

Public Scoping Summary Report
Mineral King Management Plan and
Environmental Assessment



Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks

October 2010

Introduction

Scoping is the crucial start to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) defines scoping as “an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action” (CEQ §1501.7). Scoping is crucial because it mandates that an agency include all interested parties, “including those who might not be in accord with the action” (CEQ §1501.7 (a)(1)).

Formal public scoping for the 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.

On May 3, 2010, cooperating agency invitation letters were sent to Tulare County-Resource Management Agency, the State of California-Water Resources Control Board, and the Sequoia National Forest per the NEPA P.L. 91-190 U.S.C. 4321, and the CEQ Regulations §1501.5 and 1501.6. 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 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 (*formerly guidelines*) 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.

Consultation and coordination with other primary concerned parties included the Disney Corporation. An onsite field trip with a Disney representative was conducted on August 13, 2010 to discuss issues related to the Mineral King Land Protection Plan (MKLPP).

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:

- 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

- Printed and CD copies of the Draft Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District Standards (Standards)
- 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 being analyzed and will be addressed separately as the standards are developed; however, comments received on the Standards that relate to water resource issues will be addressed in the MKMP and are incorporated into this summary.

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 NEPA 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 is derived from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during internal NPS scoping, past planning documents, and the public comments themselves. 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 being 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

Code	Description	# of Comments
AE20000	Affected Environment: Land Use	4
AE22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use	2
AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities	5
AE4000	Affected Environment: Floodplains	1
AE8000	Affected Environment: Visual Quality	1
IC100	Issues: Cultural Resources	3
IN100	Issues: Natural Resources	2
IN200	Issues: Natural Resources (Marmot Management)	3
IP100	Issues: Park Management	4
IP200	Issues: Prescribed Burns	2
IS100	Issues: Special Park Uses	4
IV100	Issues: Visitor Use or Experience	4
IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)	9
IV102	Issues: Stock Use (Removal of Former Commercial Mineral King Pack Station Structure and Site Restoration)	2
IV200	Issues: Access: MK Road; Do Not Pave	3
IV201	Issues: Access: Stock Use Historic in MK	2
IV300	Issues: Trailhead Campsites	1
IV400	Visitor Use: General Access	5
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	1
ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	2
PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance	5
PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis	2
VN100	Values - Value the Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural quiet, undeveloped areas)	1
VU1001	Visitor Use: Stock Use and SEKI Related Management Plans	2
VU1002	Visitor Use: Stock Use and Related Laws (NHPA and NEPA)	1
VV100	Values - Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)	6
WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws	19
WQ6000	Water Resources: Impairment Analyses	3
		Total: 99

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.

AE20000 Affected Environment: Land Use

Correspondence Id: 28 Comment Id: 144044

Comment Text: Just a few basic amenities for the tourists...just a small restaurant, just a nice discreet place for tourists to stay...any number of possibilities could damage the valley as quickly and irreparably as our beautiful historical monument was destroyed by short sighted proposals for development. There must be NO more development in the valley whatsoever. Bureaucracies and agencies tend always to create development. It is the nature of man to build monuments to our egos. Those of us who have the eyes to see how quickly the last remnants of the wilderness are disappearing know that it simply must stop. Mans soul aches for true wilderness.

Correspondence Id: 23 Comment Id: 144941

Comment Text: "What should be our priorities for willing seller land acquisitions in the future?" Buy, or let someone else buy and rebuild store.

Correspondence Id: 9 Comment Id: 144858

Comment Text: The "Disney parking lot," although not controlled by the park, is in a disgraceful state of disrepair. Its condition does not encourage use of the park. Arrangement should be made for repair as soon as possible.

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144831

Comment Text: It isn't right to spend taxpayers' dollars on any more public land acquisition!

AE22000 Affected Environment: Visitor Use

Correspondence Id: 2 Comment Id: 139009

Comment Text: Any plan for Mineral King needs to continue its history of providing multiple uses and opportunities to the people who visit it while preserving what currently exists there to maintain its unique character.

Correspondence Id: 2 Comment Id: 141522

Comment Text: I recommend that the NPS look into converting some of the day use camps to overnight use camps which could help campsite availability on such busy weekends as 4th of July and Labor Day. I have observed that most of the day use sites are empty. You might also consider more walk in campsites in the upper valley. There used to be campsites in the upper valley which were serviced by the now over

grown dirt road. Some of those which are far enough away from the river to avoid contributing pollution could be converted to walk in campsites. With some minor clean up on the existing dirt road, a small Cushman size truck like the one sometimes used now to collect garbage or drag the road could be used to service the sites.

AE22001 Affected Environment: Existing Visitor Use Facilities

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144833

Comment Text: * Allow stock-users with their trailers and animals to stay overnight in the corrals. Allow horse trailers to park at the corrals. * Repair the bridge! * Allow backpackers to sleep overnight in the picnic areas/upper valley (beyond Crystal Creek) rather than take up space in the campgrounds. * Allow use of the campgrounds as soon as the road opens, whether or not the water is on. * Atwell Mill is a very special campground to camp among the big trees, to experience the size of the stumps, to be among second growth is all a great experience. Atwell Mill area has been logged (impacted) and the second growth trees are very healthy. There is no visible evidence that the area is being affected by camping activities. * The existing picnic areas are not used much and there appears to be no justifiable reasons to add any more. They need to be made more inviting by leveling the tables, cleaning out and leveling the fire pits. Allow backpackers overnight usage of picnic areas on the occasions when ranger station is closed and campgrounds are full. Garbage and pit toilet facilities are in the vicinity of all picnic areas and overnight usage would not create any additional impact on the resources. * Quit giving “out-of-bounds” tickets for sleeping in the parking lots when the campgrounds are full. It is less of an impact than disrupting a campground in the middle of the night, and a parking lot can hardly be more impacted! * Stop using the picnic area across from the ranger station as a parking lot. There are marmots down there too, parking there is not safe. * Most parking areas are already adequately delineated. If more delineation is required, minimal effort and time will be necessary. It can be done in a day with one piece of equipment and one operator.

Correspondence Id: 23 Comment Id: 144943

Comment Text: - What facilities are important to you - Dumpster for permittee; One more campground at end, where one used to be, would be good.

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 144930

Comment Text: I would like to see good maintenance of features that enable public usage: trail maintenance, road maintenance (to reasonable safety standards while respect the rural nature of the road), slight expansion of the parking areas to avoid parking on the roadways that endangers traffic flow, restrooms and picnic tables.

Correspondence Id: 35 Comment Id: 144867

Comment Text: Enhance the human enjoyment of the Mineral King Valley and surrounding back country. Examples would be better maintenance of trails and campgrounds, more campgrounds (as there used to be), and a hot shower for campers in the Cold Spring campground.

Correspondence Id: 9 Comment Id: 144859

Comment Text: Visitor use would also be promoted with better signage (with mileage estimates) at the trailheads and along the front country trails.

AE4000 Affected Environment: Floodplains

Correspondence Id: 18 **Comment Id:** 144843

Comment Text: There has been some discussion about Cold Springs campground being in a floodplain and what that may imply. Historically it has been in this location and there is no justification to move it based on that fact.

AE8000 Affected Environment: Visual Quality

Correspondence Id: 18 **Comment Id:** 144829

Comment Text: The new signs placed around Mineral King last summer are too large, and the paint is already peeling. There are more warnings on them than actual useful information.

IC100 Issues: Cultural Resources (General)

Correspondence Id: 18 **Comment Id:** 144827

Comment Text: All the cultural resources are equally important and enhance the Mineral King experience. Acknowledge and identify the value of the cultural resources: buildings, mining sites, dams, old trails and roads, and current human presence. Utilize the expertise and knowledge of cabin owners, regular visitors, Mineral King Preservation Society, NPS and other knowledgeable entities.

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 144948

Comment Text: The historic district strikes me as somewhat odd since the original town was a full community. What is there today, is a remnant of the housing and quite modified. I do not think that a person visiting our historic district today would understand the historic Mineral King. Alternatives should consider the full range of legal opportunities for managing the historic district including managing the cost of maintaining the structures.

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 144938

Comment Text: - What is your long-term vision for Mineral King and how could this be accomplished?
1. Preserve the cabins with owners as a living history, historians, for the Mineral King Valley.

IN100 Issues: Natural Resources (General)

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 144939

Comment Text: - What natural resources do you consider most important to address in the plan? Water, plants, animals, personal history.

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 144949

Comment Text: Each alternative should protect the biological integrity of the area.

IN200 Issues: Natural Resources (Marmot Management)

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 144033

Comment Text: Marmot damage is a relatively new problem in the Mineral King Valley. When I was growing up, and well into the 1950s and 1960s, there was a substantial coyote population in the Mineral King Valley. I can remember going to sleep hearing the coyotes high in the mountains above me. I believe that it was the coyotes which kept the marmot population under control; and while I have no idea what happened to the coyotes, I believe that reintroducing them to the Mineral King Valley would be both

restoring the historic character of the Valley and addressing the marmot population through natural means. I'd like to see that possibility considered in the final version of the plan.

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 144854

Comment Text: As far as marmots, they are a nuisance, but unless someone can invent the perfect solution, the NPS is handling that well. I just park my car, hope for the best, and accept the possibility of a problem.

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144830

Comment Text: Let the visitors know that the marmots cease to be a problem in mid-summer.

IP100 Issues: Park Management

Correspondence Id: 35 Comment Id: 144868

Comment Text: Enhance the livability of the Mineral King ranger station, such as installing a refrigerator and hot water. Encourage park staff to actually live there, as the summer rangers and their families did from the early days into the late 1970s. The basic principle of management in Mineral King should be: if it isn't broken, don't fix it; and, leave well-enough alone.

Correspondence Id: 7 Comment Id: 144944

Comment Text: I. I recommend that each alternative (except no action) provide appropriate resolution of problems associated with the project area. These include: - marmot damage - bear damage - failing sewage systems/public waste management - water diversion - pipelines running across the landscape - lack of equal public access to all public property; appropriate use of cabins - parking and narrow roads - anthropogenic wildlife losses, especially export of marmots on vehicles and wildlife road kills (especially reptiles in June) - acquisition of private property in Mineral King (Disney) - fulfillment of appropriate recreation opportunities - appropriate management of historic district/management of costs

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 144934

Comment Text: "What issues are important to YOU?" *Protection of the environmental aspects of the area: trees, wildlife, river, native plants. *Maintaining a safe environment for visitors (road conditions, sanitation, communications, and law enforcement). *Maintenance of the historic community and emphasize other historical aspects of the area with educational displays, campfire talks, tours of historical venues, etc. Emphasize participation by members of the historical community in operation of the valley. *Developing a policy that self-regulates the visitor level to not to exceed the level that can be supported by the existing or slightly expanded infrastructure. *A trail system that precludes damage to the ecosystem. (I was recently in the Galapagos Islands National Park in Ecuador where they are extremely rigid, and successful, in enforcement of "staying on the trail", and metering of the number of visitors on the trails to protect the ecosystem). *Minimize the "official" presence of the government with a low profile policy. Encourage self-policing by the members of the historic community. Reduce the number of NPS vehicles on the road (I've noticed an increasing number of NPS vehicles and NPS vehicles with only one person in recent years.). *Establishing a policy and process for interaction with the stakeholders of the valley (NPS, campers, fisherman, hikers, cabin permittees, etc.) wherein rules and management policies are jointly established and joint "ownership" of the policies and procedures can be assured.

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 144933

Comment Text: Relative to the general scope of the management plan, I would suggest it include:

- Guidelines for the government and the public in the control and utilization of the resources of the Mineral King valley
- Firm plans for the immediate 5-10 years
- Forecast evolution of plans for the following decade
- Identification of the stakeholders and how each contributes to the plan
- Rangers and other NPS personnel
- Day use people, sightseers, picnickers, day hikers, and those who use the valley as a staging area for extended duration backcountry hiking, fisherman, cabin owners permittees
- Vehicular traffic, road maintenance, traffic control/enforcement, parking
- Limitation on number of NPS vehicles
- Infrastructure
- Drinking water and Sewage
- Trash removal, including separate recyclables
- Communications, emergency services, and ranger services
- Information and guides to natural things (campfire talks, nature walks, etc)
- Hiking and camping permits
- Education and public outreach
- Law Enforcement
- Wildlife and people interaction management: Bears and Marmots
- Campgrounds: maintenance, management / supervision, expansion of existing campgrounds, and/or opening new (or old) areas
- Pack animals
- Dead or dangerous tree removal
- Historic structures, maintenance standards, modifications/upgrading guidelines and constraints
- Cabin permittees, involvement in NPS programs, cabin visitors
- Continuing stakeholder advisory provisions
- Interaction/interface with adjacent wilderness areas

IP200 Issues: Prescribed Burns

Correspondence Id: 26 Comment Id: 144030

Comment Text: I would like to see the plan focus on specific techniques to be used in controlled burns. Certainly the continuing, long term effect on the forest is a prime consideration; but perhaps equally important is the immediate visual effect on visitors-to be seen for the next twenty five to fifty years. Previous burns have already made certain areas bleak and ugly. The management plan must state that controlled burns be limited to very small areas, be well supervised and easily controlled. Past burns have burned unscheduled areas causing erosion, mudslides, and damage to streams and roads--and some structures. The plan should consider the negative visual impact of the burned areas on visitors-- from the road, as well as in the valley. In my worst nightmares, I cannot imagine what over 1,400 burned acres in the Mosquito area would look like We have not received any information about the perimeters of that proposed burn. I recognize that there is a lot of duff and dead trees between East Mosquito Creek and Fowler Creek, but it looks like a difficult area in which to control fire. Hence the necessity for burning in very small increments using specific techniques.

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144834

Comment Text: There is a corridor of dead trees along the roadway between Silver City and Mineral King that has created a hazard in itself. Mechanical thinning should be practiced around the sequoia trees in addition to the inhabited areas. It is always appreciated when the smoke is kept to a minimum.

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.

Correspondence Id: 7 Comment Id: 144945

Comment Text: Some thoughts to consider during the development of alternatives: Currently we have privately-owned cabins on public land and a historic district in which the cabins are to be preserved. This is public land. All people should have equal access, and special rights should not be granted to a privileged few. At least one alternative should consider the government acquiring ownership of the cabins and renting them to the general public at a rate that will support their maintenance. If this is not a viable option, then some other alternative needs to be developed that gives all people equal access to the area that is occupied by privately-owned cabins on government land.

Correspondence Id: 23 Comment Id: 144942

Comment Text: - How should the change in vacation cabin permittee status be reflected in the Mineral King Management Plan? It should be viewed as a partnership with shared responsibilities.

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144832

Comment Text: Acknowledge the cabins community as vital to the park and enriching to the visitors because of continuity of knowledge, history and experience plus the fact that they regularly help visitors and volunteer their time in the park.

IV100 Issues: Visitor Use or Experience

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144828

Comment Text: Encourage winter use for the hearty visitors. This is a wonderful recreational opportunity unlike anywhere else within Sequoia!

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 144931

Comment Text: Because of the long drive on the narrow road, I think it would be best if the valley be more focused on "longer-than-day-use objectives." This is not to preclude day use, but to minimize the traffic flow to more safe levels. I think day use participants are more likely to drive faster on the road and be less concerned with the bigger objectives of preservation of the valley's ecosystem and historical aspects. Overall, I would like to see the valley maintained such that it continues to serve as a gateway to the high country, provide an opportunity for camping, fishing, hiking and enjoyment of the plants and wildlife that abound. I would preclude any kind of commercial development. I would like to see public services at an appropriate level to the anticipated visitor level that would assure public safety, sanitation (restrooms, availability of drinking water, trash removal), and communications. I would like to see the historic community preserved and maintained and other aspects of the history of the area highlighted (mining, for example).

Correspondence Id: 23 Comment Id: 144940

Comment Text: “What recreational opportunities would you like to see at Mineral King?” Horses to lakes, campfire talks, organized walks.

“What type of interpretive or educational programs do you expect or desire?” History, campfire chats. - How can visitor experience be enhanced? Provide the space, let the visitor experience.

Correspondence Id: 36 Comment Id: 147013

Comment Text: I wasn't aware of the problem the stock people have when they can't camp where their horses and mules are tethered for the night. This idea occurred to me later; let one or two people at least sleep there overnight but have an established campsite occupied at Coldsprings Campground.

IV101 Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)

Correspondence Id: 2 Comment Id: 141519

Comment Text: I support continued maintenance of the trail systems and the reinstatement of a pack station to allow access by horse, mule and donkey to back country. Having a pack station provides options for the old or physically challenged who may not be able to hike to the back country while also providing a historic experience to those who want to feel how many of the early pioneers explored Sequoia and other parts of the Sierra.

Correspondence Id: 23 Comment Id: 144937

Comment Text: “What is your long-term vision for Mineral King and how could this be accomplished?” Accommodate horses, mules, donkeys, llamas, etc. in a campground with pens at the end of the road by the old pack station, so that everyone has access to the high country.

Correspondence Id: 35 Comment Id: 144866

Comment Text: Mineral King and surrounding back country are accessible on foot and also riding stock such as horses, mules, and burros. There is a viable pack station in Mineral King, not just for day rides but for people (like me) who have physical limitations and would like to have access to the back country from the back of a horse or mule. Work to restore a viable pack station in Mineral King. Not everyone can hike to lakes and the back country. From the vantage point of the Americans with Disabilities Act, it's a reasonable accommodation to have horses, mules, and burros available to rent, both for the day and multiple days. Re-supply remote ranger stations and trail crew camps via the pack station, not expensive, noisy helicopters.

Correspondence Id: 9 Comment Id: 144857

Comment Text: Please make every effort to preserve traditional use of the area by providing a pack station to facilitate backcountry use.

Correspondence Id: 27 Comment Id: 144043

Comment Text: Going back to the portion of the workbook where it invites comments about how we use the park and how project objectives might affect our use of the park, we strongly suggest the following:

*Make Mineral King inviting for stock users.

*Make the corrals available for private stock users.

*Reestablish the Mineral King pack station. Develop a prospectus to get the process started to re-open the pack station.

*Provide facilities and parking for stock users.

*Provide camp sites and related stock facilities for stock users.

*Maintain the trails that leave Mineral King valley. At the present time, in various locations, decomposed granite is sliding into drains and making passage difficult in places on various trails.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 144040

Comment Text: As you know, the Mineral King pack station is not presently in operation. Further, it is our belief that a prospectus for a commercial operation of the pack station at Mineral King is overdue. As you also know, the Wolverton pack station is no longer in operation. It is a tragedy that Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, although cognizant of the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the NEPA, have allowed this to happen. We understand that the current General Management Plan suggests that the Mineral King pack station needs to be relocated. It would amount to an even greater breach of the NHPA and the NEPA provisions cited above if SEKI allowed for the permanent closure of the pack station at its current location until a new location can be identified and a new site established. With the present problems related to government finances and environmental litigation, if the present pack station site is eliminated before a new pack station site is identified and established, then SEKI will utterly fail in upholding its obligations under the NHPA and NEPA provisions.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 144032

Comment Text: Most of us who grew up in Mineral King were first introduced to trail stock there, and whether or not we were ever able to ride them into the back country, the sight, sound and smell of horses and mules were among the things which distinguished Mineral King. I'd like my grandchildren to have that same exposure to a part of our history which they can find nowhere else. While there is not now a pack station in Mineral King, I would hope that the NPS would do everything possible to encourage restoration of that service to Mineral King. That "everything possible" would of course include both reasonable business incentives for packers and trail maintenance for the benefit of all visitors to the park; and the plan should provide for that.

Correspondence Id: 26 **Comment Id:** 144029

Comment Text: I would like to address the absence of a functioning pack station. When I was growing up, there were sometimes as many as four pack stations in the valley. Even though that was a different time, there is still a strong interest in horse activities among Mineral King visitors. To test the strength of that interest, a friend and I took a petition through the campground, and in two weekends gathered over three hundred signatures from people who would like to have a pack station--some who had come to Mineral King specifically because they had thought that there still were horses they could rent. Without a pack station, the general plan neglects the needs of the elderly and the small children who want very much to ride a real horse. The lakes and surrounding fishing spots are made completely inaccessible for the handicapped and those who can no longer hike long distances. The management plan should include language that will provide for the reinstatement of a pack station on an original site in the Mineral King valley.

Correspondence ID: 34 **Comment ID:** 144860

Comment Text: I was planning to submit my own comments - but I would rather go on record as being 100% in agreement with the letter sent by Richard Cochran.

IV102 Issues: Stock Use (Removal of Former Commercial Mineral King Pack Station Structure and Site Restoration)

Correspondence Id: 30 **Comment Id:** 144046

Comment Text: It is our understanding that the MKMP will not include any action(s) related to the former Mineral King pack station. In brief, the High Sierra Hikers Association is very concerned that any action(s) to re-open or relocate the pack station, or to otherwise establish or reestablish commercial packing services in or near the Mineral King Valley would create significant, adverse environmental impacts both in Mineral King and in the surrounding fragile wilderness areas.

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

Correspondence Id: 31 **Comment Id:** 144804

Comment Text: The MKMP should consider and adopt an alternative to remove all structures at the former and long-defunct Mineral King pack station, and to restore the site to natural conditions. The former pack station has been closed for many years, and the NPS has long and repeatedly acknowledged that the site is not suitable for pack stock facilities and activities. The decrepit buildings and other structures are an intrusion and an eyesore that mar the scenery and degrade the experience of park visitors. Furthermore, the structures, compacted soils, and other impacts of the former pack station are preventing the ability of the site to return to natural conditions. The MKMP should not consider any action(s) to reopen or relocate the former pack station. There is no need for commercial pack & saddle stock services in Mineral King or surrounding areas. There is not even a demand or desire for such services. There is no good site in Mineral King for a pack station. Reopening or relocating the former pack station would have many significant impacts, including, but not limited to: introduction and spread of invasive weeds, harm to native songbirds due to proliferation of non-native cowbirds, water pollution, degradation of trails, trampling of soils and wildlife habitats, impairment of the experience of hikers (due to dust, manure, and flies), traffic/safety hazards from stock trucks on the narrow access roads, etc. A pack station at Mineral King would not only be extremely harmful, it just isn't necessary. The easy thing to do via your MKMP, would be to raze the ugly, decrepit structures, and restore the former pack station site to natural conditions.

Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association

IV200 Issues: Access (Mineral King 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: 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.

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 144824

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.

IV201 Issues : Access (Stock Use Historic in Mineral King)

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 144037

Comment Text: We care deeply about the past, present and future use of these parks and ensuring the preservation of the cultural and historic use of pack and saddle stock in the parks and in protecting access to these public lands.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 144852

Comment Text: The horse packing and horse rides, if still in operation, is fine as that is part of our heritage and allows people who otherwise could not get into the back country an opportunity to do so.

IV300 Issues: Trailhead Campsites

Correspondence Id: 24 **Comment Id:** 144031

Comment Text: Walk in campsites near the trailheads in East Mineral King are a good idea. I think just south of the Sawtooth parking lot near Harry's bend would be a good location for about 10 or 12. There are bathrooms at the parking lot. Individual campsites could be laid out near the trees and the East Fork River is nearby for water. These campsites should be restricted to backpackers who have a wilderness permit or late arrivals that would obtain one in the morning.

IV400 Visitor Use: General Access

Correspondence Id: 2 **Comment Id:** 141521

Comment Text: I recommend the NPS send any required parking or access stickers with their permit renewals. Some places I have been will send 4 or 5 generic parking forms which are colored differently each year with a blank space on the form to fill out the person's name and cabin number. You could give one of these forms to everyone who uses the cabin and drives into the park.

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 144946

Comment Text: II. Some thoughts to consider during the development of alternatives: Consider closing the park portion of the Mineral King Road to private vehicles and providing all access through a shuttle system. This largely resolves issues with narrow roads, parking, and marmots. Parking might be completely out of the park. Alternatively, consider terminating road at Silver City or Faculty Flat. Resolves bridge and probably marmot issues. Move trailheads and pack station accordingly. This does concern me regarding people that cannot walk. Everyone should see the upper valley.

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 144856

Comment Text: I would like the NPS to allow non-cabin owners access to the Mineral King valley thru all the gates in spring whenever the road is passable. Right now the park has a two-tier, discriminatory system in which cabin owners can drive thru the gates whenever the road is passable, but the general public cannot. This often means that one cannot ski the Mineral King valley in spring on a short trip because there may be a 5-mile hike on dirt roads passable by vehicle because the upper gate is locked. As a backcountry skier, my vehicle and my friends are as ready for snow road difficulties as any cabin owner, and probably better than many. The locked gate is an issue in low snow years. The NPS can require a permit, visitor acknowledgement of the hazards of the drive, and let people use it. After all, backpacking skiers most likely leave the smallest footprint of all the users. This would be an accommodation by the park without any downside for the park. Please note that I know several cabin owners so this is not a personal problem, but I do not think it is right that I have a privilege just because I happen to know a cabin owner, and some other skier who doesn't know someone is denied access.

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 144853

Comment Text: Bikes and snow mobiles should be prohibited, as there are other places to do that and they would detract from the pristine experience and condition. I mountain bike and I know there are other places available.

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 144849

Comment Text: I would like the NPS to open the Mineral King valley up to spring skiing by allowing non-cabin owners to drive thru all of the gates (assuming the road is passable). If cabin owners are able to drive in, then there is no rational reason to exclude skiers by making them walk on a drivable dirt road.

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144835

Comment Text: The Spring Creek bridge needs to be put in as soon as possible! Without it, people are blazing their own trails and trying to cross in dangerous places.

ON1000 Other NEPA Issues: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142918

Comment Text: It would be very desirable to also have a least an outline of the larger management plan for the valley to see how this document 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?

Correspondence ID: 1 Comment ID: 144763

Comment Text: Will the next documents for public review be provided before or after the alternatives are finalized this coming fall 2010?

Organization: California Department of Transportation

PN2000 Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance

Correspondence Id: 22 Comment Id: 143282

Comment Text: We all want to preserve this beautiful area for future generations.

Correspondence Id: 23 Comment Id: 144936

Comment Text: "Does the Purpose and Need statement meet your needs? Should they be modified?" Looks good. Only thought would be to incorporate the new gray water standards as laid out by the State of California.

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 144928

Comment Text: I believe that the general scope of the management objectives is appropriate. In addition, I would add objectives that relate to preservation of the historical mining aspects (as much as those that remain, perhaps only in exhibit or other historical mementos, that preserve the memory of the mining era), and of the historical aspects of the old community in the valley (preservation of buildings and other artifacts). I believe that there is a need to include a process and procedure for closer interaction with the public stakeholders in the area: hikers, campers, fishermen, cabin owners, day-users, etc., in the determination of policy for administration of the area. There needs to be balanced use of the area, with the balance determined by the fragileness of the environment on one hand, and the ability to provide services to the public (safety, sanitation, recreational facilities, etc.) on the other hand.

Correspondence Id: 35 Comment Id: 144865

Comment Text: “Does the purpose and need statement meet your needs? Should it be modified?” I am in agreement with what's written. What's missing is a stronger emphasis on human interaction with Mineral King and surrounding backcountry. What makes Mineral King unique is the human "layer" on top of the natural beauty. Overall, I'd like to see a much stronger commitment from the NPS on enhancing the human experience in the area, both from cabin permittees and other visitors such as campers and hikers. All of the stakeholders in Mineral King (e.g. cabin owners, campers, hikers, fishermen/women, and NPS personnel) build upon each others' strengths to enhance the Mineral King experience. People are partners rather than adversaries.

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 144848

Comment Text: The number one task or purpose of the NPS in management should be to preserve Mineral King's pristine quality. The cabins at the bottom and along the road are fine as long as they are not expanded, continue to look rustic, reminding us of the pioneers, and do not harm the environment. The private inholdings around Silver City should not be allowed to over develop to the park's detriment.

PN3000 Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis

Correspondence Id: 27 Comment Id: 144041

Comment Text: Our organization understands that SEKI is committed to preparing in the future a Wilderness Stewardship Plan ("WSP"). We expect that the WSP will be as many years in the development and implementation as was the present General Management Plan. While it might be appealing to suggest that consideration of stock use and stock use facilities and the Mineral King pack station might be deferred and addressed in the WSP, our opinion is that it should be addressed now as regards Mineral King. We also wish to avoid the temptation, at a later date, to conclude that the matter of stock use and stock use facilities and the Mineral King pack station should have been addressed earlier in the MKMP. Accordingly, we suggest that now in the MKMP is the appropriate time to address issues peculiar and particular to Mineral King and stock use and stock use facilities in Mineral King.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 144929

Comment Text: I believe that the planning objectives listed on page 8 of the Mineral King Planning Participant Workbook, April 2010, are well stated. They cover most of the issues that I believe are critical to sustaining the area for public use and conservation of the environment. I would stress long-term protection of environmental features without invasive engineering features (highways, power lines, cut and fill earth moving, etc.).

VN100 Values: Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural quiet, undeveloped)

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 144846

Comment Text: I value Mineral King because of its spectacular beauty and near pristine condition. It is one of the few places in the Sierra where one can drive into a valley that goes from pine forests to 11,000 foot mountain tops, sub-alpine as you call it. The long, slow drive into the valley is wonderful because one experiences all of the different climate/ecological niches as one goes up the river valley, which would be lost if the road were improved to drive fast.

VU1001 Visitor Use: Stock Use and Park Related Management Plans

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 144038

Comment Text: At the present time, two of the planning documents that govern the use of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks are the Stock Use and Meadow Management Plan ("SUMMP") and the Backcountry Management Plan ("BMP"). In the INTRODUCTION to the SUMMP it states as follows: "The use of pack and saddle stock is still recognized as a traditional, historically and culturally significant, and legitimate activity that will continue in the backcountry of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks." In Section 5.8 entitled Stock Use and Meadow Management of the BMP there is the following direction stated: "Pack and saddle stock use of the backcountry of these parks is a long established historically and culturally significant and traditional use that will be continued with controls that will keep the effects of such use within acceptable limits." The BMP and the SUMMP are two planning documents that must be considered by Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks and must be considered in relation to the MKMP even though a Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) is being developed. It could be many years before the WSP is completed.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 144042

Comment Text: Another of the park-wide planning documents that must be considered in regards the MKMP is the General Management Plan (GMP). In the description and details in the preferred alternative in the GMP, which was the selected action as documented in the Record of Decision (ROD), it is clearly stated in numerous places that the use of stock (horses and mules) is an appropriate activity. There are numerous references to commercial services, including pack stations, that are offered to make available "high quality and safe visitor experiences." The direction specific to Mineral King indicates that the pack station needs to be relocated to improve resource conditions. However, as indicated above, it would be a further compounding of the tragedy which occurred when the Wolverton pack station was closed for the Mineral King pack station also to be closed before a new location is identified and a new station is established. The direction specific to Mineral King also calls for the trail system to be maintained with major backcountry trailheads providing access to all directions. In other words, visitor use, including stock use, needs to be provided for and enhanced. Further, park-wide management direction provides for increased day use, with park facilities accommodating sustainable growth. It states that the preferred alternative is also the most "environmentally preferred alternative". Thus, stock use is seen as a valid use and one which has a definite future in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, including the Mineral King area. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the GMP, as regards "frontcountry prescriptions" as well as "backcountry prescriptions" repeatedly describes stock use as an appropriate use. Accordingly, the Mineral King area, which historically has been a launching point for stock use in the backcountry, should be supported in the MKMP.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

VU1002 Visitor Use: Stock Use and Related Laws (NHPA and NEPA)

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 144039

Comment Text: One of the laws that must guide development of the MKMP is the NHPA. The NHPA states, in pertinent part, as follows: "The historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people." In regards to the mandate of the NHPA, if stock use traditions in SEKI are reduced and diminished, it reflects poorly on the planners and administration for making decisions that will result in a loss of an important heritage. NEPA section 10(b)4 mandates preservation of "important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage?" Pack and saddle stock use is an important historic and cultural aspect of our national heritage. Pack and saddle stock use pre-dates the formation of both

Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. First stock use by Euro-Americans was in the late 1850s. In 1861 horse use and trail building took place in Log Meadow. In 1890 Sequoia National Park was formed, and the Fourth United States Cavalry conducted its first administrative patrol in 1891. In 1902, a contract was awarded for commercial transportation with horses and mules (wagons, pack trains, etc.). Moreover, into the early twentieth century stock was the primary means of access to SEKI.

Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of California

VV100 Values: Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 144825

Comment Text: 3. I appreciate the various tours (flower hikes, Empire Mine, Atwell's Mill, etc.) that the park sponsors. I would hope the Alles cabin could be open every Sunday for tours.

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 144847

Comment Text: My long term vision for Mineral King is that in 100 years our descendants can go into the valley and hike or ski the trails and mountains and see the same wilderness that I saw 30 years ago, and that I see today. Mineral King should be managed for people who want to enjoy the rustic experience and simple outdoor life. There are plenty of other places, including in the main park, where people can access built up trails, the vendors and post cards, and the restaurants and accommodations. Keep the place simple and undeveloped, like it was when it first entered into the park system.

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 144863

Comment Text: I have been visiting Mineral King, almost every summer, since 1950. My family has been visiting much longer than that, since the 1890s, currently five generations. It is one of the most beautiful mountain communities in the world. Its location also offers access to a variety of beautiful lakes and streams, fishing, and other forms of outdoor recreation. The Mineral King Valley (and surrounding area) also offers historic cultural assets. Two examples of assets in Mineral King include historic cabins and relics from the mining days. An example not too far away is the ranger cabin in Redwood Meadow. Over the years, the Mineral King experience has been a successful example of the interaction between people and the wilderness.

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 144927

Comment Text: I first visited Mineral King as a 10-year-old in 1953 on a camping trip with my Dad. I was awestruck with the big trees, the affect of the timberline, Mosquito Lake, fishing for trout, and the rushing Kaweah River. Since my introduction to Mineral King was as a regular member of the public and without attachment to the historic community, I value the opportunity that the federal government (the U.S. Forest Service and the NPS) has made to allow the general public to see and recreate in the grandeur of this special part of the Sierra, and I wish to see this opportunity for all to continue for all time.

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 144935

Comment Text: "Why do you value Mineral King? What makes Mineral King special to you?" It is a beautiful place in the Sierra to visit. Camping in the valley with a number of day hikes make this a great destination. Numerous streams and meadows, trails and peaks make my heart sing.

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 144947

Comment Text: Alternatives should provide capacity to take advantage of Mineral King's unique interpretive opportunities: a) The road provides a vegetative transect going from oak woodland to two

types of chaparral (chamise & mixed), then a succession of upper foothill, montane and subalpine communities. It is a classic example of west-side changes in plant communities related to changes in elevation; b) complex geology (including alpine caves); c) probably the highest willow diversity in the park; d) easily accessed mineral springs; e) mining history

WQ1000 Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws

Note: Many of these comments were made in response to language in the "Draft Standards for the Mineral King Road Cultural Landscape District." Water resource issues will be addressed in the MKMP.

Correspondence Id: 4 Comment Id: 141391

Comment Text: Statements in the Draft Standards seem to suggest that present access to water would be disallowed if the permit is transferred except, perhaps, in the West MK water system.

Correspondence Id: 5 Comment Id: 141441

Comment Text: Suggested revision to Draft Standards: Household water systems in need of major repair or replacement must be upgraded to be in compliance with state and county health and safety codes.

Organization: Mineral King Preservation Society

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.

Organization: Mineral King Preservation Society

Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 142411

Comment Text: Septic systems that function properly, are pumped regularly, and otherwise properly maintained are grandfathered.

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142795

Comment Text: "All sewage systems will be upgraded to be in compliance with current septic standards, at the cabin permittee's expense." The tone seems to have moved away from "guidelines" towards "mandates." This requirement will place an undue financial burden on most cabin owners. We are aware of no current public health issues concerning these historic systems and therefore question this requirement. Newly installed compliant systems would most certainly change the historic character of a property and would change its defining characteristics.

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142796

Comment Text: Draft Standards text reads: "Surface or groundwater may not be extracted outside of NPS permit conditions." Many cabins hold ancient water rights and have grandfathered access to these waters. This guideline needs to specifically acknowledge and allow for this right.

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142909

Comment Text: Draft Standards text reads: "All sewage systems will be upgraded to be in compliance with current septic standards, at the cabin permittee's expense." This seems to not be needed – many fewer cabins now than 1950. There are fewer people in cabins today than 1950.

Correspondence Id: 16 Comment Id: 142910

Comment Text: Toilet usage is only during 3 month period, and many cabins are not used over 20 days/year. Upgrading all sewage systems is an unnecessary expense and of no value for NPS or visitors. This will cause just more truck pollution going up / down the road.

Correspondence Id: 15 Comment Id: 142942

Comment Text: The citation of "current septic standards" needs some kind of reference to County or State regulations. Likewise, a specific reference should be provided for the International Plumbing Code.

Correspondence Id: 3 Comment Id: 142952

Comment Text: Draft Standards text reads: "All sewage systems will be upgraded to be in compliance with current septic standards, at the cabin permittee's expense." Some systems will be grandfathered and will not be found to be out of compliance. You may want to reconsider this language.

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143025

Comment Text: Draft Standards text reads: "Septic and Wastewater guidelines are beyond the scope of this document." Repair or replacement should be under the direction of the Tulare County Building Department.

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143026

Comment Text: Draft Standards text reads: "Water storage and delivery guidelines are beyond the scope of this document." Questions should be directed to the California Water Resources Board.

Correspondence Id: 19 Comment Id: 143027

Comment Text: Water utility systems have nothing to do with historic preservation. These are private residences (not a public hazard). Repairs and replacements should be under the guidelines of Tulare County Building Department.

Correspondence Id: 20 Comment Id: 143038

Comment Text: This (*septic and wastewater guidelines*) should not be part of the Draft Standards, but rather handled as part of the permit agreements, just as water storage and delivery are beyond the scope of the Draft Standards.

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143221

Comment Text: These "wastewater" systems have been adequate for 100 years +. They are only used a few weeks each year. No problem.

Correspondence Id: 21 Comment Id: 143222

Comment Text: Not clear what is meant by "Water Storage and Delivery" language. Assume the current "boxes" for water supply to lines is OK. The few cabins on the line with us are quite happy with the water. We don't want expense of something not needed.

Correspondence ID: 21 Comment ID: 143223

Comment Text: The few cabins on the line with us are quite happy with the water. Don't want expense of something not needed.

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143879

Comment Text: How is any reader expected to know what the "International Plumbing Code" requires?

Correspondence Id: 25 Comment Id: 143883

Comment Text: Suggested revision to Draft Standards: Change to read "If necessary, household ..." and to read "Major repair or ..." Changes remove the implication that all indoor and outdoor water lines must be modified. Minor repairs, which are common and may be urgent, should not require NPS approval, nor would the park wish to be burdened with dozens of requests each year.

WQ6000 Water Resources: Impairment Analyses

Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 142797

Comment Text: Draft Standards text reads: "Household water systems must be upgraded to be in compliance with health and safety codes." We submit a comment similar in scope to our comment concerning Septic System requirements. This places an undue financial burden, there is no evidence of any health or safety problem, and new compliant installations will change the defining characteristics of historic cabins.

Correspondence Id: 22 Comment Id: 143226

Comment Text: Our water use and disposal do not seem to be disturbing the area, and since this is not a growing community the existing rules and regulations should be sufficient.

Correspondence Id: 18 Comment Id: 144826

Comment Text: The most important natural resources to address are scenery, trails, lakes and air quality. No data has been provided on how water or waste water affects the resources and we see no appearance of any adverse effects on the resources. To ensure protection of the resources for future generations, make them (the natural resources) available to the public so they can come to know, love, appreciate and help protect them. Keep the roads, trails, parking lots and campgrounds maintained for this purpose. The East Fork watershed appears to be thriving without any more human regulatory interference.

APPENDIX A – Correspondence Indexes

Table 2. 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 3. 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	Dalgleish, 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 4. Index by Organization Type

Organization	Corr. ID	Code	Description
Mineral King Preservation Society	5	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
Mineral King Preservation Society	6	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
Backcountry Horsemen of California	27	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
		IV201	Issues: Access (Stock Use Historic in Mineral King)
		PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis
		VU1001	Visitor Use: Stock Use and Park Related Management Plans.
		VU1002	Visitor Use: Stock Use and Related Laws (NHPA and NEPA)
	34	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
High Sierra Hikers Association	30	IV102	Issues: Stock Use (Removal of Former Commercial Mineral King Pack Station Structure and Site Restoration)
High Sierra Hikers Association	31	IV102	Issues: Stock Use (Removal of Former Commercial Mineral King Pack Station Structure and Site Restoration)
California Dept. of Transportation	1	ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments

Table 8. Index by Unaffiliated Individuals

Corr. ID	Code	Description
2	AE22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use
	IS100	Issues: Special Park Uses
	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
	IV400	Visitor Use: General Access
3	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
4	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
7	IC100	Issues: Cultural Resources (General)
	IN100	Issues: Natural Resources (General)
	IP100	Issues: Park Management
	IS100	Issues: Special Park Uses
	IV400	Visitor Use: General Access
	VV100	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)
8	IN200	Issues: Natural Resources (Marmot Management)
	IV200	Issues: Access (Mineral King Road; Do Not Pave)
	IV201	Issues: Access (Stock Use Historic in Mineral King)
	IV400	Visitor Use: General Access
	PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance
	VN100	Values: Value the Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural quiet, undeveloped areas)
	VV100	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)
9	AE20000	Affected Environment: Land Use
	AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities
	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
10	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
14	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
	WQ6000	Water Resources: Impairment Analyses
15	AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities
	IP100	Issues: Park Management
	IV100	Issues: Visitor Use or Experience
	ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments
	PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance

	PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis
	VV100	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)
	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
16	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
18	AE20000	Affected Environment: Land Use
	AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities
	AE4000	Affected Environment: Floodplains
	AE8000	Affected Environment: Visual Quality
	IC100	Issues: Cultural Resources (General)
	IN200	Issues: Natural Resources (Marmot Management)
	IP200	Issues: Prescribed Burns
	IS100	Issues: Special Park Uses
	IV100	Issues: Visitor Use or Experience
	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	WQ6000	Water Resources: Impairment Analyses
19	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
20	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
21	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
22	PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance
	WQ6000	Water Resources: Impairment Analyses
23	AE20000	Affected Environment: Land Use
	AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities
	IC100	Issues: Cultural Resources (General)
	IN100	Issues: Natural Resources (General)
	IS100	Issues: Special Park Uses
	IV100	Issues: Visitor use or experience issues
	IV101	Issues: Stock Use: Re-Instate MK Commercial Pack Station
	PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance
	VV100	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)
24	IV200	Issues: Access: MK Road; Do Not Pave
	IV300	Issues: Trailhead Campsites
25	IN200	Issues: Natural Resources: Marmot Management
	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
	WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws
26	IP200	Issues: Prescribed Burns

	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
28	AE20000	Affected Environment: Land Use
32	IV200	Issues: Access (Mineral King Road; Do Not Pave)
	VV100	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)
35	AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities
	IP100	Issues: Park Management
	IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate Mineral King Commercial Pack Station)
	PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance
	VV100	Values: Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)
36	IV100	Issues: Visitor Use or Experience

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
AE20000	Affected Environment: Land Use	N/A	9 18 23 28
AE22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use	N/A	2
AE22001	Existing Visitor Use Facilities	N/A	9 15 18 23 35
AE4000	Affected Environment: Floodplains	N/A	18
AE8000	Affected Environment: Visual Quality	N/A	18
IC100	Issues: Cultural Resources (General)	N/A	7 18 23
IN100	Issues: Natural Resources (General)	N/A	7 23
IN200	Issues: Natural Resources (Marmot Management)	N/A	8 18 25
IP100	Issues: Park Management	N/A	7 15 35
IP200	Issues: Prescribed Burns	N/A	18 26
IS100	Issues: Special Park Uses	N/A	2 7 18 23
IV100	Issues: Visitor Use or Experience	N/A	15 18 36 23

IV101	Issues: Stock Use (Re-Instate MK Commercial Pack Station)	Backcountry Horsemen of California	27 34
		N/A	2 9 23 25 26 35
IV102	Issues: Stock Use (Removal of Former Commercial Mineral King Pack Station Structure and Site Restoration)	High Sierra Hikers Association	30 31
IV200	Issues: Access (Mineral King Road; Do Not Pave)	N/A	8 24 32
IV201	Issues: Access (Stock Use Historic in Mineral King)	Backcountry Horsemen of California	27
		N/A	8
IV300	Issues: Trailhead Campsites	N/A	24
IV400	Visitor Use: General Access	N/A	2 7 8
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	N/A	18
ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	California Dept of Transportation	1
		N/A	15
PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance	N/A	8 15 22 23 35
		Backcountry Horsemen of California	27
		N/A	15
		N/A	8
PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis	Backcountry Horsemen of California	27
		N/A	15
VN100	Values - Value the Natural Resources or Setting (flora, fauna, views, natural quiet, undeveloped areas)	N/A	8
VU1001	Visitor Use: Stock Use and Park Related Management Plans.	Backcountry Horsemen of California	27
VU1002	Visitor Use: Stock Use and Related Laws (NHPA and NEPA)	Backcountry Horsemen of California	27

VV100	Values - Value the Visitor Opportunities (activities, programs, recreation)	N/A	7 8 15 23 32 35
WQ1000	Water Resources: Guiding Policies, Regulations And Laws	Mineral King Preservation Society	5
		Mineral King Preservation Society	6
		N/A	3 4 10 14 15 16 19 20 21 25
WQ6000	Water Resources: Impairment Analyses	N/A	14 18 22