3-5

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143006

Comment Text: "Suanne" (as spelled) or "Suzanne"?

Page: 42 Paragraph: 14

CR7240 STANDARDS: App. A Definitions

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141443

Comment Text: Appendix A: Definitions: In general, all entries describing or derived from laws, rules, and regulations should cite the source with their titles and reference numbers included.

Page: 44 Paragraph:

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143891

Comment Text: Change to read " ... research, although in rare cases, if coming ... ". Without this or a comparable change, the second part of the sentence contradicts the first.

Page: 50 Paragraph: 18

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143888

Comment Text: Change to read " ... research, although in rare cases, if coming ... ". Without this or a comparable change, the second part of the sentence contradicts the first.

Page: 50 Paragraph: 18

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143887

Comment Text: Delete the words "(i.e. projects)". The word "project" is not defined, nor should it be. To a cabin owner, repainting a shutter may be a project ? And that is clearly not the intent of Section 106. "Undertaking" is the appropriate word in this context.

Page: 44 Paragraph: 37

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142945

Comment Text: Perhaps the cabin numbers for the contributing and non-contributing structures should be listed so there is no misunderstanding about who the various guidelines apply to. Also pg 49, line 19.

Page: 45 Paragraph: 20

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142938

Comment Text: Need definitions for the acronyms CRM and SHPO, either here or in the Appendix A.

Page: 17 Paragraph: 4

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142426

Comment Text: On page 50, line 32 we suggest adding "and repair or replacement of broken shutters".

Correspondence Id: 6 Comment Id: 141640

Comment Text: Porch: isn't this distinguished from a deck in that it is permanently "covered" - it needs to be distinguished or clarified some way - used several times in previous sections

Page: 49 Paragraph: 28

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141449

Comment Text: Add: definition of Section 106

Page: 50 Paragraph: 33

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141448

Comment Text: What is a Programmatic Agreement? With whom? Too vague.

Page: 49 Paragraph: 43

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141447

Comment Text: Add: Period of Significance

Page: 49 Paragraph: 30

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141446

Comment Text: Note: First sentence doesn't make sense.

Page: 48 Paragraph: 19

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141445

Comment Text: Spelling: technological device

Page: 44 Paragraph: 41

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141444

Comment Text: Addition: Advisory Council on Historic Preservation definition

Page: 44 Paragraph: 16

CR7260 STANDARDS: App. C Preservation Assessment Form

Correspondence Id: 17 **Comment Id:** 143007

Comment Text: Appendix C, Assessment form: Form has the feeling of meeting the needs of the park service while not communicating with the person who will be filling out the form; consider language and questions that are more in tune with the knowledge base of those filling out the form

Page: 57 **Paragraph:** 1-42

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 143893

Comment Text: Consider providing for the designation of which of the various reviews may be required (or which may not be required). In some cases it might be obvious that the proposed action will not require review by all the offices listed. In those cases, routing the form through all of them will simply waste time. Someone in the administration ought to be able to determine what reviews will actually be required.

Page: 59 **Paragraph:**

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 143892

Comment Text: Change "Incur" to "Reduce or accelerate the ... ". "Incur" implies an immediate effect, not a gradual effect.

Page: 57 **Paragraph:** 35

CR7270 STANDARDS: App. D Approved Paint Color Palette

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 141450

Comment Text: Appendix D: Source of contact at Preservation Society and Office of Historic Preservation needed

Page: 61 **Paragraph:** 3-4

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 142946

Comment Text: Appendix D: The color palette has not been included

Page: 61 **Paragraph:**

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 142939

Comment Text: Appendix D ? the color palette is not provided

Page: 22 **Paragraph:** 42

CR7320 STANDARDS: App. I Exempt Undertakings

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141451

Comment Text: New number 3: Addition: Maintenance and minor repair of plumbing lines (In high altitude seasonal residences this is a continual process beyond the scope of plumbing codes for major work. As with all exterior surfaces, plumbing needs constant maintenance so major problems do not occur.)

Page: 67 Paragraph: 11

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143897

Comment Text: Delete the words "(less than one square foot)". Same reasons as above.

Page: 67 Paragraph: 22

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143896

Comment Text: Delete the words "limited (affecting no more than one square foot). Other than repainting the letters on a sign, it is difficult to imagine a painting project covering less than one square foot. Repainting should be encouraged, rather than restricted by arbitrary limitations.

Page: 67 Paragraph: 19-20

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143895

Comment Text: Delete the words "Limited (less than one square foot)". You have already provided strict guidelines for the replacement of windows or shutters. (See page 19 lines 27 - 38 and page 20 lines 26 - 39.) The repair (as opposed to replacement) of windows and shutters is encouraged and certainly should not be restricted by size restrictions.

Page: 67 Paragraph: 16

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143894

Comment Text: Delete the words "Limited (less than one square foot)". You have already provided strict guidelines for the replacement of windows or shutters. (See page 19 lines 27 - 38 and page 20 lines 26 - 39.) The repair (as opposed to replacement) of windows and shutters is encouraged and certainly should not be restricted by size restrictions.

Page: 67 Paragraph: 16

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143009

Comment Text: Appendix I, Exempt Undertakings: The list should be further reviewed and revised with representatives of the Mineral King Preservation Society and the Mineral King District Association (Permittees and cabin users)

Page: 67 Paragraph:

Correspondence Id: 11 Comment Id: 142427

Comment Text: We are in agreement with most of the content and tone of the draft guidelines up through page 66. On page 67 we strongly disagree with the language and restrictions. Specifically, the words "limited (less than one square foot)" should be removed entirely and replaced with the word "moderate". The one square foot reference is absolutely absurd in our opinion. We also suggest changing the words "minor-in-kind- on line 14 (item # 5) to "moderate-in-kind".

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142416

Comment Text: Pg.67: The park doesn't really want to have to give approval for painting, window repair, grouting, etc., which is routine maintenance. That would inundate the park with requests.

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141452

Comment Text: Omit: (less than one square foot) This is totally impractical, especially for window frames.

CR7330 STANDARDS: App. J Project Submittal Procedure Decision Tree

Correspondence Id: 17 Comment Id: 143008

Comment Text: Assessment form, park service review: How long will it take for the park service to complete their review of this form? The form must be designed for a quick turnaround.

IS100 ISSUES Special Park Uses

Correspondence Id: 2 Comment Id: 141516

Comment Text: I support a plan that will continue the permits for all cabins in Cabin Cove and Mineral King while working with the cabin owners to maintain those cabins so they can continue to coexist with the campgrounds and other uses in Mineral King.

IV200 ISSUES - Access: MK Road; Do Not Pave

Correspondence Id: 24 Comment Id: 143578

Comment Text: The Mineral King Road Paving this road is wrong, wrong, wrong! I have felt a deep loss every time the NPS has paved a part of it. This is unique in its history. It was built by hand as a wagon road. Dust and potholes are part of this history. Paving, widening or anything else other than general maintenance should not happen. I also think more signs are needed to inform drivers to slow down and to pull over to allow passing.

Correspondence Id: 32 Comment Id: 145003

Comment Text: 1. Since the road is part of the history of Mineral King, I suggest that it be maintained as it is with no further paving. Cars can slow down and enjoy the gorgeous scenery.

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 144855

Comment Text: I do not think that the road in should be improved or upgraded, as it is adequate for a pristine experience. Money for road upgrades can be better spent in other ways in the park system.

APPENDIX A – Correspondence Indexes

Table 5. Index of Organizations

Correspondence ID #	Receipt Date	Organization	Name
State Government			
1	5/5/2010	California Dept of Transportation	Deel, David
12	5/27/2010	State Historic Preservation Office	Donaldson, Milford Wayne
Interest Groups Preservation/Conservation			
6	5/24/2010	Mineral King Preservation Society	Ingram, Jim
13	5/27/2010	Mineral King Preservation Society	Hendricks, Stuart
27	6/25/2010	Backcountry Horsemen of California	Cochran, Richard H
30, 31	5/12/2010 and 6/29/2010	High Sierra Hikers Association	Browning, Peter
34	7/5/2010	Backcountry Horsemen of California	Reese, Marily

Table 6. Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters

Correspondence ID	Receipt Date	Name
1	5/5/2010	Deel, David
2	4/23/2010	Bissiri, Mark
3	5/25/2010	Anonymous
4	5/13/2010	Barton, Jim
5	5/19/2010	Jackson, Louise
6	5/24/2010	Ingram, Jim
7	6/10/2010	Werner, Harold W
8	6/12/2010	Krase, Robert
9	6/22/2010	Doyle, Barbara
10	6/3/2010	Hack, Nadine
11	6/22/2010	Pennebaker, Roy and Celia
12	5/27/2010	Donaldson, Milford Wayne
13	5/27/2010	Hendricks, Stewart
14	6/14/2010	Alltucker, Michael and Marilyn
15	6/29/2010	Cunningham, Glenn E
16	6/28/2010	Pinkham, Frank
17	3/30/2010	Hendricks, Stuart
18	6/28/2010	Botkin, Michael and Jana
19	6/28/2010	Cosart, Keith
20	6/11/2010	Workman, Bill Nielsen and Lynn
21	6/29/2010	Pinkham, Mary P. and Patrick C.
22	7/1/2010	Peterson, Jay and Betsy
23	6/29/2010	Stansfield, Tracy
24	6/25/2010	Cluck, Aaron
25	7/1/2010	Crowe, John T.
26	6/28/2010	Bissiri, Nadean
27	6/25/2010	Cochran, Richard H
28	7/1/2010	Dagleish, Ken
29	6/1/2010	Devol, Shirley
30	5/12/2010	Browning, Peter
31	6/29/2010	Browning, Peter
32	6/22/2010	Koch, Jean
34	7/5/2010	Reese, Marily
35	5/28/2010	Reynolds, Brian
36	5/18/2010	Barton, Jim

APPENDIX B – Index by Organization Type and Individuals

The Index by Org Type reports display the number of correspondence IDs that have coded comments associated with them. Each correspondence ID can be associated with multiple comments/codes and use the same code as another correspondence ID. Each correspondence ID is only counted once.

Table 7. Index by Organization Type

Organization	Corr. ID	Code	Description
Mineral King Preservation Society	5	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
		CR7020	GUIDELINES: Executive Summary
		CR7030	GUIDELINES: Introduction
		CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
		CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
		CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road
		CR7084	GUIDELINES: Access Roads, Driveways, and Trailheads
		CR7090	GUIDELINES: Cabin Communities
		CR7092	GUIDELINES: West Mineral King
		CR7093	GUIDELINES: East Mineral King
		CR7104	GUIDELINES: Signs
		CR7111	GUIDELINES: Lookout Point
		CR7112	GUIDELINES: Atwell Mill
		CR7131	GUIDELINES: Buildings and Structures
		CR7132	GUIDELINES: Exterior Walls
		CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
		CR7136	GUIDELINES: Shutters
		CR7141	GUIDELINES: Decks, Porches and Patios
		CR7143	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Retaining Walls
		CR7144	GUIDELINES: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel
		CR7145	GUIDELINES: Fences and Hedges
		CR7146	GUIDELINES: New Construction
		CR7152	GUIDELINES: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such
		CR7180	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas
		CR7181	GUIDELINES: Planters and Plantings (NPS)
		CR7183	GUIDELINES: Hazard Fuels Identification and Removal
		CR7184	GUIDELINES: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems

		CR7185	GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs
		CR7191	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)
		CR7193	GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking
		CR7195	GUIDELINES: Trails and Pathways
		CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
		CR7202	GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery
		CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage
		CR7240	GUIDELINES: App. A Definitions
		CR7270	GUIDELINES: App. D Approved Paint Color Palette
		CR7320	GUIDELINES: App. I Exempt Undertakings
	13	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
		CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
		CR7060	GUIDELINES: Process and Procedures
		CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road
		CR7092	GUIDELINES: West Mineral King
		CR7131	GUIDELINES: Buildings and Structures
		CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
		CR7137	GUIDELINES: Chimneys and Stovepipes
		CR7138	GUIDELINES: Foundations
		CR7143	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Retaining Walls
		CR7144	GUIDELINES: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel
		CR7182	GUIDELINES: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal
		CR7184	GUIDELINES: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems
		CR7185	GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs
		CR7192	GUIDELINES: Access Roads
		CR7193	GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking
		CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
		CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage
		CR7240	GUIDELINES: App. A Definitions
State Historic Preservation Officer	12	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
		CR7070	GUIDELINES: Feature Descriptions
		CR7120	GUIDELINES: Historic Character Guidelines
		CR7152	GUIDELINES: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such
		CR7160	GUIDELINES: Pets and Wildlife Attractants

Table 8. Index by Unaffiliated Individuals

Corr. ID	Code	Description	
3	CR7132	GUIDELINES: Exterior Walls	
	CR7190	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Access and Transportation Features	
	CR7192	GUIDELINES: Access Roads	
	CR7193	GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking	
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater	
	CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage	
4	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments	
	CR7030	GUIDELINES: Introduction	
	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need	
	CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road	
	CR7083	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road Associated Features	
	CR7111	GUIDELINES: Lookout Point	
	CR7132	GUIDELINES: Exterior Walls	
	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs	
	CR7170	GUIDELINES: Food Storage	
	CR7184	GUIDELINES: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems	
	7	IC100	ISSUES - Cultural resource issues
	9	CR7191	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)
	10	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
		CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
CR7050		GUIDELINES: Assumptions	
CR7120		GUIDELINES: Historic Character Guidelines	
CR7143		GUIDELINES: Treatments for Retaining Walls	
CR7170		GUIDELINES: Food Storage	
CR7182		GUIDELINES: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal	
CR7185		GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs	
CR7193		GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking	
CR7201		GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater	
CR7202		GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery	
CR7204		GUIDELINES: Energy Storage	
CR7206		GUIDELINES: Exterior Lighting	
CR7220		GUIDELINES: Acknowledgements	
CR7320		GUIDELINES: App. I Exempt Undertakings	
11		CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need	
	CR7070	GUIDELINES: Feature Descriptions	
	CR7152	GUIDELINES: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such	

	CR7186	GUIDELINES: Landscape Ornaments
	CR7240	GUIDELINES: App. A Definitions
	CR7320	GUIDELINES: App. I Exempt Undertakings
14	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
	CR7141	GUIDELINES: Decks, Porches and Patios
	CR7146	GUIDELINES: New Construction
	CR7185	GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs
	CR7192	GUIDELINES: Access Roads
	CR7200	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Utilities
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
	CR7202	GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery
	CR7203	GUIDELINES: Trash Disposal and Recycling
15	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7020	GUIDELINES: Executive Summary
	CR7030	GUIDELINES: Introduction
	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
	CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
	CR7070	GUIDELINES: Feature Descriptions
	CR7084	GUIDELINES: Access Roads, Driveways, and Trailheads
	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
	CR7141	GUIDELINES: Decks, Porches and Patios
	CR7200	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Utilities
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
	CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage
	CR7240	GUIDELINES: App. A Definitions
	CR7270	GUIDELINES: App. D Approved Paint Color Palette
16	CR7030	GUIDELINES: Introduction
	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
	CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
	CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road
	CR7160	GUIDELINES: Pets and Wildlife Attractants
	CR7170	GUIDELINES: Food Storage
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
17	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
	CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
	CR7060	GUIDELINES: Process and Procedures
	CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road
	CR7092	GUIDELINES: West Mineral King
	CR7093	GUIDELINES: East Mineral King
	CR7103	GUIDELINES: Retaining Walls

	CR7113	GUIDELINES: Ranger Station
	CR7130	GUIDELINES: Guidelines
	CR7131	GUIDELINES: Buildings and Structures
	CR7132	GUIDELINES: Exterior Walls
	CR7134	GUIDELINES: Windows
	CR7138	GUIDELINES: Foundations
	CR7141	GUIDELINES: Decks, Porches and Patios
	CR7142	GUIDELINES: Outbuildings
	CR7144	GUIDELINES: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel
	CR7145	GUIDELINES: Fences and Hedges
	CR7146	GUIDELINES: New Construction
	CR7150	GUIDELINES: Treatment for Outdoor Accessories and Features
	CR7186	GUIDELINES: Landscape Ornaments
	CR7193	GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking
	CR7200	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Utilities
	CR7202	GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery
	CR7203	GUIDELINES: Trash Disposal and Recycling
	CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage
	CR7220	GUIDELINES: Acknowledgements
	CR7260	GUIDELINES: App. C Preservation Assessment Form
	CR7320	GUIDELINES: App. I Exempt Undertakings
	CR7330	GUIDELINES: App. J Project Submittal Procedure Decision Tree
18	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7083	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road Associated Features
	IC100	ISSUES - Cultural resource issues
19	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7020	GUIDELINES: Executive Summary
	CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
	CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road
	CR7090	GUIDELINES: Cabin Communities
	CR7143	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Retaining Walls
	CR7145	GUIDELINES: Fences and Hedges
	CR7155	GUIDELINES: Tarpaulins
	CR7180	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas
	CR7184	GUIDELINES: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems
	CR7185	GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs
	CR7193	GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
	CR7202	GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery
	CR7203	GUIDELINES: Trash Disposal and Recycling
	CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage

20	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7040	GUIDELINES: Purpose and Need
	CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
	CR7185	GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
	CR7220	GUIDELINES: Acknowledgements
21	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
	CR7144	GUIDELINES: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel
	CR7145	GUIDELINES: Fences and Hedges
	CR7154	GUIDELINES: Clotheslines
	CR7170	GUIDELINES: Food Storage
	CR7183	GUIDELINES: Hazard Fuels Identification and Removal
	CR7193	GUIDELINES: Cabin Driveways and Parking
	CR7196	GUIDELINES: Spontaneous Paths
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
	CR7202	GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery
	CR7204	GUIDELINES: Energy Storage
22	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7200	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Utilities
23	IC100	ISSUES - Cultural resource issues
24	CR7138	GUIDELINES: Foundations
25	CR7000	GUIDELINES: General Comments
	CR7020	GUIDELINES: Executive Summary
	CR7030	GUIDELINES: Introduction
	CR7050	GUIDELINES: Assumptions
	CR7060	GUIDELINES: Process and Procedures
	CR7082	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road
	CR7083	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road Associated Features
	CR7090	GUIDELINES: Cabin Communities
	CR7091	GUIDELINES: Cabin Cove
	CR7092	GUIDELINES: West Mineral King
	CR7103	GUIDELINES: Retaining Walls
	CR7113	GUIDELINES: Ranger Station
	CR7131	GUIDELINES: Buildings and Structures
	CR7138	GUIDELINES: Foundations
	CR7144	GUIDELINES: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel
	CR7155	GUIDELINES: Tarpaulins
	CR7170	GUIDELINES: Food Storage
	CR7180	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas
	CR7182	GUIDELINES: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal

	CR7185	GUIDELINES: Exterior Signs
	CR7190	GUIDELINES: Treatments for Access and Transportation Features
	CR7201	GUIDELINES: Septic and Wastewater
	CR7202	GUIDELINES: Water Storage and Delivery
	CR7203	GUIDELINES: Trash Disposal and Recycling
	CR7220	GUIDELINES: Acknowledgements
	CR7240	GUIDELINES: App. A Definitions
	CR7260	GUIDELINES: App. C Preservation Assessment Form
	CR7320	GUIDELINES: App. I Exempt Undertakings
29	CR1000	Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws
32	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
	CR7191	GUIDELINES: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)
35	CR7133	GUIDELINES: Roofs
	CR7170	GUIDELINES: Food Storage

APPENDIX C – Index by Code

This table lists the commenters and topics commented on (identified by the codes used in this analysis). The report is organized by code, and under each code is a list of the commenters who submitted comments that fell under that code and their correspondence numbers as assigned by the park. Those identified as N/A represent unaffiliated individuals.

Table 9. Index by Code

Code	Description	Organization	Corr. ID
CR1000	Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	N/A	29
CR7000	STANDARDS: General Comments	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
			13
		State Historic Preservation Officer	12
		N/A	4
			10
			11
			15
			17
			18
			19
			20
			22
			25
CR7020	STANDARDS: Executive Summary	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	15
			19
			25
CR7030	STANDARDS: Introduction	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	4
			15
			16
			25
CR7040	STANDARDS: Purpose and Need	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	4
			10
			11
			15
			16
			17

			20
CR7050	STANDARDS: Assumptions	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society /	6
		Mineral King	
		N/A	10
			15
			16
			17
		19	
		20	
		25	
CR7060	STANDARDS: Process and Procedures	Mineral King Preservation Society /	6
		Mineral King	
		N/A	17
		25	
CR7070	STANDARDS: Feature Descriptions	State Historic Preservation Officer	12
		N/A	11
			15
CR7082	STANDARDS: Mineral King Road	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society /	6
		Mineral King	
		N/A	4
			16
			17
		19	
		25	
CR7083	STANDARDS: Mineral King Road Associated Features	N/A	4
			18
			25
CR7084	STANDARDS: Access Roads, Driveways, and Trailheads	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	15
CR7090	STANDARDS: Cabin Communities	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	19
			25
CR7091	STANDARDS: Cabin Cove	N/A	25
CR7092	STANDARDS: West Mineral King	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society /	6
		Mineral King	
		N/A	17
		25	

CR7093	STANDARDS: East Mineral King	Mineral King Preservation Society N/A	5 17
CR7103	STANDARDS: Retaining Walls	N/A	17 25
CR7104	STANDARDS: Signs	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
CR7111	STANDARDS: Lookout Point	Mineral King Preservation Society N/A	5 4
CR7112	STANDARDS: Atwell Mill	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
CR7113	STANDARDS: Ranger Station	N/A	17 25
CR7120	STANDARDS: Historic Character Guidelines	State Historic Preservation Officer N/A	12 10
CR7130	STANDARDS: Guidelines	N/A	17
CR7131	STANDARDS: Buildings and Structures	Mineral King Preservation Society Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King N/A	5 6 17 25
CR7132	STANDARDS: Exterior Walls	Mineral King Preservation Society N/A	5 3 4 17
CR7133	STANDARDS: Roofs	Mineral King Preservation Society Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King N/A	5 6 4 14 15 20 21 32 35
CR7134	STANDARDS: Windows	N/A	17
CR7136	STANDARDS: Shutters	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
CR7137	STANDARDS: Chimneys and Stovepipes	Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
CR7138	STANDARDS: Foundations	Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King N/A	6 17 24 25

CR7141	STANDARDS: Decks, Porches and Patios	Mineral King Preservation Society N/A	5 14 15 17
CR7142	STANDARDS: Outbuildings	N/A	17
CR7143	STANDARDS: Treatments for Retaining Walls	Mineral King Preservation Society Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King N/A	5 6 10 19
CR7144	STANDARDS: Rocks, Boulders and Gravel	Mineral King Preservation Society Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King N/A	5 6 17 21 25
CR7145	STANDARDS: Fences and Hedges	Mineral King Preservation Society N/A	5 17 19 21
CR7146	STANDARDS: New Construction	Mineral King Preservation Society N/A	5 14 17
CR7150	STANDARDS: Treatment for Outdoor Accessories and Features	N/A	17
CR7152	STANDARDS: Spas, Gazebos, Outdoor Seating Areas, Picnic Tables, and such	Mineral King Preservation Society State Historic Preservation Officer N/A	5 12 11
CR7154	STANDARDS: Clotheslines	N/A	21
CR7155	STANDARDS: Tarpaulins	N/A	19 25
CR7160	STANDARDS: Pets and Wildlife Attractants	State Historic Preservation Officer N/A	12 16
CR7170	STANDARDS: Food Storage	N/A	4 10 16 21 25

			35
CR7180	STANDARDS: Treatments for Local Cabin Areas	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	19
			25
CR7181	STANDARDS: Planters and Plantings (NPS)	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
CR7182	STANDARDS: Hazard Tree Identification and Removal	Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	10
			25
CR7183	STANDARDS: Hazard Fuels Identification and Removal	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	21
CR7184	STANDARDS: Irrigation Ditches and Other Watering Systems	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	4
			19
CR7185	STANDARDS: Exterior Signs	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	10
			14
			19
			20
			25
CR7186	STANDARDS: Landscape Ornaments	N/A	11
			17
CR7190	STANDARDS: Treatments for Access and Transportation Features	N/A	3
			25
CR7191	STANDARDS: Mineral King Road (within NPS boundaries)	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	9
			32
CR7192	STANDARDS: Access Roads	Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	3
			14

CR7193	STANDARDS: Cabin Driveways and Parking	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	3
			10
			17
			19
		21	
CR7195	STANDARDS: Trails and Pathways	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
CR7196	STANDARDS: Spontaneous Paths	N/A	21
CR7200	STANDARDS: Treatments for Utilities	N/A	14
			15
			17
			22
CR7201	STANDARDS: Septic and Wastewater	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	3
			10
			14
			15
			16
			19
			20
			21
	25		
CR7202	STANDARDS: Water Storage and Delivery	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	10
			14
			17
			19
			21
			25
CR7203	STANDARDS: Trash Disposal and Recycling	N/A	14
			17
			19
			25
CR7204	STANDARDS: Energy Storage	Mineral King Preservation Society	5

		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	3
			10
			15
			17
			19
			21
CR7206	STANDARDS: Exterior Lighting	N/A	10
CR7220	STANDARDS: Acknowledgements	N/A	10
			17
			20
			25
CR7240	STANDARDS: App. A Definitions	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society / Mineral King	6
		N/A	11
			15
			25
CR7260	STANDARDS: App. C Preservation Assessment Form	N/A	17
			25
CR7270	STANDARDS: App. D Approved Paint Color Palette	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	15
CR7320	STANDARDS: App. I Exempt Undertakings	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		N/A	10
			11
			17
			25
CR7330	STANDARDS: App. J Project Submittal Procedure Decision Tree	N/A	17
IC100	ISSUES - Cultural resource issues	N/A	7
			18
			23
IS100	ISSUES Special Park Uses	N/A	2
IV200	ISSUES - Access: MK Road; Do Not Pave	N/A	8