

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 1 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Jan,10,2013 11:49:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I can't believe my eyes. Here you have prepared this extensive and expensive report that forgets that visitors come to Tuolumne Meadows for the meadows and the mountains, not the river. Everything is focused on preserving the river and ignoring why the visitors have come to TM in the first place. No one comes to Tuolumne to focus on the river. The come to enjoy the meadows, wild flowers, the scenery, the climbing and the hiking. The preferred plan eliminates the gas station (Why? It has such a small footprint and isn't anywhere near the river), reduces Glen Aulin (Why, when hiking is the primary activity? That makes it really tough on the Loop trips. It should be no smaller than Volgelsang.), parking along the roads, etc, which just makes activities much more difficult to pursue. (Aging knees can't necessarily add more miles if parking locations are few and far between.) I even noticed on page 8-168, Volume 2, that enjoying the river isn't even on the list of activities that visitors come to TM to enjoy! Were these planners reading their own findings? How did these values get so misplaced? How did 'wild and scenic river' come to drive the decisions about activities at TM? Yes, it's important to protect our rivers, but making National Park land difficult to visit and eliminating facilities that make it possible for visitors to enjoy what they've actually come to see shouldn't be the result. ... Throw out this effort and start all over keeping in mind the reasons that visitors come to the meadows. Tuolumne Meadows (and not Tuolumne River Area) is not called Tuolumne Meadows by accident. My credentials? ... I first visited TM about 1940, did the high camp loop in 1948 as a 12 year old, worked for the Curry Company my three summers in college and managed May Lake in 1996. There's hardly been a summer that I've not visited THE meadows.

Correspondence ID: 2 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Jan,12,2013 08:21:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What ever happen to the Maters Plan Yosemite Vallery National Park. All the time effort people of the world,... wrtings reveits,...meeting State of California,...

" State all employees no longer staying over night incudeing park official (who look after their own well being in the park over the wildlife in my opinion)and the construction housing for park official and empolyee of hotels(over at curry village ICE shating ring),....the meeting in Village Center Park empolyee and park offical superseated the Master Plan (in Our opinion the government and the people shoud never aollow) vote that took away right from people of califoria and the world voices that wat agree in the Master Plan of Yosemite Valley. We should revist the Yosemite Valley Master Plan that insist all park offical out of the valley over night and park employee.and no excuses.Wildness is priority not park empolyee or park officials.Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 3 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Jan,16,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please send me a printed copy of the Tuolumne and Merced River plan/EIS. I dont have ready or convenient access to the internet. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Jan,22,2013 08:00:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having used Glen Aulin, Tuolumne Meadows Lodge and the other High Sierra Camps for many years, I think it is absolutely imperative that these valuable resources continue to be made available for the most number of people possible.

Of the Alternatives shown on the Environmental Impact Statement, I would support Alternative 4 - with reservations.

Without easy access to Glen Aulin, Tuolumne Meadows Lodge and the other High Sierra Camps, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for some people - particularly those incapable of carrying a heavy backpack - to gain the true Yosemite and Tuolumne River wilderness experience.

Arbitrarily limiting the number of people who have access to the facilities is, in my opinion, not the best way to preserve the wilderness.

It would be much better to use a combination of (a) a lottery and (b) a price-based market mechanism to both limit the number of people who use the facilities and pay for whatever additional water and waste facilities are deemed needed to keep the facilities open to as many people as the price allowed. 1. By allocating a portion of the overnight spots available at Glen Aulin and Tuolumne Meadows Lodge to a lottery mechanism at a modest fixed price, you insure that everyone (with even limited means) has access to the facilities. 2. By using a price-based market mechanism (such as an auction) for the other spots, you increase the revenue to the facilities, thus allowing upgrading of the facilities and improvements to the water and waste facilities. Please consider some modification to Alternative 4 to allow an increase in the number of people which Glen Aulin in particular can handle.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID:	5	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Jan,23,2013 10:48:31				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Having used Glen Aulin, Tuolumne Meadows Lodge and the other High Sierra Camps for years, I think it is absolutely imperative that these valuable resources continue to be made available for the most number of people possible. Of the Alternatives shown on the Environmental Impact Statement, I would support Alternative 4.				
<hr/>					
Correspondence ID:	6	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Jan,24,2013 12:53:32				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I know this plan has been years in the making but how is this the best possible plan? How is this allowing our visitors of all ages to enjoy the park in different aspects other than hiking it? Through rafting, biking and horseback riding we are getting more people with families that can come enjoy our park with their family. I grew up in Yosemite valley and it was one of the most amazing experiences yet the things that made it so fun and unique are up for removal? In my eyes that's a travesty. Are there improvemens that can be made? Certainly. But this seems entirely to extreme.				
<hr/>					
Correspondence ID:	7	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Jan,24,2013 15:33:54				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan.				
In general, I support Alternative 4. In particular, I like:					
* Having multiple designated parking areas. I was concerned that the plan to remove roadside parking might result in visitors clumping up on a couple of trails accesible from clustered parking areas, but I see that NPS is proposing a string of parking areas along the Tioga Road.					
* Increasing the frequency and number of stops of the TM shuttle bus service. This approach has worked wonderfully in Yosemite Valley, so I'm sure it will benefit Tuolumne Meadows as well.					
* Restricting commercial use of wilderness areas and giving priority to noncommercial (especially educational) use.					
* Formalizing a trail connection between the campground and the John Muir Trail.					
* Providing more picnic areas.					
I do have the following modifications to suggest to Alternative 4:					
* Public fuel station. These days, most cars can easily make the drive from Tuolumne Meadows to Lee Vining or Crane Flat even if they only have a few gallons left in the tank. And those of us who visit Yosemite frequently would not let ourselves get in that situation in the first place. But I'm concerned about newcomers who might not research YNP and adjoining areas sufficiently before their trip and end up needing gas at Tuolumne Meadows. I realize that the gas station poses challenges regarding the area's water quality and other environmental concerns, but I still urge NPS to consider keeping it.					
* Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. Would reducing the camp from 8 to 5 tent cabins endanger its economic viability? I'm not concerned about DNC's bottom line, but about the longterm availability of this camp to visitors. Hauling all those tents and other supplies up and down every year is a hassle. If DNC (or a future concessioner) can't justify the expense of setting up the camp when revenues drop almost 30% (proposed 20 people/night vs. current 28 people/night), they could decide to delete this camp. (Revenues will actually drop more if backpackers are no longer allowed to get meals at the HSC.) Perhaps they wouldn't ever drop it because it's a vital part of the HSC network, but I wouldn't want to take that chance.					
* A few more quick comments on Glen Aulin: (1) I'd like the "meals-only" option to remain so that backpackers could still get meals at the HSC. It's a nice treat to have real cooked food in the backcountry! (2) If wood is discontinued in the visitor tent cabins, would some other heating alternative be offered? (3) If the flush toilets for visitors at Glen Aulin are replaced by composing toilets, would there still be running water available for washing up? (I know there aren't showers, but just for a washcloth and tooth-brushing.)					

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Thank you for your time.

██████████ Calif.

Correspondence ID: 8 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,25,2013 11:17:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have worked in the High Sierra Camps since 2007 and have a thorough knowledge of the water and sewage systems at these camps, particularly at Glen Aulin, at which I was the assistant manager for the 2012 season. In this position, I was involved in the daily monitoring of the water system, including usage statistics. I love the camps and all of the Yosemite backcountry, and I know that the camps are worth preserving.

The leach field at Glen Aulin is small, and as I understand it can handle less than 600 gallons of waste per day. In fact the watershed forester for the city of San Francisco requested that we put less than 500 gallons of water per day into it. During the peak of the summer season this is very difficult. A major problem that has yet to be addressed there is the toilet system there. The flushing toilets for use by High Sierra Camps guests are extremely wasteful and unnecessary. They are commonly used by backpackers and day hikers not staying at the camp, and it is difficult to prevent this from happening as they are old and difficult to lock and easy to break in to. I believe if these toilets were replaced by a composting system similar to those at Vogalsang and Sunrise High Sierra Camps, the daily water usage would drop to a manageable level, thus eliminating the need to remove three tents from that camp.

Glen Aulin already holds the distinction of being the smallest of the camps, with only 32 beds. Since there is a constant circuitous movement of hikers between the camps, removing beds from an already small camp creates logistical problems to a very high-demand activity - the High Sierra Camp loop.

In conclusion, rather than removing three tents from the camp, which still allows for hoards of noncamp hikers to use the flushing toilets, I would like to see a composting toilet installed. This would save hundreds of gallons per day, thus easing pressure from an aging system.

Correspondence ID: 9 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,26,2013 13:57:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am requesting that Glen Aulin, Historic camp, with 20 beds be kept open to the public. This is a historic camp and should be kept for future generations to enjoy. It is a useful and needed camp for back packers.

Correspondence ID: 10 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,26,2013 19:47:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for drafting such a well considered plan.

I strongly support the adoption of alternative 4. This plan makes improvements important to the future of our park yet still preserves many of the key features that make visiting Yosemite a wonderful experience.

Preserving the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is a prerequisite of my support for any proposed improvement. The High Sierra Camps provide a backcountry experience to those who would not otherwise venture off the pavement. It allows visitors to immerse themselves intimately in Yosemite's backcountry. The High Sierra Camps make possible an experience that is otherwise accessible only to those trained in backcountry camping and possessing the physical conditioning to carry a heavy pack. Alternative 4 reduces the capacity of the camp, but still preserves the facility for generations to enjoy.

Again, thank you for drafting such a well considered plan that has several alternatives that preserve the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp for future generations.

- ██████████ CA

Correspondence ID: 11 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,30,2013 20:15:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The plan should discuss the Hetch-Hetchy Reservoir, which affects planning options both upstream and downstream. I recognize that the park service cannot make unilateral decisions concerning the reservoir area, but it can and should make

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

recommendations as to the ultimate restoration of the valley and, more immediatly, the trials, accomodations, boating, etc. in the reservoir area.

Correspondence ID: 12 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,04,2013 19:44:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having completed and enjoyed the High Sierra camp tour last summer I believe that "Alternative 4: Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experience" is the best compromise between keeping the park in it's natural state and allowing the maximum number of people to enjoy the benefits of walking and hiking within it's boundaries. I understand that the wear and tear of all the people using the park can degrade the park's natural condition, but the unique experience of spending time in the High Sierra background should be maximized to the extent possible. The week I spent hiking those camps was truly an experience of a life time. I intend to enjoy it again some day in the future and so I hope that the camps will remain open so that I can have that privilege again.

Correspondence ID: 13 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,10,2013 11:23:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have two questions: Is the NPS barn an historic structure? If so, will it be razed, moved or left in place.

It is unclear to me about the future of the present ranger station. Is it an historic structure? Will it remain in place and if so, what will it be used for? Or, will it be physically removed and that function (ranger administrative) be moved to the visitor center?

No mention was made of the rescue cache. I assume it will remain in place.

Operationally, where will the ambulance and fire truck (assuming there still is one) be physically located? At the new ranger station or in the NPS housing area. Will this equipment be immediately available for after-hours calls, etc. where ranger staff reside or will rangers have to travel down to the new ranger station to access this equipment?

I was the Tuolumne Sub-district ranger 1981-85.

Correspondence ID: 14 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,24,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Mike & Planning Committee:

I was at one of the original public meetings with Kristina Rylands in the beginning of this process and appreciate how thorough and mindful you are all being. Thank you for putting so much care into such an important plan as this one that is so near and dear to so many people!

Thank you for your time during the webinar! Here are some questions that I have that there was not time to answer:

* If low flow fixtures are installed in showers, faucets and toilets, why don't I see the adjustment of that usage in gallons compared between current usage and the various alternatives on pg 7-106, ref. table 7-15?

* What type of fencing and what height is expected to be used along the trail between Lumbert Dome and the Lodge and the along the trail to Parson's Lodge?

* How are any of these alternatives being funded?

* How is Loop A expected to be realigned and how many sites are expected to be moved from Loop A?

* When are the changes expected to start taking place...summer 2014? How long is it estimated to take to make all changes involved in the various plans? (Curious about road construction delays, campground closures due to upgrades/realigning roads/building/building removal?)

Thank you for your help in clarifying? Will you be able to respond to questions via email over the next month or so as people review the draft?

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 15 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,08,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a Washington resident and a Class 5 paddler who frequently boats in California and enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan.

Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating. Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities. I personally love to boat because of the activity but also the large community that surrounds it. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 16 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,23,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: It has been brought to my attention the purposed closure of Glen Aulin. I'm very upset to hear that this closure is even being considered. This is used by many visitors every year, for their enjoyment. It would be a real disservice to them if it was closed. Please do not close this public facility, that many visitors, look forward to using each year. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 17 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,12,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Ladies and gentlemen: In drafting the Environmental Assessment other historical features in the assessment area must be considered. In compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Preservation and guidelines for Preserving Historic buildings Item 4 is clear in its intent. While this page states "building" further study of the Secretary's standards reveal it applies to all historic structures and elements. In drafting the comprehensive plan the historic rusticated stone bridges in Yosemite valley must be considered in their own right as to their historical and cultural value, not just as some sort of intrusion imposing on other goals and values. http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/preserve/preserve_standards.htm Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Correspondence ID: 18 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,11,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a California resident and a Class IV-V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Personally, I moved from Michigan to California purely for the quality of whitewater kayaking the California provides. Thus far, I have not been let down. It wasn't until my first Cables hiking trip a year and a half after arriving that I first observed the whitewater quality let alone river-level scenery that Yosemite humbly offers. Banning such activities seems, to me, a massive hindrance to visitors looking to experience the beauty of Yosemite in every way possible. Climbing is not banned on premises and such activities routinely alter the rock face in the name of safety. Whitewater sports do no such thing. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	19	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,10,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	I reviewed the 4 alternatives listed and I find both #3 and #4 are satisfactory. However I prefer #4 primarily because the facilities at Tuolumne Lodge are preserved. Many of the area's visitors are elderly and need the facilities that Tuolumne Lodge presents. With alternative #4 I didn't see any mention of shower facilities at the Campground or the use of shower facilities at Tuolumne Lodge by campers. These are now needed because people who stay in the Campground can't use the showers at Tuolumne Lodge at the present time. The showers at the Campground or Tuolumne Lodge could be low-flow and timed, e.g. \$3 for 3 minutes. That way Campground visitors could get a shower for \$3 or \$6. Please contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.				

Correspondence ID:	20	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,08,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Neubacher,				

As an Arizona resident and a Class IV+ paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Kayaking is my preferred method of experiencing the outdoors. My best memories come from paddling trips with friends. It would be amazing to be able to experience Yosemite from my kayak with my closest friends. Paddling helps me de-stress from work and life in general. . Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	21	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,08,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Park Planners: What is the date of the 60 day deadline for comments on the T W&S R CMP and EIS? I calculate it could be as early as Mar 9 post mark. Are you aware that a lot of the folks most interested in this CMP among agency, NGO and private citizens are also bound up in a Don Pedro Reservoir relicensing response deadline at this same time with comment deadline on up to 90 revised Initial Study Plans falling on March 11. Three weeks extension on your end would help.				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

I'm pleased to see white water boating offered in Alternate 2. Did you notice that the number of trips and number of boaters are opposite from page ES-12 compared to Chapter 7 page 7-57? I suggest you let boaters qualified to undertake the two stated reaches help set the safest limit on party size. Perhaps different party size would be best for different runs since there is a trail near one but none for the other, etc. I see no logic in not allowing a run from Poopenaut Valley to Early Intake, since I know that stretch has been run. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 22 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,25,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sirs:

Please do not allow the environmentalists to close off all the recreational facilities for the middle class. People still need the Tuolumne area for recreational purposes and to appreciate the outdoors. I notice from your plans that you are going to eliminate beds from the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. This is a mistake as beds are already at a premium. It is nice also for people to be able to ride horses or mules in the meadows although it does trash the trails for the hikers. The high Sierra camps are a wonderful facility-well run-and are a good alternative to camping outdoors. The river habitat and the meadows must be protected, yes, but we need increased parking areas and camp facilities.

Correspondence ID: 23 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,04,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: In reference to the Tuolumne River Plan Alternative 4 (preferred alternative) I generally agree with the plan. If the capacity of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is to be reduced, platform tents should be removed, in accordance with the new capacity, and the tent sites restored. Compared to flush toilets, composting toilets would require more maintenance.

I would appreciate it if you would please send me a copy of the map showing the trails to be constructed and those to be discontinued in the Tuolumne Meadows area.

Correspondence ID: 24 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan,14,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: letter #1

This is in response to the Tuolumne River Plan DEIS. I will limit my comments to one recommendation I previously made, the relocation of the stable to an area south of the Tioga Road. This was to correct a management mistake made around 1970 that degrades the visual integrity of a wide area in eastern Tuolumne Meadows. When such mistakes are made, it should not be the policy to perpetuate these indefinitely into the future.

About the nearest the present plan comes to correcting this mistake is Alternative 2, that while relocating the stable to south of the Tioga Road, converts the existing site, associated parking lots, and access road, commonly clogged with cars, to a different use. This entire area should be closed to public use.

In Yosemite, when some development is no longer used, the policy is to allow the gradual return to natural conditions. One example is the old Big Oak Flat Road. The preservation of the Tuolumne Meadows would be best served by doing that here.

letter # 2

This is in further reference to the Tuolumne River Plan DEIS. This will explain the historic context of management actions taken in Yosemite in the year 1970.

The year 1970 was pivotal, and an extremely difficult period in understanding what the role of the National Park should be. The old Curry Company had lost control of the franchise, and an adventuresome new company had taken over. New elements of commercialism were appearing. The giving of the present stables site for concessioner use was but one.

My experience in Yosemite started in the year 1950, with many long stays at Tuolumne Meadows and the High Sierra Camps. I can only recall my impressions of the way things were, and how they should be preserved for future generations of visitors.

Correspondence ID: 25 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Jan.15,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Supt. Neubacher:

Thanks for the mailing.

Alternative 4 (preferred) seems to be the superior alternative. Strict safeguarding of the riparian area is most desirable. Thanks for your work these 6 years, all those who worked during the time.

With best wishes,

Correspondence ID: 26 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 13:21:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Ban humans from the Tuolumne River entirely. Then work toward banning humans altogether.

Correspondence ID: 27 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 13:45:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please allow whitewater kayaking within the Park on both the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers. You allow horse packers, hikers and climbers. It makes no sense to not allow expert boaters on the river especially since they have the least impact of all the visitors.

Please choose ecosystem restoration projects that re-establish sensitive species populations like the yellow-legged frog and Yosemite toad.

Please choose alternatives that reduce commercial services within the park.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 28 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 13:52:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to get my voice out on the Tuolumne River Plan for the alternative 2, that allows some limited kayaking as part of the plan. Kayakers are very low impact users of the river and can bring awareness of the beauty of the river through video and print material to many types of media. I am just a river use activist with no other agenda other than promoting access to as much rivers as can be safely done. Please consider my point of view in deciding how to best protect and utilize this river. The two are not mutually exclusive! [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 29 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 15:02:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is not accurate that capitalism - ANY profiteering - and survival of Earth in any form that would sustain us can co-exist. It has never been the case. Our Owners lie all the time. We keep letting them because we are so barely, and illy informed. This is accomplished by careful control of the state, its hand'maiden' the church - any of it, school - presented to us as 'education' of which it is the opposite, and the dribbles from there: home, community - the aborted result of capitalism's attack on it, recreation, media. Capitalism owns our lives, our minds, and most centrally, steals our 'work', making it a behavior outside ourselves instead of part of our living, enjoying life together - all of us. (the meaning of 'all' of us has become the great lie - like full employment - never meant to be us all....)

Correspondence ID: 30 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 16:22:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The first priority should be restoration and protection of all endangered species in the impact zone. Human activity should be restricted or regulated with that concept kept as priority number one. By definition extinct species are irreplaceable. [REDACTED]

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 31 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 16:22:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All of the points being addressed are excellent!

My point of view comes as a concerned flyfisherman. I would prefer these areas of the river remain free of human contact with the water as erosion and pollution would dramatically increase. Also putting a huge stress on this part of the watershed which supports a fragile ecosystem of plants, birds, animals, and of course fish.

Camping sites should remain far enough away as to avoid any potential pollution contamination. And camping should be limited only to within camp sites and properly sectioned off so that no access roads could be used to get around this area. ATVs, motorbikes etc..

For example, take what has happened to the Kern River and the high pollution rates and river degradation over the last few decades.

As human encroachment continues to increase into our wild areas, the pressure exerted on these environments causes them to degrade much quicker than they can recover.

Those that abuse our national parks and resources need to be held accountable.

Providing excellent oversight and enforcement with stiffer penalties should help to ensure our wild areas will still be around for generations to come.

Good work NPS!

Correspondence ID: 32 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 17:16:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor a plan allowing boaters and kayakers inside Yosemite Park, to make it legal for qualified people within the park to boat. I also favor use of the park where more people get to see and use the beautiful natural resources. Open it up and protect by education and enforcement of rules already on the books. Don't lock it down where only a few get to enjoy it.

Commercial facilities should only exist where they are properly zoned and necessary for the people to enjoy the park. Gas may be necessary when other provisions may be better purchased outside in preparation before entering the Park.

Good luck. People need a place to return to nature and experience it. The best use is nourishment of the people, not the profit of a few.

Correspondence ID: 33 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 21:04:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Very simply, access not only to the Tuolumne River but also to Yosemite National Park should be limited perhaps by a lottery system.

Correspondence ID: 34 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,16,2013 21:09:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please vote/enact Alternative #1. Let's keep the riverside as natural as possible.

Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 35 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,17,2013 10:55:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The alternatives should tie restoration goals to specific objectives, like re-establishing Yosemite toad, Sierra yellow-legged frog and other sensitive species that have disappeared from Tuolumne Meadows.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 36 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,17,2013 19:47:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am older and feel that it is difficult to walk from many lots to access areas, i would like to see picnic areas near the meadows not for parking but for 2 hr. limits so families could stop and eat but not impact meadows so much. Kept Glen Alden area as it is, we need to have ways to access the high sierras Open whitewater so that special use that does not harm habitat it encouraged and the monies from that could help maintain water projects. Likewise if there are commercial interests like stores, food and other things the fee should be created to help maintain the parks long term projects;. If you don't have any commercial resources the valley will be even more impacted and the store on 395 will get funds that could be spent to help park.

Correspondence ID: 37 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,17,2013 20:10:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't see a reason to open the river for limited boating. That seems to favor one group over the rest.

The high mountain tent camp is a good destination, and should be kept open.

This world needs to have population control on the table for discussion, but we don't. Thus the problem. And this is far from the only problem caused by over population.

Correspondence ID: 38 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,17,2013 22:04:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect Tuolumne Meadows.

Day Use Parking At Tuolumne Meadows ? Most alternatives reduce roadside parking next to Tuolumne Meadows in favor of providing more centralized parking areas within walking distance to the meadows to reduce congestion and visitor impacts on wetlands and the meadow ecosystem. Commercial Services ? Alt. 1 reduces overall visitor capacity by removing all commercial services from the Tuolumne Meadows area, including the Tuolumne Lodge, gas station, grill, and store. Another alternative reduces the overnight capacity of Tuolumne Lodge while maintaining its capacity in the other alternatives. Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp ? Alt. 4, the Park Service's Preferred Alternative, reduces overnight visitors to the Glen Aulin Camp. Alternative 1 removes the Camp, which is a non-conforming development in the existing Park Wilderness and Tuolumne Wild River segment. The other alternatives maintain the camp at current capacity. Whitewater Boating ? The Park Service currently prohibits all boating on the Tuolumne within Yosemite Park. Some expert kayakers would like to legally run the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne (a class IV-V run requiring several portages). In response to whitewater interests, Alt. 2 allows for limited kayaking permits on the Tuolumne. All other alternatives continue to prohibit day use boating in Tuolumne Meadows in order to protect the meadow ecosystem. Ecosystem Restoration ? All alternatives propose various levels of meadow, vegetation, and ecosystem restoration. However, none of the alternatives tie restoration goals to specific objectives, like re-establishing Yosemite toad, Sierra yellow-legged frog and other sensitive species that have disappeared from Tuolumne Meadows Thanks [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 39 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,19,2013 14:39:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: if any boating/rafting is to be permitted within the grand canyon of the tuolumne river, watercraft inspections/cleansing should be mandatory to mitigate potential for introduction of any invasive species.

Correspondence ID: 40 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,20,2013 11:55:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic

Correspondence ID: 41 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,20,2013 22:01:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Glen Aulin is an invaluable resource for those who want an opportunity to experience the wilderness but don't have the physical capability to backpack into remote regions. Its environmental impact is relatively slight since showers have been eliminated. It is one of two High Sierra Camps that are reasonably accessible from Tuolumne Meadows and should be maintained for future

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

generations to have a chance to visit this extraordinarily beautiful location.

Correspondence ID:	42	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Fax				
Correspondence:	Merced and Tuolumne Rivers				

Please open the Merced & Tuolumne Rivers to private rafters. The boaters I know & the Park Rangers that have given up the, "Prior to launch talk", know that we are environmentalists who will tactfully pass the word on to others such as, "Yes, I know the bottle says environmentally safe, but it doesn't mean you should wash your hair in the river. " Thank you for all that you do

Correspondence ID:	43	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,11,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Fax				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Neubacher				

As an Utah resident and a Class IV-V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Yosemite Valley is a special place for me. I lived in Yosemite Valley the summers of 2005 and 2006 working as a housekeeper in Curry Village and then a hiking guide for the mountain school. I was able to experience first hand the beauty and splendor of Yosemite. I climbed many of the features in the Valley and a few in Tuolumne. Though I am a resident of Utah I have family in Sonoma County and my fiance's grandfather has a house in Yosemite West so I have the opportunity to visit Yosemite often and would love to be able to boat there and experience Yosemite in what I believe is the best way to experience a wilderness area, from the cockpit of a kayak. I have boated in both national parks out my backdoor Canyonlands and Arches (yes there is boating in Arches just not much) and I do not understand the banning of a low impact, physically challenging, non-motorized way to explore on of the best places in the world. Please take this into consideration.

Correspondence ID:	44	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,13,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	As a California resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.				

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Boating is a passion of mine and many others. Ever since I learned to k ayak with my family on the rivers of the Sierras they have held a special meaning to me and I k now many that feel the same. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating. This will ensure these natural resource are truly getting their beneficial use to all the public.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 45 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Feb,15,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Please view attachment letter. Yosemite has beautiful rivers that we should all be able to enjoy.

As a California resident and kayaker and raft guide who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating, both kayaking and rafting, is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Since a young age I have been coming to Yosemite with my family on vacations. I enjoy how California takes such pride in its natural wonders, such as Yosemite, and it would be a dream come true if I could share the views of the valley from the river with both my friends and family. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Correspondence ID: 46 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Feb,15,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: I would like to voice my support for opening boating opportunities on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers within Yosemite National Park. These rivers have outstanding attributes for kayakers of appropriate skill levels. The Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne, for instance, is one of the high Sierra classics that was explored in the 1980s. While only a select few kayakers have the skill to tackle that river, many can enjoy the easy section of the Merced within the park. Kayakers have little impact on the environment - they are similar to hikers, which are permitted access to nearly all of the park. a similar policy should be applied to kayakers. PLEASE ALLOW BOATING ON THE RIVERS IN YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK in the revised management plan.

Correspondence ID: 47 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Feb,16,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Please find my signed attached petition to help grant access the Tuolumne and Merced rivers.

As a California resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

I absolutely love visiting the Yosemite National Forest. Boating on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers would be a cultural enrichment and would enhance my experience of Yosemite National Park. Myself and friends are very low impact when we visit places such as these. We more often than not leave it cleaner than we found it. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 48 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,19,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Friends, We strongly urge the Park Service to retain and even expand both the Merced and Glen Aulin camps. There are very few options for back country exploration and multiple days' lodging in Yosemite or other national parks. Camps such as these allow folks like ourselves to spend multiple days in the back country without having to carry 50 pound packs, etc. We are strongly of the opinion that both of these camps are integral parts of the High Sierra camps program and we are avid supporters.

Thank you for your consideration,

Correspondence ID: 49 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,21,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear NPS,

I have been for many years requesting that you folks open up ALL lakes, rivers and creeks that exist in Yosemite National Park to on water related recreation activities. PLEASE remember that you are in the state of California and all waters in this state are considered navigable If you can get any form of watercraft down said water course. That means that since you first started restricting navigation of Yosemite's waterways and lakes you have been breaking the laws of the state of California. Is it not about time that the public of California as well as the population of the USA and the entire world has the RIGHT to use the lakes and rivers of Yosemite as well see fit? Are you not required to allow the public to use our natural features and resources in non harmful ways? Why is it that I can climb, ski, bike and hike all over your park but I cannot paddle, float or navigate your National Park lakes and rivers as well as their creeks? Is it not about time that you pulled your micro managing, restrictive, repressive, asinine policies out your ass? I should be able to legally paddle the Upper Tuolumne, the Merced, Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and hordes of other YNP water features. Wake up!!! Do the right thing!!! Why should I and others be subjected to federal fines, citations, jail, seizure of my paddling gear and boats because I wish to recreate on water in your park.

Correspondence ID: 50 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,21,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: I think that the park should allow paddling due to the fact that taxpayers pay for the parks and access should not be restricted to one group when others have full access!

Correspondence ID: 51 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,21,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear NPS,

I was shocked that the public doesn't have access to kayak and paddle on all waterways within Yosemite National Park. There is no reason public should be restricted from kayaking on all waterways within the park, just as they are allowed to walk and climb wherever they desire. Kayaking and paddling is the least environmental impact of all modes of transportation within the park. Even Wildlife and fish see kayaks as a natural part of the environment and see us as just another aquatic life. It is a total waste of federal resources to fine, prosecute, and jail the public for enjoying this natural beauty from a non-impacting human powered small watercraft. Please do the right thing and let the public paddle on all of the waterways within the park.

Correspondence ID: 52 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,21,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: I believe that a well-thought out plan could be put in place that allows permitted access to Yosemite waterways on certain days of the month. An example of where a limited schedule like this works is on the Tahoe Rim Trail section that begins at Tahoe Meadows. Biking is allowed on this section on even numbered days. This allows other trail users to enjoy the trails without worrying about bikes and mt. bikers are provided the opportunity to enjoy the trails, as well. For Yosemite, perhaps a schedule of every other weekend and certain days during the week could work.

You can also require a quiet zone - as we see on the American River - so that everyone that is using the wilderness can enjoy its peace and beauty. If there's a way to ban alcohol on the waterways, this would also be a great way to keep the waterways safe

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

and more peaceful.

Please consider a plan that provides limited and permitted access.

Thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 53 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,23,2013 11:21:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the disruption of wilderness solitude by one distinct user group. Every year tens of thousands of unmuffled motorcycles descend on the park and the tioga pass corridor in particular. These unmuffled engines can be distinctly heard up to three miles from the tioga road on either side. If the total distance of the tioga road corridor is multiplied by 3 miles on either side of road the amount of square miles disturbed by this one group of illegal users is huge. These unmuffled engines are illegally modified to be louder than they are when purchased and are not legal either in the state of california or in the park. Yet there is no active enforcement of the vehicles code either at the park gates or on the roads by LEO officers. If the park has any concern with maintaing the "value of solitude" this would be an excellent place to start. All it takes is the effort to enforce existing laws. Any vehicle that does not meet the existing muffler law or excessive vehicle noise regulations should be turned away at the gates. This problem has only gotten worse over the past decades. Now the park has allowed tour groups of up to 75 rental using motorcyclists to enter as a group all riding illegally modified extremely loud motorcycles. If these tour groups are required to conduct business under any sort of use permit it should be recinded until they comply with muffler noise laws. If a train of 75 unmuffled cars entered the park as a group they would certainly be stopped by LEO officers why is this one user group granted defacto immunity from the law? This is an easy fix just enforce exisiting law and would do a great deal to quiet the impact of visitors vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 54 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,26,2013 06:06:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I congratulate the team on the quality of these documents! They are well organized and easy to read. As a customer, I want the opportunity to be able to stay at Tuolumne Meadows Lodge especially as I begin to think about retirement. I do see the benefit of option 4 but I would not have a problem with reducing the number of tent cabins or camping sites at the Lodge location. Under no circumstances would I want the Lodge to be closed. Regarding Glen Aulin, reduction in size is a rationale option. However, if Glen Aulin could be maintained at full capacity by reducing Tuolumne Meadows, I would choose that option. My best to you and thank you for your hard work on this project. Brilliant!

Correspondence ID: 55 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: FOR Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,28,2013 10:37:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Current use parking near cathedral trailheads is unacceptable...unsightly, unsafe, damage to meadows increases every year. Number one duty of NPS should be to protect the meadows and NOT facilitate their misuse.

Disperse parking and decrease use of private vehicles.

Close all High Sierra Camps, save the one in TM. They cost NPS too much in logistics, serve too few, and often pose ongoing waste problems. They are of marginal benefit to the concessionaire.

Correspondence ID: 56 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,28,2013 11:07:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please take into consideration the following points. This river needs protection!

Protecting the river corridor and its ecosystem should be a higher priority than keeping high levels of use. Prioritize restoration efforts. The Park should remove Loop A campsites and the road segment that squeezes into the river corridor and restricts wildlife movement. Either the Tuolumne Lodge facility should be removed or it should be moved or reconstructed further back from the river. The Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp unfairly causes large amounts of wilderness impacts because of so much stock use transporting gear and supplies to benefit a tiny minority of recreational visitors. It should be phased out or converted to a backpackers camp with less impacts. Keeping the same amount of crowding and congestion at Tuolumne Meadows is not adequately protecting the precious area for future generations. The Park should disperse visitor use elsewhere along the Tioga Road to reduce impacts on the Tuolumne Meadows core area.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID:	57	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 11:20:33				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Protecting the river corridor and its ecosystem should be a higher priority than keeping high levels of use. Prioritize restoration efforts. CSERC has carefully studied this proposal. I support everyone of their recommendations in order to preserve Yosemite Valley for future generations.				
Correspondence ID:	58	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 12:08:45				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I strongly support the stands taken by the Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center for the preservation of Yosemite Valley and all it's assets including the Tuolumne River. The impact of human activity must be managed in order to maintain the beauty of this precious natural treasure.				
Correspondence ID:	59	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 12:15:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Protecting the river corridor should be the highest priority. ? Tuolumne Campground ? remove the Loop A campsites, too close to the river ? Tuolumne Lodge facility ? move or remove it , too close to the river ? Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp ? phase it out, stock used to support it causes very high impact to the backcountry for a benefit to only a relatively few visitors				
Correspondence ID:	60	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 12:25:55				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support CSERC's recommendations.				
Correspondence ID:	61	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 13:19:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The Tuolumne River (as have most rivers in the west!) has been abused long enough. The salmon runs are near extinct, water has been diverted to Southern California, a dam was built on it in the middle of a National Park! . . . not to mention the Native American artifacts/history that are now "drowned". It's time to get this right and get a true assesment of the environmetal impacts on this unique river and what we can do to correct the past. Please, don't let this opportunity pass us by. Let's make the best possible plan for the Tuolumne River!!				
Correspondence ID:	62	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 14:30:34				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I live in the Tuolumne River Watershed, and our home in [REDACTED] Water quality is of prime importance to me and for future generations. I recently reviewed the Wild and Scenic River Management Plan for the Tuolumne River. I have some urgent concerns regarding the plan. a. Protection of the river corridor and its ecosystem should be a higher priority than keeping the current high levels of use, and restoration efforts should be prioritized. b. The Park should remove Loop A of the Tuolumne Meadows Campground, along with the road segment that intrudes into the river corridor and restricts wildlife movement. c. The Tuolumne Meadows Lodge facility should be removed, or reconstructed farther back from the Tuolumne River corridor. d. The Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is causing a major negative impact with the use of stock transporting gear and supplies to benefit a very small minority of recreational visitors. This camp should be either phased out or converted to just a backpackers camp to lessen the impacts. e. The sensitive Tuolumne Meadows needs to be protected more from the crowding and congestion for our future generations. The Park should disperse visitor use to other less sensitive areas along the Tioga Road to reduce the negative impacts in the core area of Tuolumne Meadows.				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 63 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,28,2013 14:51:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the Tuolumne River plan, I urge you to emphasize restoration of the river ecosystem to its natural state. It's waaaaay overused currently.

There are just too many people tracking through.

Correspondence ID: 64 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,28,2013 14:58:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Friends,

Please make protection and restoration of ecosystem values your top priority in the Tuolumne River plan. This should come ahead of continuing present levels of use. Visitors to the Park and the Tuolumne River corridor currently have significant negative impacts which not only harm the natural values of the river but mean that future visitors will have a greatly diminished experience.

I have visited the upper Tuolumne and both it's forks many times and I am particularly concerned about Tuolumne Meadows. I am constantly saddened at the damage being done to the river corridor and surrounding land by the large numbers of people and vehicles which are allowed close access to the river.

Examples: -Loop A campsites and the road segment that squeezes into the river corridor and restricts wildlife movement should be entirely removed. -Horse packing should be severely limited or removed from Glen Aulin. Too few horse-using visitors are producing enormous negative impacts. Make Glen Aulin a back-packing camp.

There is simply too much crowding and congestion of visitors at Tuolumne Meadows. Put restoration ahead of keeping the same visitor numbers.

thanks, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 65 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,28,2013 17:15:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Planners,

As a couple who has visited Yosemite many times and plans to visit many more, we are concerned about the fate of the Tuolumne River, one of the important features of the Tuolumne Meadow.

We urge you to protect the River through Wild & Scenic designation. Without the designation, we fear that the Meadow may become even more vulnerable to damage than it already is.

Please consider spreading human traffic through other parts of the park to relieve some of the pressure on the Meadow.

Thank you for your hard work on this project.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 66 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,28,2013 18:28:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live near and love the Park, my main concern is to protect it. Restoration efforts should be a high priority.

The level of visitation at Tuolumne Meadows does the opposite of protecting this precious area for future generations. The Park could disperse visitor use elsewhere along the Tioga Road to reduce the impact on the Tuolumne Meadows area. The Tuolumne

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Lodge located right on the river causes too much destruction of that area and should be moved or removed.

Protecting the river corridor and its ecosystem should be a higher priority than keeping high levels of use up. Thank you for your consideration [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 67 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,01,2013 10:59:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of retaining Glen Aulin as a fully operational High Sierra Camp, whatever that takes. I am in favor of upgrading waste water treatment to service Glen Aulin. I would also be willing to financially support such an endeavor through tax-deductible contribution. (As a retiree living on Social Security I couldn't contribute a lot.) I would also be willing to contribute some of my time to supporting my position.

I also know that the current location of the Camp has it's own natural constraints. If there is a nearby suitable location, I would support relocation.

I have taken the Ranger-led 7 day High Sierra Loop Hike and am trying to get picked to do so again. I would not like to see Glen Aulin removed from the loop, reduced in the number stays or reduced by a no-food option. I want to stay at the Glen Aulin backpacker camp for a number of days while hiking and fishing the area, taking my meals at the camp and using the camp toilet facilities.

I have also hiked the Tuolumne River Canyon from Tuolumne Meadows to White Wolf via Pate Valley. I love this area and want to visit it more. As a side note, I strongly oppose the removal of the Hetch-Hetchy reservoir O'Shaughnessy dam.

I am a strong believer that the National Parks are there specifically for our enjoyment, Yosemite INTERNATIONAL Park in particular. I also believe that a balance between environmental stewardship and recreational opportunity can and must be maintained, even at Glen Aulin.

I understand that the Tuolumne River Plan involves much more than just Glen Aulin. However for now, my comments only address that facet.

Respectfully submitted, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 68 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,01,2013 17:42:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am commenting on the Tuolumne River Plan Draft EIS.

I am particularly interested in the proposals for restoration or development in the Tuolumne Meadows and Glen Aulin Area.

My family and I have visited the Tuolumne Meadows and surrounding backcountry on nearly an annual basis since 1974. We generally use this area as a trailhead for overnight backpacking trips into the surrounding Wilderness. We also enjoy day hiking in the meadows, to the top of Lambert or Pothole Dome, etc. We occasionally camp in the Tuolumne Meadows car campground, although I find it beaten down and dusty. And I generally buy an ice cream cone at the store!

I applaud the proposals for restoration activities in the Meadows. In particular, I strongly support plans to remove informal parking areas and the existing Cathedral Lakes trailhead. Parking in these areas creates visual sprawl that seriously detracts from the wilderness setting, not to mention effects on the meadow ecology.

I also approve your proposals to reduce pack stock use in the Meadows area. I did not have time to read the entire EIS, but the summaries I saw did not mention pack stock use in the Dana Fork watershed, particularly in the Parker Creek area from Dana Meadows up to Parker Pass. This is a popular area for day hiking and for starting backpacking trips that exit the Park into the surrounding Ansel Adams Wilderness. This watershed is closed to overnight camping by backpackers to protect water quality, since it is the water source for the Tuolumne Meadows area. Yet, on my last hiking trip there in 2007, I saw horse manure scattered along the trail within a few feet of the creek! You know that this manure gets washed into the creek and creates pollution. Animals defecate and urinate indiscriminately on the trail and stream crossings. How can you justify continued stock use in this Dana Fork watershed while prohibiting human overnight use? It is completely hypocritical and leads to undesirable pollution. ALL pack stock use, whether concessionaire or private, should be prohibited in the entire Dana Fork watershed above the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge!

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

In general, I support a combination of Alternative 1 (emphasizing self-reliant experience) and Alternative 4 (preferred alternative). I agree that NPS should try to accommodate a wide range of low-impact recreational activities in the Tuolumne Meadows area, including day use and short-term visitors, which seems to be the focus of the preferred alternative. Yet, there are some specific features of Alternative 1 that I think are especially appealing and should be incorporated into the final plan. I list them here with my rationale for supporting them.

1) Removal of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. I STRONGLY support removal of ALL the "High Sierra Camps" and the restoration of these areas to full Wilderness status. These camps are a complete anachronism and continuing source of wilderness degradation. They made sense when they were constructed early in the 20th century, because backcountry travel and camping was difficult then for ordinary people. But the technological revolution in lightweight backpacking equipment that began in the 1960s, plus the increasing knowledge about the fragility of our high country wilderness, makes these High Sierra camps both unnecessary and detrimental! Anyone today who can hike into the camp could easily backpack a few miles into the wilderness and carry his own equipment for an overnight stay. We don't need the intrusion of permanent facilities in the middle of the wilderness, which also tends to concentrate use and impacts, plus the enormous impacts from the constant pack stock trips needed to supply and maintain these camps. I have taken my family backpacking to the Glen Aulin area when my children were as young as 4 years old. There is really no excuse for continuing this non-conforming use in the Wilderness. Eliminating the HS camps would then allow a drastic reduction in need for stables in the meadows with additional environmental benefits.

2) Removal of the wastewater ponds and sprayfield and restoring that area to natural conditions. These ponds are an enormous eyesore from any surrounding high point (such as one of the domes). I imagine they are also a potential source of serious river contamination since they are so close to the river. I can understand that removal of these ponds and relocation of wastewater treatment and disposal to the forested area on the south side of the road is easiest in Alternative 1, because that alternative removes much of the source of the wastewater - the Tuolumne Lodge and much concessionaire/employee housing. But removing these ponds and restoring the meadow fringe where they are located is a worthwhile goal for all alternatives. Please try to accomplish that even if you retain the Tuolumne Lodge.

3) Removal of campground loop "A". This "loop" is a long stretch of campsites along the Tuolumne River itself. Removing this loop would reduce ecological impacts and improve the scenery directly near the river. It would also create additional opportunities for short hikes by converting the "loop" into a trail. This would give short-term visitors more opportunity to experience the wilderness.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Correspondence ID:	69	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,02,2013 11:32:45				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The change to composting toilets is a good one. However, making the high camps reduced in bed count and food services is not.				

I lived and worked in the park for years - for both the park service and the high camps.

The high camps are a vital part of the park in that they let people who normally could or would not experience the joys of the back country do so. These people, from all walks of life, take that experience with them for the rest of their lives and become spokespeople for the park and its wonders. To curtail or reduce that opportunity for people would be wrong and a shame. I have run into many of these people outside the park who to this day praise the value, the history, and the unique wonderful experience that the high camps provide.

I have roughed it and done without amenities for days and weeks at a time, but that does not mean that everyone who want to visit the backcountry needs to be an elite outdoorsman - in fact that would be wrong and in the long run detrimental to conservation overall. If you make access to things so difficult that no one can experience them to fall in love with them, people will stop caring, stop supporting, and would certainly stop fighting for something they never had a chance to experience.

Sincerely [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	70	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,26,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	NPS ?				

Some input regarding the proposed river restoration(s) in Yosemite:

I am a [REDACTED] resident, previously from the San Joaquin Valley, & longtime lover of the park. After many years of sharing

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

trails with pack animals & their associated "output", I would welcome any reduction in the volume of c**p hikers have to wade through. My personal opinion, & it's just that, is that the only folks that should be allowed to ride into our back country are those that cannot physically walk (disabled, elderly, young). Everyone should be able to experience the wonder. But if you're able, & just not willing to put one foot in front of the other?

I'm admittedly not up to speed on the entire scope of the proposed Tuolumne & Merced river projects. However, the idea that these areas may end up a bit more pristine seems like a move in the right direction.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	71	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,27,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Oh please do everything you can to decrease the public amusement park like experience among the magnificent sequoias in California. I have not gone to Yosemite in decades because I feel badly about being there, being another exhaust producing driver and trail tramping walker among the far too many who are enticed to party all seasons in the woods. When did we decide to "use" these places without regard to the impact, as if they were convention halls that should accommodate constant amusement.				

[REDACTED] CA

Correspondence ID:	72	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	February, 27th, 2013 Dear Superintendent Neubacher,				

As a California resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Each individual's reason for kayaking changes through the years. What begins as new, meanders self-discovery, and turns out benevolent becomes realized as the antidote to a troubled age. It's in settings full of Love and Beauty like Yosemite capable of change to the course of genetic predisposition, giving people reason why to work, a reason to raise a family, and share real moving experiences (not just links to Facebook) down the rich American timeline to the succeeding generations.

Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	73	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,23,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern,				

I am writing in response to the planning of Yosemite's High Sierra Camps. I believe these camps are an important part of the Yosemite experience in that they offer an easier method of camping out and enjoying the beauty of the back country. Having these camps in place allows for people who might not otherwise be able to, to get out and experience multiple days in the high sierras and build an appreciation for the great outdoors. The more people who gain an appreciation for the beauty of Yosemite,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

and all natural beauty, will be the one's who try to preserve these places in the future, and pass on these ideals to future generations. Please keep these camps intact!

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 74 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,25,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam am providing comments on the recently released plans for the Merced River and Tuolomne River. I want to express my strong support for the continuation of the High Sierra Camps. They are unique and wonderful and I have enjoyed trips to the Yosemite back country that I would never have done if those camps were not there.

I fully support keeping them the size they are, especially Glen Aulin. I do not support the preferred alternative which would reduce the size of Glen Aulin from 32 beds to 20. That is a big mistake.

Please, please do not shrink the size of these camps. They provide a wonderful wilderness experience to people who would otherwise not have the opportunity to have that experience.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 75 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,26,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Planning Committee

Please do not reduce the number of beds for overnigheters at Glen Aulin; or the availability of meals for backpackers after a long day on the trail. This lovely place serves many visitors to the High Sierra region and should remain accessible to all: visitors who can't hike up to Sunrise or Volgosang but want to overnight, those planning to hike the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne, and those doing the complete High Sierra Loop. I have enjoyed my stay there on all of these types of trips and oppose making it more exclusive to access than it already is.

[REDACTED] CA

Correspondence ID: 76 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,22,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Sirs, I understand that you are revising the Wild & Scenic Management Plans for the Tuolumne and Merced rivers in Yosemite National Park. I feel strongly that these revised plans should recognize kavaking and rafting as viable low-impact recreation activities allowed within the park boundaries. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 77 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,23,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: 2-23-2013

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a frequent visitor to Yosemite and the surrounding Sierra area, I am elated to have the opportunity to voice my opinion on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers.

I am writing to express support for opening ALL segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating. Whitewater kayaking, canoeing and rafting is a great way for visitors to experience the immense natural beauties the park has to offer, and is form of recreation in the park that is consistent with the mission statement of the United States National Park

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Service. "The mission of the U.S. National Park Service is to conserve the scenery, the natural and historic objects, and the wildlife in United States' national parks, and to provide for the public's enjoyment of these features in a manner that will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Let's not forget the last part of that statement, "provide for the public's enjoyment of these features in a manner that will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Whitewater boating meets that statement word for word: it is low impact, provides for public enjoyment, and leaves the wild intact. Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River, and the alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. The thought of continuing this ban is unconscionable to me.

I believe the original advocate for the creation of this park said it best, "In every walk with nature, one receives far more than he seeks." ? John Muir By continuing this ban, you are not only denying the public the opportunity to boat these rivers, but you are also denying the public an opportunity to experience nature in a raw and natural way, resulting in a further disconnect between modern society and the natural world.

I thank you for your time and hope you consider the importance of whitewater boating in America's National Parks.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	78	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,23,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To: Superintendent ?Yosemite National Park				

From: [REDACTED]

I am writing to comment about Yosemite's planning for the High Sierra Camps, specifically regarding the Merced River Plan and the Tuolumne River Plan. First, I understand that both plans may include preferred alternatives to build composting toilets to reduce water use and sewage at both Merced Lake and Glen Aulin which is a positive conservation approach. However, I urge you to not reduce the number of guest accommodations at Merced Lake from 60 to 42 beds. More importantly, please do not reduce Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp guest accommodations from 32 to 20 beds which would greatly impact the ability for people to travel from camp to camp because Glen Aulin will no longer be the same size as the other camps.

I have great memories of my Loop hiking/camping experience as well a shorter day hikes in the High Sierras. I think that the access to the majesty and splendor of the High Sierras must be preserved for my children and grandchildren. Yosemite National Park is a great treasure which should continue to be accessed by future generations on the basis that I have come to enjoy and appreciate greatly.

Thank you for the wonderful work that you do in maintaining and preserving the High Sierra Camps.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	79	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,03,2013 17:16:29				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I generally approve of option 4 and I applaud the long hours of hard work that the NPS obviously put into the document and the larger project. My concerns are as follows:				

1- One of my favorite activities in Tuolumne Meadows is to go for a walk in the meadows in the evening. While I fully appreciate that the landscape has been degraded, I think it is important to maintain, in appropriate places, areas where people are free to wander off trail through the grasses. The NPS need not encourage this behavior, only not prohibit it in all meadow locations.

2- I was disappointed to see no discussion of restoring amphibian populations along the Tuolumne River; there were no fish in the Tuolumne Meadows area until 100-150 years ago. While this would be an ambition, and perhaps impossible, undertaking, I'd like to see more done to support the restoration of native amphibians to Tuolumne Meadows. Perhaps all size and catch limits could be eliminated on fish, and catch-and-release discouraged, in order to apply pressure to fish populations, with the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

hope that this reduces stress on amphibians, who are already struggling due to a varied of reasons.

3- I'd encourage a lot of careful thought be applied to where the new trails are established. I heard that Frank Lloyd Wright wouldn't put any sidewalks in until a building had been up for a year, in order to see where people actually walked and to put the sidewalks there. This story might not be true, but all too often I've seen 90 degree angles when clearly people would prefer to cut the corner. In working with natural (human) tendencies we'll (for it's my park as well...) have the most success in limiting impact to the Meadows.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	80	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,03,2013 18:22:31				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	March 3, 2013				

Superintendent, Yosemite National Park Attn: Draft Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite National Park, CA 95389

While all alternatives have aspects that are positive, negative and a mixture of such, I support the preferred Alternative 4. However, there are several points that I would like to comment on.

The availability of parking is an issue in many areas of Yosemite Park and there has been a trend to removed undesignated parking without adding equal numbers of replacement parking near those areas. This trend started in Yosemite Valley and now is going to extend to the Tenaya Lake area and might extend to the Tuolumne Meadows area. I heartedly feel that the removal of road side parking and an insufficient shuttle system has added to the adverse traffic conditions in Yosemite Valley and are concerned that this issue will spread to the Tuolumne Meadows area.

Undesignated parking in the Tuolumne Meadows area should not removed until replacement parking is available and shuttle system improved. The current shuttle system is sometimes unreliable and I have heard of hikers being stranded because the shuttle did not come at the designated time or did not come at all. To get people to park in designated areas and get out of their cars to enjoy the area, the shuttle system needs to be more reliable, have more shuttle stops, and also come more frequently. The possibility of more shuttles from Yosemite Valley and the addition of shuttles from the Lee Vining area should be considered.

Replacement of undesignated parking along Tuolumne Meadows with a small amount of short-term parking comes with it own issues. How are these parking areas going to be monitored to prevent people from parking there longer than the posted time limit? How is this going to affect the spontaneity aspect of driving and stopping when something attracts your attention? Will people see animals and want to stop and take pictures and block the road because there is no place to pull off?

There has been discussion of using curbs to prevent people from parking in undesignated parking and to limit people's ability to enter the meadow. I feel that the curbs that were added in Yosemite Valley make the roads look too city like. To achieve a look that is more rustic, instead of the typical concrete curbing, the possibility of using stacked rocks or pressed concrete that looks like rock should be considered. The use of rustic fencing, like in Grand Teton NP, could be used for the prevention of cars and people entering restricted areas.

Existing parking lots such as the ones at Dog Lake and the Wilderness Center should be landscaped with appropriate vegetation to reduce visual impact. Any new parking should also be screened as much as possible.

For multiple reasons I am against building a new Visitor Contact Station and feel that the current Visitor Center should be retained for that use. If additional facilities for NPS operations are needed, they could be constructed at the ranger camp or in another already developed area. Not using the existing Visitor Center would decrease the ability for people to experience this historic district and be exposed to examples of Park Rustic Style architecture. For myself, being a fan of the Park Rustic Style of architecture, going to that Visitor Center is part of the Tuolumne Meadows experience. I would also have liked more information of the appearance and function of the new Visitor Contact Station.

I feel that the issue with the Cathedral Lakes Trailhead has not been sufficiently addressed and I do not have a clear idea of where it is to be. Where will the trailhead be if the current VC is used or if a new Visitor Contact Station is built? If the current Visitor Center is retained the current parking lot is probably not large enough for both the Visitor Center and if a new trailhead to Cathedral lakes is established in this area. If a new Visitor Contact Station is built, then where would the Cathedral Lakes Trailhead be so that hikers do not have to walk through a developed area to reach the trailhead?

The proposal to ensure solitude starting a few hundred feet from the road and the fact that there is crowding near the roads, makes me concerned about the possibility of a day hiking permit being instituted. This would limit the ability of people to take spontaneous, short hikes away from the road. On page 7-85 it is stated, "day visitors would be encouraged to get out of their cars

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

and take walks or short walks to sites of natural and cultural interest?" If a day use permit system is implemented this could become essentially impossible.

I would like to thank the Planning Department for all of their work in preparing this document, Webinars and public meetings. I especially appreciate the Webinars since I am not often able to attend a public meeting and it is a great way to get clarification on aspects of the plans.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	81	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,04,2013 11:38:10				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	SIERRA CLUB COMMENTS ON TUOLUMNE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND EIS				

The Sierra Club supports the preferred Alternative 4, Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experience, on condition of action on our suggested changes and improvements as set forth below. The Sierra Club supports the Actions Common to all Alternatives which make needed changes to protect the River and the meadows. We support the elimination of undesignated roadside parking in the Tuolumne Meadows area, the improvements to the water systems, the removal of unnecessary structures, and site restoration. However, the undesignated parking should not be removed until the replacement parking is available and/or vigorous additions are made to public transportation shuttle systems to allow and encourage visitors to enjoy Tuolumne Meadows without their cars. The Sierra Club supports the retention of the existing campground and Tuolumne Lodge. However, at Tuolumne Lodge, we suggest that the mess hall and kitchen be moved away from the River. The Sierra Club supports maintaining, not increasing, the current visitor use levels. The Sierra Club has no position on the proposed new visitor contact station. The Sierra Club supports the removal of the unneeded fueling station and mountaineering store and combining the stables. We also support the elimination of day use riding trips. The Sierra Club strongly recommends all available technologies be employed to eliminate the two wastewater ponds (industrial grade lined tanks and spray fields) north of the meadow with a new state of the art wastewater facility at the existing site #7. Replacing long outdated water gulping toilets in use throughout the area, with new ultra low flow toilet technology would significantly reduce wastewater effluent volume and may be an appropriate solution to this difficult problem of excessive waste-water flows. The Sierra Club supports the construction and expansion of parking lots to replace the loss of roadside parking although some of the loss of roadside parking should be mitigated through substantial and well publicized increase in public transit visitor access to Tuolumne as described below. The lots should be kept out of the open meadow areas and shielded from view by foliage. The Sierra Club opposes any overall increase in day use parking. The Sierra Club proposes landscaping existing "open" unsecluded parking lots at the wilderness center #15, Dog Lake #17, and Tuolumne Meadows Lodge #18 with Lodgepole pine or other appropriate vegetation to reduce the visual impact of vehicles at these three exposed parking sites. The Sierra Club supports the increases in transit and suggests more transit increase. We suggest that the Park Service consider a joint plan with the Forest Service to construct a parking lot outside the Park near Lee Vining with shuttles into the Park, which would also serve the Lee Vining Canyon campgrounds. At Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp, the Sierra Club supports the reduction in overnight capacity and other improvements to reduce the environmental impact of the facility. The Sierra Club suggests implementation of a plan to reduce excessive vehicle noise, including motorcycle noise. No day use wilderness permit system should be imposed without full public and environmental review.

Correspondence ID:	82	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,06,2013 09:49:17				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Tuolumne Meadows, and the river corridor, is unique mainly because of its wilderness character. That is what should be preserved and the management plan should emphasize protecting the wilderness attributes of the Tuolumne for the future. Specifics that should be included to this aim of protecting the wildness of the Tuolumne are: phase out the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp; it doesn't belong in a wilderness setting - it detracts from the basic premise of preserving the wilderness character. Similarly the Tuolumne Lodge should be removed. If wilderness preservation is the goal then structures should go, even if they are popular etc. Why try and make for more amenities even though popular if they are contrary to the stated goal. Sincerely, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	83	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:34:56				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear NPS,				

Please do not reduce the number of beds at the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. Even 32 people per night is a tiny number. Many

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

people could not possibly enjoy this beautiful area any other way. Please do not exclude so many of us.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	84	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	[REDACTED]	Unaffiliated Individual			
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:40:08				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I object to the reduction of beds at Glen Aulin camp. Those High Sierra camps are already very difficult to get into, and they are not harming anything the way they are. (I am not making my comment as a spokesperson for the CMC, but merely as a member of the public that has used the HSC twice before and hope to go again)				

Correspondence ID:	85	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:40:21				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	From what is available on the web I have found it very difficult to see exactly what you are going to do. You should make that more clear. If, by chance, your plan makes any changes to the river and use of it, such as rafting, swimming, floating - then I am entirely against it. Please do not impinge on the simple uses of the water - they are what the average people enjoy - don't take that away. Thanks				

Correspondence ID:	86	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:43:26				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Sounds like a very smart choice. Well planned.				

Correspondence ID:	87	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Concerned citizen and frequent NP visitor Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:44:12				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I have reviewed the NPS recommendations outlined in "Alternative 4" : -Retain 304 campsites plus 7 group sites equaling 2,034 beds / night at Tuolumne Meadows Campground -Retain 69 units equaling 276 beds / night at Tuolumne Meadows Lodge - Reduce overnight capacity from 32 to 20 people at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp -Discontinue stable (horse/mule) day rides at Tuolumne Meadows -Retain 350 / night Backpackers Wilderness above Hetch Hetchy -Retain 50 / night Backpackers Wilderness below O'Shaughnessy Dam -Increase day use from 1,774 to 1,839 people at one time -Restore 171 acres of meadow & riparian habitat and 2 acres of upland habitat, with 27 acres of disturbance for new construction for relocation of facilities - Combine NPS and concessioner stables				

These considerations all seem reasonable to me. I have visited this pristine area several times and believe that the "boots on the ground" know it best. I am in favor of Alternative #4.

Correspondence ID:	88	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:44:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Yosemite National Park is one of the prettiest National Parks and we should strive to allow people to visit the park as much as possible without disrupting the natural beauty. I trust the park rangers and those who work in the NPS, so my vote is for plan #4 though I hate to see the hikers limited in the High Sierra Glen Aulin Camp.				

Correspondence ID:	89	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	tax payer; camper; backpacker Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 11:48:17				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I do not support the reduction of Glen Aulin camper from 32 to 20. The existing facilities currently accommodate 32 campers. Removing 12 campers does not measurably increase biodiversity or scenic vistas. Alternative #4 allows for more day use overall. Surely, an increase in day users will have a significantly greater impact on the environment than 12 campers in an established camp site. Leave the improvements at Glen Aulin as is and maintain the current maximum 32 campers at the High Sierra Camp.				

Sincerely,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 90 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 11:57:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative #4. It retains the current level of camping possibilities in the Tuolumne Meadows area. Such visitor accessibility is necessary to allow the public to appreciate the value of the area, and is a long-standing tradition. We raised our children with great familiarity with Tuolumne, and they remain committed lovers of nature. Please select Alternative #4.

Correspondence ID: 91 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 11:57:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor removing horse/mule rides in Tuolumne Meadows, except maybe for the handicapped who may have no other way to share the same experience as able-bodied people. I oppose decreasing the # of tent cabins @ Tuolumne Meadows and Glen Aulin, as I have enjoyed Tuolumne Meadows Lodge for many years and do want to experience Glen Aulin one of these yhears and can no longer backpack.

Correspondence ID: 92 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 11:58:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You have done a very poor job of presenting to the public exactly what you intend to do. It seems to be hidden in volumes of data which one must first download and the sort through. Be more transparent! Do not eliminate roadside parking! Continue unrestricted access to meadows and rivers. That is the charm - do not overregulate. Let people swim in the river with easy access. Let them use rafts and tubes. Do not block everything off. Your report is totally one sided - supporting your goals without considering alternatives, and makes your intended changes almost impossible to learn about. I had to read a newspaper article to learn about some of the poorly considered changes you had in mind.

Correspondence ID: 93 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 12:03:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support reducing the current limits on use as detailed in the Tuolumne River Plan. In fact, I support No Action or, in fact, I have been going to Yosemite High Country for about 3 decades and have noticed no significant decline in the quality of the trails, the lodgings, etc. In fact, the park seems to be in better shape.

So, the environmentalists that want further restrictions are wrong. They make the park too elitist to only the young, the rich, and the highly athletic. The current system is a good balance and should be left as is.

So, I recommend the No Action option.

Correspondence ID: 94 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 12:07:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to make a plea for you to discontinue all services using stock animals. These animals inflict severe damage on trails. They leave large amounts of offensive waste on the trails which attract flies and other pests.

Some people have made the argument that stock animals permit access to the disabled. However, virtually all of the people riding these animals are not disabled. There are already a large number of wheelchair accessible paths in the park for disabled people to use.

I have backpacked extensively in the park and I am tired of wading through manure and flies on trails which have been badly eroded by stock animals. Stock animals are not a "natural" part of the ecosystem. They are a relatively recent introduction by cowboys "conquering" the wilderness. They have no place in the park which suffers severely from their incursion.

Correspondence ID: 95 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 12:10:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cutting one third of the overnight spaces at Glen Aulin camp has no impact on Tuolumne Meadows. What impact does 12 people a day make, when you continue to allow over 2000 people a day to Camp in the Meadows using over 300 vehicles and over 300 campfires. Cutting the back country experience by a third, for people who do not have the equipment or stamina to pack it in

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

does not compute.

Correspondence ID:	96	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:16:35				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I am in favor of Alternative 2 -- Self Reliance, with the following suggested modifications: 1. Decrease the number of overnight and day use guests even more. 2. Keep Glen Aulin High Sierra camp open but reduce the number of occupants to the Alternative 4 level. 3. Allow packers to provide all-service options and spot packing services but not day rides. 4. Seriously restrict parking in the Park and increase parking outside park with adequate busing from exterior parking lots provided.				
Correspondence ID:	97	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:18:34				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Restoration of the meadows and the valley of the Lyell Fork (area surrounding the eight mile trail through the valley) should have first priority. This will, to a large extent, determine other changes in the proposed plan.				
Correspondence ID:	98	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:19:37				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I stayed at Tuolumne Meadows Lodge campground last summer and spent the week hiking and doing a plein air painting workshop. Please don't stop the horseback riding opportunities at Tuolumne Meadows as they allow greater enjoyment of longer distances and nature opportunities for those who cannot hike far out for miles. Horses are natural parts of National Parks enjoyment. I love the area and want to go back but also like to go out on horseback as I'm 70.				
Correspondence ID:	99	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:26:24				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I favor any NPS efforts in restoring and minimizing the damage incurred by over use of the Tuolumne River area and surrounding wilderness, even if that means reduced access to people like me. I especially favor discontinuing horse/mule rides and combining of NPS and concessioner stables. I also favor reduced capacity in the Glen Aulin HSC.				
Correspondence ID:	100	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:28:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	As an out of state frequent visitor from South Carolina, the High Camps are the most effective way to spend limited time at Yosemite. We have been to all High Camps and STRONGLY recommend NO cuts in this area. We don't understand why other parks don't have these as they are wonderful, and the stewardship of the campers is way way above average, if that is in question. I'd like to see high camps expand throughout the major parks. Glen Allen is a wonderful high camp.				
Correspondence ID:	101	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:31:27				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	"Removal of mountaineering shop/school and fuel station" so fuel would only be available at crane flat? people who want to spend a week camping at tuolumne and driving to trail heads for day hikes between tenaya and the tioga entrance would have to drive down to crane flat to refuel? this is energy/traffic efficiency?				
Correspondence ID:	102	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:43:13				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I oppose reducing overnight permits to only 20 at Glen Aulin high Sierra Camp. Reducing it from the current limit of 32 is insignificant and only keeps a few more people from enjoying the beauty and tranquility of the camp. Thank you				
Correspondence ID:	103	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 12:43:35				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence: The plan sounds quite reasonable!

Correspondence ID: 104 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 12:51:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I FULLY SUPPORT AND ASK YOU TO MAINTAIN AS MANY BEDS AS POSSIBLE (NOT TO EXCEED CURRENT BED LEVELS) AT TUOLUMNE MEADOWS AND ALL HIGH SIERRA CAMPS. I SEE THESE FACILITIES AS NECESSARY FOR ACCESS FOR THOSE WHO ARE OLDER AND YOUNGER WHO MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE BE ABLE TO ACCESS WILDERNESS AREAS. IT IS VITAL THAT YOU MAINTAIN THESE FACILITIES TO MAINTAIN A PORTAL TO THE BACK COUNTRY AREAS FOR THOSE WITH REDUCED FITNESS LEVELS AND TO THOSE WITH CERTAIN DISABILITIES. THANK YOU.

Correspondence ID: 105 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 12:51:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, get rid of the horses in Tuolumne. It seems every trail stinks of horse shit and pee. Every train of horses kicks up a huge cloud of dust and dirt as well. In fact I would like to see all the horses out of Yosemite. Let's have at least one area where hikers and back packers do not have to put up with the stink and dust. They are ruining the area. People can ride many places outside of the National Park.

Correspondence ID: 106 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 12:56:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is really difficult to get High Sierra accommodations if one does not have the ability to plan ahead and enter the lottery. Decreasing bed spaces at Glen Aulin would be a disadvantage for people who take "summer leftovers" and go there on an as-available basis. Please consider deferring the decrease and re-evaluating this in the future. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 107 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 13:00:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not sure I see any overwhelming need to reduce the capacity of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp from 32 to 20 beds. To begin with, that decision should be taken in the context of the entire High Sierra Loop, since many people sign up for the whole trip. If you reduce the capacity of one by 37%, how does that effect the rest? Would there be any room left for people who just want to go down to Glen Aulin or to one or two High Sierra camps? Is there really a significant gain in anything from reducing capacity by 12 people per night in a camp that really isn't open that long to begin with? Has there been a discussion of the tradition of the High Sierra Camps and what they have contributed to the Yosemite experience? I'm all for encouraging people to strap on a backpack and hit the trail, but for younger families trying to introduce Yosemite to their kids and older folks who can't handle a backpack, the High Sierra Camps have always seemed a perfect middle ground, while still leaving a limited footprint in the wilderness. The staffs are always friendly and dedicated. The experience leaves splendid memories and encourages people to explore and support Yosemite. I think the High Sierra Camps should be left alone.

Correspondence ID: 108 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 13:03:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do Not Reduce The Number Of Beds At Glenn Aulin High Sierra Camp.

This has been enjoyed by me and my wife for many years that we stayed at the High Sierra Camps. Don't deny 12 more people a night from also having the enjoyment that this camp offers.

Correspondence ID: 109 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 13:13:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This set of choices seems very reasonable for maintaining the integrity of the park while allowing maximal visits. The challenge always is to strike the right balance.

Correspondence ID: 110 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 13:16:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Retain Glen Aulin at its traditional size. To reduce its size eliminates or hinders ones ability to hike the HSC loop. I'm that the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

impact of twenty people for ninety days per year could be compensated for with some engineered system for handling the waste water or materials. Maybe eliminating a dozen stream side camping sites would accomplish as much if not more.

An "old" hiker who appreciates the HSC arrangements

Correspondence ID:	111	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 13:25:23				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I prefer alternative 1.				

Toulumne meadow is currently over-congested with too many commercial facilities. During peak summer months, many sections of the road are chock full of cars, akin to a shopping mall parking lot. Fewer visitors and fewer facilities will enhance the scenic value of the meadow.

Other sections of the river are well managed.

Correspondence ID:	112	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 13:28:34				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Alternative 4 looks fine EXCEPT:				

1. Removal of fuel station. Over several decades, I've noticed considerable use of this station, often by foreigners. They don't fully understand where various other gas stations are and their hours of operation, nor the distances to them. They don't always plan their trips well, which is understandable, coming from afar. Europeans are used to cities (gas stations) being close together, unlike the USA. Even late at night, vehicles stop there for fuel for a reason - they have to. Consult the fuel usage data. But even if little fuel is sold, the station may be justified by emergency needs, which are high priority. Notice there is no other place to wash vehicles' windows in this spectacular place.

2. The need for the mountaineering shop is only partially reflected in its sales volume. It would seem that people often forget to pack certain items or need to replace broken items. The T.M. General Store only carries typical camping parts. More and more rock climbers often from far away now go to T.M. because the Cathedral granite is so good. They need a source of parts/supplies/etc. Where else can they get them? Not in Lee Vining(?), but probably in far away Mammoth Lakes. Lack of proper parts/supplies can result in more dangerous climbing. Even if the sales volume is not high, the nature of parts desperately needed can justify this tiny store. Why not keep it?

Glad to see the removal of the stable facilities for rental horses. The heavy weight of a horse pulverizes the soil and thus beats up the trails. If people can not hike in this hikers' paradise, they must accept their limitations and not expect horses, escalators, etc. to take them up the mountains. This is similar to only a few disabled people who can't reasonably expect exceptionally expensive services detrimental to thousands of others.

Correspondence ID:	113	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 13:38:51				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Number 1) provide the complete plan. As is, the plan is not available on this web site.				

2) What needs clarification, this means define these terms especially disturbance, what new construction and which specific facilities are being relocated and to specific location: "disturbance for new construction or relocation of facilities."

3) Clarify the justification for the environmental impact of sixty-five more people camping along the river per day: "Day use will increase slightly from 1,774 to 1,839."

4) Clarify how many "Concessioner stock day rides" are currently in use, then clarify why the NPS and concessioner stables will be combined and why there will be additional NPS housing (how many units will be built and where exactly in the park).

Correspondence ID:	114	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 13:42:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I recommend implementing alternative 4 with this change. There will be no change to high sierra camp at Glen Aulin .

Correspondence ID: 115 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 13:45:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree with all of your recommendations on the Tuolumne River Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In particular, I strongly agree with the need to discontinue horses in this area. The area is too fragile to allow horses. They have destroyed many of the trails in the area and frankly make hiking not enjoyable. I would like to find trails that are not full of horse shit and trails that are not ground to dust by countless horses. I strongly believe that horses should be banned throughout the entire park, including the valley. I enjoy the beauty and serenity of the park and look forward to enjoying it for years to come. I have been a yearly visitor to the park since 1960.

Correspondence ID: 116 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 13:47:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: FIRE DNC!!!!

From the onset the NPS, in it's total lack of business acumen, fires Curry Company, one of the best things going at Yosemite; consistently good and committed to the visitor-then in Curry's place the NPS hires a slip shod corporation out of DELAWARE, the #1 state where slip shod corporations file to avoid liability -in the event their business goes south.

Those of us in the business community know to limit our dealings with companies that form their entities in Delaware- especially when the company itself IS NOT LOCATED IN DELAWARE! DA!

Then fast forward to today. Curry is full of vermin and the Hanta virus. The food is disgusting, the lodging through out the park is dirty and the service is "dicey at best." Used to be college kids would work in the park over summer, now DNC uses rehabs that aren't so rehabbed! Creepy! Nothing is being maintained, the pools are being shut down, the showers-when open are filthy and the drains plugged... I am embarrassed when I visit the park and I see tourists from other countries holding their noses as they look at what is offered in the way of food and lodging.

All the talk we hear is "what next to shut down." Attendance is down and it is no small wonder. Was this the plan? The make Yosemite so undesirable that people would stop coming? Well, it is working-the eco-extrmists are getting their way but at what cost to the park and our park service in general? Where is it written that Government must be stupid when it comes to making business decisions? Yosemite needs to be run like a business-it needs protecting and managing-two things it is not getting now.

What happened to the beautiful park which was the jewel of our great nation? Curry took pride in the park-maybe the company did not break even but at least tourists and Americans alike went away remembering the Grandeur of this great park and not the disease, pestulance and stomach problems that we experience today.

Keep the campgrounds open and have people park their cars once settled in. Limit the number entering the park (reservations) if you have to. Do not shut down the river rafting, horsebackriding and backpacking and for heavens sake get DNC out of there! Hire a corporation that knows what they are doing where hospitality is concerned and make sure they have the wherewithall to make it happen again! (Disney Corp/Sandals Resorts/ shoot-even motel 6 would do a better job-at least the sheets would be changed and there would be no vermin in them!)

Do what we do in business, be good stewards of the park by insuring a quality experience FOR PEOPLE TOO and bring back the park we all miss.

thank you,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 117 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 13:49:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I first visited Yosemite when I was 10 or 11 years old -- in 1973 or 1974. My mother took my sister and I on a three-day mule

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

trip to Sunrise, Merced and Vogelsang High Sierra Camps. I fell in love with the backcountry and returned frequently. During college, I worked at the High Sierra Camps (1982-1986) - three summers at Glen Aulin, one at May Lake and one at Sunrise. My last visit to the high country was last July, when my family and I stayed at Tuolumne Meadows lodge.

My first summer at Glen Aulin, we had trouble with the leach field - as I recall, the camp and the campground were closed for a few days while the Park Service dealt with the issue. Problems related to sewage and water supply persisted during the next two summers (and that was 30+ years ago...).

I love the backcountry, and I think the High Sierra Camps serve an important function -- they allow people who might not otherwise see the glory of the high sierra to experience it on a very intimate level. However, I've always thought the camps left a significant footprint on the environment. I understand that now, showers are available at Glen Aulin only for staff. That's a good move.

I support Alternative 4. I have heard concerns that reducing the number of overnight guests at Glen Aulin will impact loop trips. I don't think the impact on loop trips should be the primary concern. The group size of the loop trips could be reduced so that they could still be accommodated at Glen Aulin. Also, during the course of a 'normal' summer, there aren't that many loop trips - not enough that the loop trips should factor into the decision on how best to preserve the environment surrounding Glen Aulin.

I would go one step further with Alternative 4, and reduce the number of tent cabins at Tuolumne Meadows Lodge. During our last visit in July 2012, the camp seemed the worse for the wear. Remove tents 4-12: they are in an awful location, right near the restrooms and main pathways. Removing those tents would remove 36 beds.

I would also reduce the number of campsites at Tuolumne Meadows Campground, which has a higher density than many other national park campgrounds we have visited. Also, it is not necessary to have seven group sites. The impact of so many campers is immense, not just on the resources that support the campground, but on the surrounding areas (including the meadow).

I also support the discontinuation of the daytrip mule rides out of Tuolumne Meadows. The trails and surrounding areas have been severely impacted due to the constant use by mules. If mule day trips are kept, they should be limited to a small number of trails - preferably those that are not near a water source (admittedly hard to find in the Tuolumne area!).

The goal must be preservation, in balance with public access. I believe Alternative 4 finds the balance -- Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp remains open, but with reduced capacity, thereby preserving this spectacular setting for all visitors - present and future.

Correspondence ID:	118	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar.07.2013 13:49:40				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear NPS,				

I wish to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan.

My background at Yosemite: I have visited Yosemite National Park twice in the last three year -- these are my only visits and I'm 60+ years of age.

IMHO, Tuolumne Meadows is one of the beautiful areas in the World.

I do not say this lightly. I've visited Yellowstone and Rocky Mountain National Parks over a dozen times each. I previously lived in Seattle for 30 years and visited Rainier National Park over 100 times. I've hiked and climbed in Switzerland, France, Germany, Italy and Austria.

My experiences are generally back-country -- hiking and climbing. I don't camp much and rely on hotels and lodges for my accommodations.

So, I repeat, I think that Tuolumne Meadows is one of the most beautiful area in the World.

My comment is this: Regarding the Tuolumne River Plan, I recommend that the NPS adopt Alternative 4, WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE GLEN AULIN HIGH SIERRA CAMP SHOULD RETAIN 8 TENT CABINS.

My next visit to Yosemite is in Sept. 2013 and my wife and I have reservations at Tuolumne Meadows Lodge.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 119 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: US citizen and taxpayer Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 14:13:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think that it should stay as it is, no action. The US is in serious debt and these plans will cost a bundle. Keep things as they are because it is hard enough as it is to find a reasonably priced place to stay anywhere in Yosemite.

Correspondence ID: 120 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 14:19:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative 4. I hiked the entire loop last September in the reverse, i.e. from Tuolumne to Vogelsang on the first leg. The river did not carry as much water as shown in your video, but despite of that, it was a wonderful experience to hike alongside it. The water was very clear, one could look down and see every pebble. As far as reducing bunk bed capacity at Glen Aulin, I am definitely in favor of that. It is too crowded and this shows. It was by far the least attractive and well maintained camp of the entire loop. I also think that a strong hiker can reach Tuolumne from May Lake Camp or vice versa.

Correspondence ID: 121 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 14:27:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why in the world would you remove 3 of the 8 tent cabins at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp? The impact on the river is negligible, and it is one of the few High Sierra camps that is reasonably easy hike to reach. Also, the trail along the river is probably the most scenic in the park. There are so few people using that trail as it is; why is a reduction of 12 beds necessary. Also I notice there is nothing about the backpackers camp at Glen Aulin mentioned at all. Does that mean its being removed completely? If so , some disclosure is warranted. Or is it to be retained that should be mentioned too.

I would appreciate a reply.

Correspondence ID: 122 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 14:29:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Plan number 4 appears to be the best to improve the environment yet allow continued usage of the backcountry. One of my best memories is a 5 day circuit hike of the high Sierra camps. Maintaining these camps allows older individuals like myself to get beyond the tourist areas with some support (meals/ tents). We are not all 25 year olds capable of carrying a 40 lb pack but it is a privilege to still experience the backcountry.

Correspondence ID: 123 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 15:04:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Continue stable day rides at Tuolumne Meadows. Provides an alternative means for people who have difficulty hiking/walking distances to see some of the back country and enjoy the views that hikers enjoy.

Correspondence ID: 124 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 15:08:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have some questions regarding NPS recommendation for Option 4; -What is the new construction necessary to disturb 27 acres? -Why removal of the gas station/mountaineering shop? not profitable for the owners or another reason? -Why the need for 8.6% more NPS employee's at Tuolumne with overnight camper/lodging capacity remaining the same as current?

Many Park visitors never travel to Tuolumne but those that do so regularly have a special bond with the area and are eager to expose it to others who share similar views about protecting and preserving it but perhaps have not yet seen it. I have seen the degradation of the Valley in the last few years as more people visit looking for a Disneyland type experience. Visiting the area over many, many years I feel it has been well managed and preserved in its present state.

Correspondence ID: 125 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 15:23:53

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yosemite National Park is being loved to death. Too many people create too much impact on the ecosystem of the park. More should be done to protect the river and it's ecosystem than to increase visitor numbers. Tuolumne Meadows is also suffering from high visitor numbers. Campers could be easily dispersed throughout the river corridor and create less crowding. Furthermore the High Country camps could be closed to pack animals except in the case of handicap access. Hikers on foot would have much less impact and probably provide a much more quality experience. Thank you, [REDACTED] CA

Correspondence ID: 126 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 15:27:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a repeat, senior hiker on the High Sierra Loop circuit, I have a concern about reducing the capacity at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. It will be much more difficult for us older hikers to make the Loop without the "easy" first-day downhill hike to Glen Aulin from Tuolumne in the counter-clockwise direction. Accessing Glen Aulin gives us that much more time to adapt to the altitude before climbing up to May Lake. I understand there are environmental concerns, but I would request that funds be allocated to apply best-practices toward mitigating the impact on the environment through added investment at the site rather than simply restricting capacity in this way. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 127 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 15:41:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I visited Yosemite in the summer of 2012 and spent time in Tuolumne Meadow camp and three of the High Sierra camps. I am opposed to any plan which would reduce the public use and access to this area. What good is this place to if we can't use it. I was alarmed to hear that there are those who would further restrict the ability of the people to use their park. People are part of nature, not some alien species which is separate. What good is the wilderness if it cannot be seen and used by the people. I also am against any reduction in the use of mules. There are people who have issues which may cause them to be unable to see some of the park that they are now able to visit due to the mules in the park. If the park is available to fewer people it will probably lose public support. Why should we pay taxes to help support a park system that is not welcoming to those who pay for it?

Correspondence ID: 128 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 15:46:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Every year I backpack to the HSCamps and the related camp grounds. I love Yosemite. The HSC's are a great way to get away from the crowds in the valley and enjoy the high country without being a rugged minimalist backpacker. The HSC's allow the average nature lover to access the wilderness. As I grow older, I appreciate the HSC even more because without them I would not be able to access this part of the park for overnight trips. Please do not reduce the size or capacity of the HSC's.

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 129 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 15:53:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Not a fan of discontinuing the Stables at Tuolumne Meadows. The very essence of being on horseback overlooking the meadows and viewing the majestic mountains rimming the area gives you insight of what some of the very first traveler's into Yosemite saw and felt. Certainly a huge supporter of preserving the fragile high sierra flora and fauna but at least horses stay on the trail. It's the people who stomp and walk all over the meadows. It's now minus one less family enjoyable activity that helped you connect with appreciation of the first western trailblazing settlers. As a camper of Tuolumne since age 4 I am sorry to see it go.

Correspondence ID: 130 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 15:58:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Last summer we visited Yosemite and the interesting comment from our teenager was she would have liked to spend more time in the high Sierra at Tuolumne Meadows and surrounding areas. It's has a unique feel and is less crowded than the valley. Please don't restrict this special gem any more than absolutely necessary. One thing they also loved was the communal dining experience.

Correspondence ID: 131 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 16:22:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this plan generally sounds fine. I particularly support the elimination of day rides in Tuolumne Meadows and combining

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

the stables because of the environmental impact this currently has on Tuolumne. I am interested about the idea of increasing day use numbers and where people will park. Tuolumne Meadows has become increasingly crowded and people often try to create parking places that impact the edges of the meadow. I am hoping that the plan has made provisions for this. Thank you for all your efforts and I hope the plan will help preserve the Tuolumne we all cherish. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 132 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 16:52:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Briefly, if anyone truly cared about the integrity of the Tuolumne River, the various government agencies responsible for maintaining the travesty known as O'Shaughnessy Dam would pursue a course of dismantling the dam and allowing Hetch Hetchy Valley to revert to its prior pristine self. Certainly, if the State of California can dictate the removal of one, and possibly two, dams on the Carmel River to mitigate red legged frog habitat and restore migration patterns for steel head trout, those same powers can wield pressure to restore Hetch Hetchy. The communities of the Monterey Peninsula will have to resort to desalination for their water supply. San Francisco, with its much larger population base and tax revenue potential can do the same and more easily. O'shaughnessy has no business in our pristine national park, and would never be accepted in this day and age. Such is the hypocrisy of government!

Correspondence ID: 133 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 17:22:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: DO NOT OPT FOR ALTERNATIVE 1. Please adopt the recommended #4 alternative. We have visited Tuolumne for over 30 years, staying at most of the high Sierra camps and Tuolumne Lodge on numerous occasions. I want to continue spending vacations and having my grandchildren to be able to experience all the wonders of the area. We prefer the Lodge over camping and I can't imagine not having it around. Alternative 4 is the best option. thank you.

Correspondence ID: 134 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 17:39:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan only accommodates those who camp in tents. The rest of the population pays taxes and has a right to use the wilderness in ways that fulfill their needs and desires. Many cannot or do not want to sleep on the ground or do the physical labor camping requires. This does not mean they cannot experience the wilderness that is a National Park, not just a park for the elite athletes . This plan shuts out a large part of the population and I for one resent the attitude of the park service and environmentalists that the only way to enjoy it is their way. And the only people who have a right to use the park must use it as they deem fit. What could possibly the purpose to limit beds in Glen Aulin ? How does 12 less beds per night make that much difference ? It would decrease the amount of people, both tax payers and foreign visitor,s that can enjoy the high country. The same is true of Tuolumne high camp. All I can see of this is to make this part of the park less accessible to regular people. The National Parks belong to every citizen, not just those who consider themselves the chosen few. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 135 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 18:45:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This summer 3 friends and I spent one evening at Tolumne Meadows Lodge, Glen Aulin and May Lake. It was the first trip of what I hope to be several in my lifetime to Yosemite National Park, and we all treasured our time at the High Sierra camps more than any part of the visit. It was truly magnificent.

During the visit, we were informed of the Tolumne River Plan. I truly hope the decision makers choose an alternative that still allows access to park visitors to camp in such a magical and historical camp.

My friends and I that visited are all mothers of children aged 18 months to 4 years of age, and we each are looking forward to a time when we can take our children to the camps we visited. I hope that is an opportunity the decision makers choose to keep open for my children.

Correspondence ID: 136 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 19:58:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this is a workable plan.

Correspondence ID: 137 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,07,2013 20:04:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence: The high camps are a wonderful resource and are similar to the alpine huts of Europe. They expose people to the grandeur of Yosemite and also provide a way for older and active adults to experience the back country. Glen Aulin is already the smallest camp and reducing its size will make it almost impossible for people to complete the high camp circuit. Why not move the camp further away from the river to protect the sensitive habitat and preserve the spirit of the high camp circuit?

Correspondence ID: 138 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 20:17:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of Plan 4, the preferred draft plan. I think it will enhance the environment and have minimal impact on visitor access and accommodation.

Correspondence ID: 139 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 20:23:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you not to reduce the overnight capacity of the Glen Aulin high Sierra backcountry camp. The camps serve too few people as it is.

Correspondence ID: 140 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 20:53:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think this plan is the right one. I have used many features in the Tuolumne area for 30 years and see the need to protect this natural recourse without denying access to those of us who love it. Thanks for your good work. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 141 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 21:14:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wish to case a vote in favor of leaving all alone. I don't want to see the ability to see Yosemite reduced.

Correspondence ID: 142 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 22:21:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

I have reviewed the plans and Alternative 4 that is currentl preferred by NPS. I feel it important to mention that I have visited Yosemite NP a total of three times, and have been within the geographic confines of that portion of the high country encompassed by this use and management plan only once in July 2008. At that time we utilized the Tuolumne overnight camp facility and rode mules on one of the four-day trips (the one that does not stop over at Glen Aulin). We did however utilize both flush toilets and vault toilets, and other facilities that were in use at the base camp and other way stops (Sunrise, Vogelsang and Merced).

I am generally in favor of most of the recommendations included in Alternative 4, however, I would strongly advise additional thought and consideration be taken when partially closing down overnight lodging facilities at Glen Aulin, and would advise reconsideration of full closure of mule day rides at Tuolumne in favor of reduced capacity. In my opinion, access to these high country facilities promotes knowledge and understanding of the sensitive nature of the ecosystem within the high country and surrounding meadows, lakes and ponds, which would be lost upon future generations by not affording access into these areas or by these means.

The four and six-day mule trips afford guide-based instruction time to small groups who have already demonstrate an eagerness to explore and learn about the high country that would not be present in other groups (be it because of larger financial commitment or back country curiosity without an ability to backpack into the backcountry camp areas, or some combination). This group is more likely to influence other enthusiasts of similar means to visit and return to these areas, bringing their knowledge and appreciation of the primitive backcountry experience (along with "leave no trace" philosophy) with them. Cutting back the overnight lodging capacity in Glen Aulin by 37.5% would proportionately diminish the number of groups that could run the excursions through this area. Converting the facilities at Glen Aulin to be more in line with say, more primitive, less environmentally impacting facilities at Vogelsang could at least partially if not completely offset the environmental impacts and/or water demands while allowing for the same number of overnight campers.

Let us not also forget that the Toulumne Meadows base camp is the jumping off point for these multi-day high country excursions. By eliminating mule daytrips, a significant number of employees and stock which already assist in booking trips, maintaining the mules, cycling the mules on and off duty to allow for rest and reserves and resotcking the high camps will be

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

eliminated, resulting in further strain on the remaining employees and stock animals. As I understand it, much of the concessioner's resources of are built from third-party purveyors of pack animals; a reduction of these levels by a significant percentage could make small suppliers' positions untenable. What kind of effect that this could have on service of those willing to purchase these services would be unknown to me, but likely quantifiable by you, your group and/or the concessioner.

In closing, I realize that there has been a movement afoot for several years now within the NPS, Department of Interior and BLM towards less human impact, and "roadless, trail-less" design within the national parks and other federal lands. My fear is that by making these lands more remote and inaccessible in the interest of conservation and environmental goals, the general public in their continued deprivation of access to the splendor of these lands will become increasingly ignorant of what the importance of realizing such goals within the federal lands and national parks system are truly about. In this scenario, our larger population becomes more increasingly swayed by a few on either side of the equation instead of being able to value the benefits of these beautiful and remote lands based upon their individual and shared experiences. It is my belief that a parks system based upon moderated access with education and regulated exploitation of resources and environmental impacts will allow for a sustainable desire by present and future generations to both marvel at our national parks as well as feel the desire to protect and conserve these most precious of lands and waters; without continued direct exposure and contact by citizens and visitors, the experience of these lands become increasingly based on second and third-hand knowledge and tales, with guidance from "other" environmental, ecological, and governmental experts from which the visitor's knowledge is increasingly removed.

As a citizen, and as a past and future visitor to these lands, I respectfully submit the above and ask your indulgence in the consideration of these points as a basis for further discussion prior to making a decision impacting the future use and access of these lands within this area.

Correspondence ID:	143	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 22:45:59				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please retain the high sierra camps intact, including Glen Aulin, at the current capacities. These camps are crucial to enable me to experience the back country because I can no longer carry heavy packs due to degenerative back and knee disease. These camps offer the crucial access to high country travel for aging park users like me.				

thanks

██████

Correspondence ID:	144	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 01:36:44				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I would like to express my strong opposition to any efforts to reduce the capacity of the Glenn Aulin High Sierra Camp, or access to mule rides. The areas around Glenn Aulin, in particular LeConte and Waterwheel Falls have a spectacular and unique beauty. I feel it is unfair and elitist to essentially limit access to these areas to rangers and those who are of the highest levels of physical conditioning (or to a lucky 20). National Parks are funded with taxpayer dollars and visitors' entrance fees. Their enjoyment should not be limited to rangers and the most physically fit.				

Correspondence ID:	145	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 04:25:31				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	We would like to support your Alternative #4. We love Yosemite and we particularly love Tuolumne and this alternative seems to be the best compromise for all concerned. Thank you for your consideration.				

Correspondence ID:	146	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 07:27:10				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The source of water contamination is mainly the mule trains. They also degrade the trails. Although they make the meals at the High Sierra camps possible, it would be best to cut them rather than limiting hiker access, or perhaps just minimize them. Cutting back Glen Aulin is NOT a good option; it would not produce any significant improvement in river water quality or trail repair. Thanks, ██████				

Correspondence ID:	147	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 07:29:40				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	i strongly agree with parks alt. #4 . please make the best decision for the future of the park.				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 148 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 08:05:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reduce overnight capacity from 32 to 20 people at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp

I would like to see capacity remain to 32 campers. I have traveled to the park across the country and have camped at Glen Aulin 2 different times with my family (5 of us)

I would hate to see the lower number of available campers.

Thank you for taking my comment.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 149 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 08:08:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I agree with the plan with the exception of the reduction of tents/beds at Glen Aulin. The incredible experience of spending the night in a tent cabin at any of the High Sierra Camps should not be limited any further than at present unless you find that reservations are dropping off enough to warrant that approach. If the concessioner and NPS stables are combined will there be a loss of jobs? If that would be the case I could not support that effort. Much as I dislike picking my way through equine poop on the trails I have to admit I enjoy seeing the pack trains and even the guided trail rides passing by. It is part of the experience and also part of the education process whereby kids (of all ages) get a reality check on how you get your food and remove trash when you don't have Starbucks and McDonalds around the corner and the garbage truck doesn't rumble by once a week! The Tuolumne Meadows, Tuolumne River and the camps along the loop trail have been such a treasured part of my life I want to see others have the same wonderful experiences I have enjoyed (as long as I can still get a reservation once a year!). More than any other place I've been the area restores the spirit and puts material objects in true perspective.

Correspondence ID: 150 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 08:56:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

After reviewing the alternatives, I am dismayed at any further limitations on commercial stock.

I am an avid environmentalist. But I do not believe there is any conclusive evidence that pack trains' use of trails and grazing has any cumulative negative impact. I believe that studies concluding otherwise have been skewed in favor of extremist viewpoints.

In August of 2011, I participated in a 5 day horseback trek into the high country, camping at the Merced River and at Emeric Lake. This was a lifelong dream fulfilled. Because of my physical limitations---I have Rheumatoid Arthritis--- this was the only way I could enjoy the interior of my national park. For people who are unable to hike long distances, there is no option for seeing the grandeur of the high country in person. For the outfitters, the ability to graze is essential for efficient operation. There is evidence (that has been ignored) that grazing actually improves the health of the meadows.

Mules and horses were instrumental in building the trails and opening the park to tourism. In addition to their historic presence, it has not been proven to my satisfaction that their continued use is detrimental in any significant way. In my experience, people on foot leave far more evidence of their passing. Mountain bike's knobby tires tear up trails far more than hooves. If you apply more limits to commercial stock in the parks and eliminate day rides, you are not only limiting access. You are harming local economies. Please be smart about this and amend Alternative 4.

Sincerely, ██████████

Correspondence ID: 151 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 09:18:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I love Yosemite. It is one of the best things about living in the Bay Area - that no matter how stressed or difficult life is, I could be at Yosemite in 3-4 hours if I wanted to go. Tuolumne is a place that holds many special memories - camping, hiking, sitting

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

by the river on a Friday night watching the deer graze. I've learned a lot about myself at Yosemite and done things I never thought I could do - like a solo day-hike of Cloud's Rest. Nothing record breaking, but important for me. I think we should keep Yosemite as wild and unspoiled as possible. To that end, I support dropping the horse/mule trekking access. Hiking on trails designed for horse use can be messy, and they tend to be wider and more scarred than necessary for hiking use. Although I think there's a place for horse/mule trekking, they do not fall in line with "leave no trace" - and that's what Yosemite ought to be all about.

Correspondence ID: 152 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 11:34:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Option 4 is good except no change to overnight capacity from 32 people at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp need be changed. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 153 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 11:50:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for your extensive efforts on behalf of Yosemite National Park.

Several brief comments: Have any of the plans for the Park addressed the issue of amphibian losses? I believe fish restocking was halted some years ago, but are there any other measures that can be taken to help protect these endangered animals? Rerouting of trails and more intensive education regarding their plight and the steps backpackers and day hikers can take to reduce human impact come to mind. Hot spots of frog and salamander reproduction areas should be off limits to people. Are there captive breeding and release programs in place or possible?

On a personal level, I wish for the day DNC could install some electrical outlets designed for CPAP (continuous partial airway pressure) users such as myself. CPAP machines are very quiet and make sleeping at high altitudes much safer for those with breathing issues while sleeping. Without an outlet, I can use a battery, but that requires daily recharging.

A recharging station for batteries and electric vehicles may be a combined use possibility as we phase in more electric cars. The CPAPs are run off a 12 volt battery. If one could leave it recharging in a secure, ventilated cabinet during the day at an outdoor recharging station and then have it available for use at night, a motel stay at Lee Vining could be avoided.

I hope the bike rentals continue in the Yosemite Valley and are available in Tuolumne as they are greener than autos or buses. Off road/off bike-path use though may be a problem. Seems like a green option though for transport and recreation for some people.

Correspondence ID: 154 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 12:02:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The preferred alternative looks pretty good but I do have a couple of concerns:

1)Would prefer that Glen Aulin HSC not be downsized (meals and cabins) as much, but if necessary to conform to the the infrastructure and protect the river, so be it.

2)greater number of formal parking spaces for day use is Great! However total removal of road side parking eliminates peoples ability to stop short term to view the wildlife. I suspect drivers will simply go over the new curbs and park anyway. The meadow filters the runoff so I don't feel it necessary to remove all the road side parking/wildlife viewing opportunities.

3) Increased bus capacity is good, fewer buses is not - I don't understand the table showing only 2 buses with greater capacity. As it is there is a wait of about 30 minutes between buses . . .

4) not sure why there is a need for more employee housing if user capacity is about the same - unless there is currently lots of employee commuting.

5) As a backpacking and day hiker, I support fewer horses on the hiking trails . . . in fact I'd support separate trails so those that need to ride could still enjoy the backcountry.

6) Alternative number 2 seems to reduce the number of Tuolumne meadows campground campsites while increasing capacity;

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

I'd prefer to keep the higher number of (smaller) campsites.

FYI - my wife and continue to visit the park every year; we're avid backpackers but have also enjoyed the HSCamps one recent summer. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Take care, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	155	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 13:24:39				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The only part of Alternative 4 that should be changed is the recommendation to remove 12 beds from Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. As someone who had to reschedule a High Sierra Camp trip because Glen Aulin was fully occupied when other camps were available, I know that the current 32 beds limit the ability to make use of the High Sierra Camp loop. Having only 20 beds would make the loop almost impossible to use. Glen Aulin is already small with a small impact so reducing the occupancy is unnecessary. Comparing 32 beds at Glen Aulin to the more than 2000 camping and lodge beds at Tuolumne Meadows highlights how small the Glen Aulin impact with 32 beds is. Keep 32 beds at Glen Aulin.				

Correspondence ID:	156	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 13:29:15				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I think the preferred alternative (Alternative 4) is a solid basis for the final plan. My comments fall into two categories: First, I support the need to rationalize and improve parking at Tuolumne Meadows and along Highway 108 (common to all alternatives). I think it is an excellent idea to eliminate informal roadside parking and the attendant informal trails. All parking should be in clearly designated spaces. This will actually improve the experience of many visitors because it will reduce traffic hazards and their associated stress and strain on drivers. I've witnessed several "near misses" passing through Tuolumne Meadows on 108 when a car pulled out unexpectedly into traffic or a visitor stepped onto the road between parked cars. Although, of course not part of the Tuolumne River drainage, I think this policy should be extended to the many informal "climber" parking spots between Pothole Dome and Tenaya Lake as well. This unregulated parking likely produces even more traffic hazards than the Tuolumne Meadows segment of 108 because of the curvy nature of the road. Plus, there is substantial visual impairment as riders look to the view and instead see tangles of parked cars.				

Second, I think it is time to close all of the High Sierra Camps, including Glen Aulin. After all, although given special exemption, they ARE nonconforming uses in wilderness areas. Historically, they provided access to the Yosemite backcountry where such access was difficult. In the era of lightweight backpacking equipment, however, access to areas like Glen Aulin or Vogelsang is not difficult for most visitors. I understand the argument that the camps are a multiple-generation family tradition for some. I maintain that even more visitors would like to visit Glen Aulin and find a wild place, not what amounts to an unsightly resort. Perhaps the camps can be phased out over time. This will at least solve the sewage pollution issues that have affected the river.

Overall, I think Alternative 4 combined with a plan to close the High Sierra Camps will be a big improvement in protecting the wild status of the Tuolumne River.

Correspondence ID:	157	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 16:32:06				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I see that the Tuolumne River Draft Plan includes more day use. The great Tuolumne mess is created by the cars parked between the Tuolumne Meadows Campground entrance and the turnout for Pothole Dome. Where are you going to put the additional cars produced by more people? It seems to me you ought to hold off on greater day use until you solve the parking problem. Maybe you could put a huge lot in the lower Gaylor horse space, or severely restrict day use. At the very least, please do NOT expand day use and make a bad situation WORSE. Thank you. Sincerely yours, [REDACTED] NPS botanical volunteer, Tuolumne Meadows				

Correspondence ID:	158	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 16:55:25				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Reducing Glen Aulin's capacity by over a third from 32 to 20 beds seems excessive. A dozen people daily is not going to make that much of an impact upon the ecosystem (negligible) and the wilderness experience, while denying access to over a thousand visitors over the course of a season will have a dramatic impact making it next to impossible to get into an already extremely tight lottery system. I have been going to the high camps the last eight years in a row with friends and family, and it provides a unique and special way to visit the backcountry. I have also seen the Yosemite high camps walk listed on the internet as among the top ten great walks of the world like the Inca Trail, Tour du Mont Blanc, and the Lyceum trail. Why threaten a world class attraction that is generally benign in an attempt to "save" it? If there's a problem with aging facilities and that's what is				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

threatening the ecosystem, have them upgraded. The traveling public that uses them will gladly pay for it (despite the rhetoric from Republicans that taxes are evil and so on) with additional fees, higher rates, and etc. Better to pay up to fix up than to shutter and shut down. If there was a \$20/night fee, that would generate tens of thousands of dollars every year towards improvements to sustain the system, just at Glen Aulin alone.

Outside of high camp reductions, the plan overall seemed reasonable, in particular the combining of the NPS/DNC stables.

Correspondence ID: 159 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 17:36:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative 4 looks the best to me. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 160 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 18:26:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have read the Plan and for several reasons I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes to Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (GA) in all the Alternatives, especially the actions in Alternatives 1 and 2. While the changes proposed in Alternatives 3 and 4 are better, they still are troublesome. This is by definition a plan for a "Wild and Scenic River." Scenic implies that someone actually gets close enough to it to see it. At times it seems like "utopia" for the NPS would be to build a fortified wall around all our National Parks and keep everyone out. Case in point: the proposed changes to GA.

First, I oppose the reduction from 32 guests to 20. Let's be reasonable ? we're talking about a season that typically lasts 2, maybe 2-1/2 months. Basically it's a plan to make a very minimal impact into a very, very minimal impact. It should be simple to modify the existing septic system to accommodate this small amount of traffic. People in the US every day rely on systems of this sort and they are easily installed. It's also puzzling that a project to improve water quality doesn't mention any improvements to the existing septic system.

To reduce that small number of visitors by 40% is unfair to guests who aren't physically able to backpack. Those citizens still should have a chance to visit GA. Additionally, to eliminate wood for the stoves will make the remaining 20 guests miserable at night ? this will essentially be making the camp so inhospitable you might as well close it (which is such a shame).

Finally, removing and reinstalling the auxiliary water intake line is purely an aesthetic improvement which will provide very little improvement in water quality. At a time when our nation is essentially broke, to spend \$1M on these changes is nothing but poor stewardship of limited resources.

For these reasons, I prefer Alternative 3, but would like to continue the use of wood for the stoves.

On a positive note, continuing to prohibit showers, replacing all the water treatment equipment, and installing a composting toilet make perfect sense. Take those steps, fix the septic system, and move on.

Correspondence ID: 161 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 20:38:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: From what I can see, plan 4 looks good. I must say the horses in Yosemite have obviously caused sanitary issues, such as in the valley. My only request, though, is please retain the high camp post office. My friends work there and I love to send postcards to my family when I visit my old pals. Tent city rules too & god bless [REDACTED] Michigan!

Correspondence ID: 162 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 22:33:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I grew up on the East Coast and fell in love with Yosemite the first time I visited, in 1968. I asked my wife (of 40 years) to marry me on a hike to Illilouette Falls. We were married on the 9th green of the old golf course the next summer and held our reception and our 25th wedding anniversary in the Ahwahnee Hotel's Solarium.

Every year, along with our friends, we are on the web at 7AM on the appointed days to book Valley campsites for both a Spring and Fall Yosemite weekend. Because I am now retired I visit the park about 3 additional times a year, usually car camping at one of the drive-in campsites along HWY120. In short, I would classify us as significant users of The Park and we make it a point to be a contributor to various "Yosemite Funds" that support the park.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

My bad back now limits me to day hikes. The one way I have been able to enjoy Yosemite's deeper back country is by staying at the High Sierra Camps. These are truly remarkable. The beauty, tranquility and vastness make these trips transformative - the highlight of our summer. We have been twice, grateful to have called just when a cancellation was available. This year our luck was better and we get to complete the South-side-loop.

We've shared the scrumptious meals with other wonderful enthusiasts ranging in age from 10 to 83! In many cases, they would not likely be able or willing to experience such wilderness without the support of the camps. I imagine that like ourselves, besides restoring body and soul, they come away with a shared sense of responsibility to see that such magnificent land and waterways be preserved for future generations.

I appreciate that balancing access with preservation is a difficult task and I commend the NPS for approaching these issues with care and thoughtfulness. For the most part, I agree with the proposals in your favored alternate plans for the Tuolumne and Merced regions. I am willing to accept that we will lose some of our favorite campsites along the Merced River and Tenaya Creek. I have looked forward to purchasing a cold drink after returning to Happy Isles from a walk to the Vernal Falls bridge but I can do without that luxury.

All in all, I think the plans strike the appropriate balance - with one exception, namely, the loss of almost half the beds at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. This is a gem of a place and gateway to a further trip to Water Wheel Falls and the incredible sights along the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne. It also completes the loop between The Meadows and May Lake.

When we stayed there two years ago, we were given strict rules to follow regarding water conservation and sanitation. I can appreciate that the camp is next to the Tuolumne River, one of the cleanest sources of drinking water in the U.S. I live in the Bay Area and am fortunate enough to get my drinking water from it. Clearly, we must preserve the pristine nature of the water. I simply wonder if it is not possible to put in place the necessary sanitation facility to keep the current complement of beds. Perhaps that would mean moving the camp further away from the river or moving the bathrooms or increasing the treatment facility.

I am aware that adding facilities is not in keeping with the overall concept of preserving the wilderness. But this is a balancing act. At 20 beds, it will mismatch with the May Lake camp making the planning of loop trips that much more difficult. What will be the experience when almost half the available beds in the North-of-HWY120-loop are lost?

It is my understanding that because of its remoteness, the Lake Merced Camp is not fully occupied all the time. For that reason, I am not as concerned with the plan to limit beds there (although I wonder at what level do these camps become unsustainable from the point of view of the concessionaire).

So, in summary, I support most of the good work that the Park Service has done in coming up with a workable plan that balances the preservation of the rich wilderness with access to it. I understand the real challenge associated with keeping Glen Aulin at its current level. Still, because of the importance of access for many, I request that you reconsider the downsizing of that fantastic facility in favor of a solution (relocation or facility upgrade) that will maintain its capacity.

Thank you for your efforts and this opportunity to comment.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	163	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,09,2013 06:25:37				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I oppose Alternative 4 and strongly recommend Alternative 3 with one change - please continue the use of wood for stoves in the camp.				
Correspondence ID:	164	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,09,2013 07:33:59				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Don't decrease capacity at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp.				
Correspondence ID:	165	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,09,2013 08:38:40				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support alternative 4 of the National Park Service				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 166 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,09,2013 10:27:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good day, I would like to briefly comment on the Tuolumne River Draft Plan. My biggest concern at this point is the amount of "pack" animals and outfits who use the trails for monetary gain. To me "Wilderness" is not a place where we pay folks to set up our camps and haul our gear out. This is not only visually displeasing for those of us who travel there under the pretense of a place "untrammeled by man" but it is also disheartening to see pack animals defecate near "pristine" and protected waters. I have been "ran off the trail" by pack animals in Wilderness locations before. I also feel that running maximum capacity of visitors for the profits of any companies sake is bad for the environment we are trying to protect. Let us also look more closely at the failed waste water treatment facilities in the area. We all know that what happens upstream flows downhill. These should be addressed immediately. I just wish to see Yosemite as I have always known her. Let's try to keep her heritage, natural history, and beauty intact. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 167 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,09,2013 10:58:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm an avid hiker and back-packer and have used the High Sierra Camps on several occasions. I spend most of my time in the Tuolumne Meadows area or other locations ... that are not in the valley. I visit Yosemite about 2 times a year. I agree that Alternative #4 appears to be the best approach and should be adopted. However I would recommend that a constant review be made of how to minimize horse/donkey manure on the hiking trails. This is a minor irritant on most trails but a major problem on some trails ... like the last 1/2 mile going into Glen Aulin. Any ideas you have on how to minimize this problem would be appreciated.

Correspondence ID: 168 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,09,2013 11:02:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We strongly support the National Park Recommendation of Alternative 4. The Tuolumne River remains a pristine waterway with minimal to no environmental impact due to park activities. To further reduce contaminant levels, the most logical course of action would be to remove all wildlife from approaching the waterway and making them excrete 100 feet away from all water. Those who are most concerned and vocal about the water should first assure that the water they use is returned to the river as clean as it was when delivered to their home!

Correspondence ID: 169 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,09,2013 12:21:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative 4, "Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences" but without any increase in maximum day visitor use. I support the Actions Common to all Alternatives which make needed changes to protect the River and the meadows, including removal of roadside parking and the addition of off-road parking.

The off-road parking should be priced per unit time (such as a penny per minute) and the earnings should be given to users of the area served by the parking (use your best judgment), of driving age, in proportion to time spent in the area. You will need to develop the technology and the methods. This link will help you understand the needed system, as well as its potential.

<http://sierraclub.typepad.com/files/mike-bullock-parking-paper.pdf>

I also support Alternative 4's removal of the unneeded fueling station and mountaineering store and, most importantly, increases in public transit within and into the Park.

The parking proposal may seem fussy and someone else's job. I have done the math and there is no way the economic sector of cars and light-duty trucks will support GEO S-3-05 (climate stabilization; please google S-3-05) without our unbundling the cost of parking. Professor Shoup has estimated that 99% of car trips in the US end in bundled-cost parking. The methods and technology you develop will be a necessary tool to achieve a stabilized (at a livable level) climate.

All of your efforts are meaningless unless our climate is stabilized; our prospects look poor.

Call me at 760-754-8025 if you need a lead on a good vendor who would be happy to perform the design and implementation of the needed parking system. If you (park service) keep control of the patients, it will earn billions because unbundling the cost of parking is feasible mitigation under CEQA law and so it will be used everywhere, in time. There are a lot of parking spaces in the world.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 170 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 12:39:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote for alternative #3. My runner up is no action. Tuolumne is overburdened with too many visitors as it is and is being loved to death like much of Yosemite.

Correspondence ID: 171 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 12:48:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in full support of ALTERNATIVE FOUR (4.) Please retain the current Tuolumne Meadows camping and Tuolumne Meadows tent cabin facilities. I support the elimination of trail rides and limitation of High Sierra camp beds. I have been a faithful visitor of the high sierra in the park for 40 years and ask (beg) you to maintain the facilities in place. I have limitations that do not allow for backpacking. That said, I am an environmentally savvy park user and totally conform to all rules and regulations. We pack out every element we bring on our day hikes. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE implement Alternative 4. Thank you for your time. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 172 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 13:48:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a frequent guest to the Park, I welcome the preservation of nature. However, there has to be a better balance of visitor use facilities and lodging. Removing recreational activities (i.e., horses, etc.) and lodging units makes access and enjoyment of the Park that much more difficult.

I like the current balance of facilities and nature.

We want to avoid pushing visitor access out of the Park. What's next? Setting up web cams and allowing no humans to enter the Park?

Correspondence ID: 173 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 13:58:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Agree with all points except reduction in Glen Aulin. Leave at 32 as it's hard enough to get a spot especially since a late winter would reduce the spots available.

Correspondence ID: 174 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 22:25:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a longtime visitor to Tuolumne meadows, I have a keen appreciation of how special a place this really is. At the heart lies the Tuolumne River. My vote for alternative 2 is not in my family's best interest, but it is in the river's best interest.

I want my grandchildren to play in the Tuolumne. I want the clear, cold water to remain cold and clear. I want my grandchildren to marvel at how cold the water is. I want to see their bravery zipping down the water slide.

Thank you to whomever had the vision to create a plan. We only get one shot to enjoy this natural wonderland-let's keep the river as wild as possible!

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 175 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 22:38:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Neubacher, Mr. Yochim, and the Tuolumne Planning Team,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

I am surprised and pleased that Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative) comes close to being what I would consider a realistic optimum plan for Tuolumne Meadows and the Tuolumne River (I have no hope that Hetch Hetchy dam will be eliminated in my lifetime). Alternative 4 takes into account several excellent suggestions from the previous comments I was not confident would be part of the Preferred Alternative. The aspects that differ from the ideal are understandable when considering the previous comments throughout this planning process. Everyone involved in formulating this plan should be commended for incorporating the various ideas expressed in response to the scoping and draft comments to formulate Alternative 4.

Rather than give a long list of the aspects of Alternative 4 that I agree with, I will confine my comments to those particular details I disagree with and those aspects I suspect may cause negative comments due to the changes proposed.

The actions common to all alternatives for free flow, water quality, biological value for both the sub-alpine meadow and low elevation, cultural values, scenic values, and recreational value are all as they should be.

The one detail of Alternative 4 that I totally disagree with is retaining vehicle access to Parsons Lodge. It should be possible to provide disabled access without the road. Alternative 1 is the only alternative that eliminates vehicle access.

There are many aspects of Alternative 1 that are attractive, and, in certain respects, constitute the ideal situation for the Tuolumne River corridor and Tuolumne Meadows. However, as much as I would prefer the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp be closed, I realize that many strongly believe it should remain. Keeping the camp at a reduced size will hopefully mitigate some of the destructive aspects. One question I have is it possible for the employees at Glen Aulin to also use the composting toilet? Also, the impact of each and every High Sierra Camp should be studied with the possibility of decreasing their size or eliminating them.

Relocating the Cathedral Lakes trailhead to the old Visitor Center and relocating the Visitor Center to the area west of Unicorn Creek is the sort of creative analysis from the previous comments that help make Alternative 4 the best of the suggested alternatives. These changes alone will go a long way to improving the "visitor experience" at Tuolumne Meadows. Please do not allow the expected negative reactions to these changes to alter the final implemented plan. Eliminating the roadside parking on Tioga Road is another long-overdue improvement. The four roadside viewing turnouts will allow those traveling through to stop and see the Meadow. The expanded parking at the new Visitor Center, commercial services area, Wilderness Center, Dog Lake, and Lambert Dome will encourage people to not stop alongside Tioga Road and thus damage the meadow and create traffic hazards, and instead get out of their cars and possibly truly appreciate the Meadow.

Also, I suspect there will be objections to eliminating the gas station and mountaineering shop. Both of these actions are also long overdue. The backpacking items sold at the mountaineering shop can be sold at the store. While I was hoping for the elimination of the grill, it is obvious from the draft comments that most people want it to remain. If the inherent trash issues caused by the grill are dealt with, the grill's negative impact can be mitigated.

I am pleased Alternative 4 keeps the campground at its current capacity with A loop relocated. Alternative 2 (a disastrous alternative in most respects) includes adding 41 walk-in sites. While 41 sites are too many, I urge you to consider adding a smaller number of walk-in sites (perhaps 10 to 20).

I have been a regular visitor to Tuolumne Meadows for over 35 years and commented at each stage of the scoping and drafting process of this plan. I urge you to implement Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative). Though I have my minor disagreements with a couple of aspects (stated above) of the Preferred Alternative, please implement it as soon as possible. Under the Preferred Alternative, Tuolumne Meadows will remain an unmatched, unique place. Someone visiting Tuolumne Meadows in the next century will gaze on and revel in the same views across the meadow from Soda Springs towards the Cathedral Range that John Muir and Robert Underwood Johnson saw when they envisioned preserving this special place for future generations.

Thank you for your consideration of my observations and opinions.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	176	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,10,2013 11:19:12				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	We like the tent-frame cabins. I hope they will continue to be available. We did an overnight horse trip once. It was a great family experience and I hope they can continue. Thank you for your effort in making a good plan. - [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	177	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	[REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,10,2013 12:01:18				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yosemite is one of the most important places in our country, bar none. It needs/deserves all the protection it can get. Having said that, as a California resident for over 50 years, I visited Yosemite at least once a year, and often more. And I introduced my grandchildren to its wonders. Since I've moved to Oregon I no longer live close enough to have that privilege. When I visited I enjoyed the back country and the amenities in the park. I think that whatever can be safely done to encourage people to visit and overnight in the park, should be done. There is something unmeasurably wonderful that happens when spending a night in Yosemite. If the plan to increase more visitors can be done in an appropriate manner, that is what I would vote for. As the great man said "We all need beauty as well as bread...." Thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 178 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,10,2013 12:13:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of reducing the capacity for guests at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. I have been visiting Yosemite for almost 35 years and have worked summers in the High Country. It is important to provide access for all people to all of Yosemite including the meadows and high country, consistent with maintaining the resource for generations to come.

It has been my experience that the high sierra camps when operated in accord with modern principles of conservation and sustainability result in a balanced situation by which the aged and less able can enjoy Yosemite and not impair the environment.

Thank you for considering my comment

Correspondence ID: 179 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,10,2013 15:54:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Tuolumne Meadows is one of the greatest experiences in life! I have been camping in Tuolumne since I was a young child and therefore can state with accuracy that subtle changes over the years have begun to erode some of the experience. Please, DO NOT CHANGE ANYTHING. It is great as it is!

Correspondence ID: 180 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,10,2013 15:57:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been coming to Yosemite since 1959 and one of the most enjoyable, memorable, and educational adventures I have had in the park was a 7-day Hi Sierra Loop Trip. It was just above my comfort level and so was a great learning experience. I am not a super-strong young backpacker, but the loop trip was a perfect way for me to get deep into the backcountry, to see places that few Yosemite visitors ever experience. Most visitors never stray from their automobiles or buses, and therefore miss much of the park. The Loop trips provide a way for normal people to go far into the rest of the part and appreciate its wonders. Yosemite is a park for all people, not just the young and hardy, so the Loop trips are a key resource.

I see that you are thinking of shrinking Glen Alun which will reduce the number of people who can make the full loop trip. It's my park too, and I would like to see you EXPAND the hi sierra camps, perhaps installing new camps as public-private partnerships, like the mountain huts in Europe which are privately maintained by hiking clubs, but which are also open to all visitors (I have stayed in one and it was fantastic, on top of a mountain). Why can't you do something like that instead of reducing one of the best features of the park? Have you been listening to rabid environmentalists who never actually visit the park? I've been to Yosemite at least 40 times, and was just there in February. I wish your decisions were based on what actual visitors to the park desire, and I wish that we could have one vote for every time we visit and spend money in the park.

Please save the Hi Sierra Camps, and I hope you don't shrink the tent cabins at Tuolumne Meadows either: they are a wonderful way to visit the high country for day hikes, then return to a warm bed and a good meal at dark.

Correspondence ID: 181 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,10,2013 16:47:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. I am impressed by and appreciate the obvious level of effort and thought that NPS staff members have put into developing the plan and the four alternatives. I have been visiting Tuolumne Meadows (T.M.) and the surrounding high country for nearly 60 years and it is one of my favorite places in this country. Over that time I have seen many changes, some for the better, some not. It always has been the "quieter, wilder setting"(quote from the plan)of the Meadows and surroundings that has appealed to me, and I believe it is important to maintain and restore this setting for the future. I have explored much of the Tuolumne River corridor above Hetch-Hetchy, and twice in recent years have hiked the High Sierra Loop, staying in all of the High Sierra Camps.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

With that background, my first comment is that "no action" clearly is unacceptable now. The Meadows have been degraded over time and the experience of visiting them has deteriorated in some ways. Elsewhere in the river corridor, there are concerns that need to be addressed.

In general, I support Alternative 4 (the preferred alternative) as a carefully-crafted response to the issues identified. I do not object to any of the major elements of that alternative, although I do have ways that I would like to see it modified and strengthened and some questions about how parts of it will be applied.

Here are some of the key parts of Alternative 4 that I support: 1. Eliminating roadside parking along the Tioga Road in T.M. for all the reasons you cite and providing designated parking elsewhere. 2. Eliminating and restoring social trails throughout the T.M. area. 3. Keeping Gen Aulin HSC open (see comments below regarding capacity). 4. Retaining the T.M. Lodge at approximately its current capacity while removing cabins from near river. 5. Maximum possible meadow/riparian restoration. 6. Removal of the gas station and mountaineering school. 7. Building a new visitor contact station closer to other facilities to encourage less driving. 8. Reducing impacts from stock use in the corridor by eliminating commercial day trips with stock in the Wilderness and reducing overnight stock use in Lyell Canyon. 9. Providing a full range of orientation and interpretation services in the Meadows both to help people enjoy the area and to educate visitors to minimize their impacts. 10. Improving transit capacity to T.M. and frequency within the area, again to encourage less driving.

Suggested Changes to Alternative 4 1. Minimize Reduced Capacity of Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. I believe that the High Sierra Camps offer a unique way for people to experience Yosemite and opportunity to help people understand why the park is special and engage them in caring about its future. They certainly are a "traditional" way to enjoy the park. My backpacking days are pretty much over, but I still enjoy hiking and experiencing the backcountry without having to carry a heavy pack. I consider visiting all of them among the best things I have ever done. At the same time, I understand that Glen Aulin has particular environmental issues that, because it is the only camp in the river corridor, must be addressed.

I am concerned about eliminating three cabins there, however, because it will significantly reduce the number of people who can experience staying there and, I assume, necessitate an increase in prices to cover expenses with fewer guests. I even wonder how it might affect the economic viability of the camp. Yet, I appreciate all of the reasons for proposing this reduction. Nevertheless, I recommend that you carefully consider reducing capacity by less than the amount proposed in Alternative 4, perhaps removing just one or two of the cabins. Could you set a limit to occupancy independent of the number of cabins? This would eliminate the need to make capacity reductions in multiples of four people and might allow the camp more flexibility in accommodating parties of different sizes.

To help address the desire to reduce the impacts of stock on the trail leading to the camp, could you make Glen Aulin a hike-in only camp. It has appeared to me that the negative impacts of stock have been especially noticeable right at Glen Aulin Camp. Of course, I do not know what percentage of overnight guests currently arrive by foot or stock or how such a change would affect business there.

2. Eliminate parking along the road to the stable, also. The most unpleasant hiking I have done in the area is along that road, which serves as the trail to Glen Aulin from the parking areas at Lembert Dome or closer to the Lodge. The impacts of parking on that roadside are basically the same as along Tioga Road. Allowing parking there encourages people to drive there each day. Eliminating that parking would help create a much more natural environment and experience.

3. Eliminate the social trail from near Pothole Dome down to the river. This is not so much a change as a request for extra care. I was surprised and disappointed after hiking for a couple of hours from T.M. toward Glen Aulin a few years ago to scramble up a nearby dome and find myself looking down on scores of people at a "beach" on the river complete with coolers, chairs and umbrellas. I assume that the informal parking at Pothole Dome is the point of origin for people walking down to this point, which seems to be inside the Wilderness boundary and the Wild segment 5 of the river. I am concerned that a formal parking area at the dome, along with building a trail to the top of the falls, will perpetuate this "traditional" activity. Please consider how you will prevent this if a parking area is built.

4. Reduce water demand. The draft states that "any increase in water withdrawals could decrease wetted habitat." I am concerned about the increased demand for water under Alternative 4 and would like to see it reduced. I suggest two steps to do this:

(1) Remove the current grill at T.M. Unless there has been change in the last two years, the current one is inadequate at peak times, with long lines forming and people spreading out around it to eat; the food quality has been poor. It also generates waste that must be disposed of. I do not believe its historical importance justifies retaining it. (2) Do not replace the few campsites that will be removed, thus slightly lowering campground capacity.

5. Reduce the overall "carbon footprint." Climate change is affecting resources in the park and river corridor, and driving vehicles also diminishes the visitor experience in the T.M. area while contributing to climate change. Therefore, I would like to see a section in the plan focused on reducing the overall carbon footprint and greater efforts to reduce driving. Some proposed

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

steps already address this concern and others could be added: (1) Eliminating roadside parking, designated parking areas, increased transit capacity and frequency, a new visitor contact station closer to other facilities, not permitting kayaking/canoeing, and a walking path linking facilities will all help. (2) In addition, eliminating parking on the stable road and removing the grill will decrease destinations for driving. (3) Also consider making the path connecting facilities suitable for bicycles and having a bike rental service available; limiting trailhead parking and promoting the use of transit to reach trailheads; creative ways to further promote and encourage transit use; and whether the lodge could be required to provide shuttle service from elsewhere.

6. Manage for greater solitude opportunities on selected trails. The plan states that "increasing day use threatens to diminish opportunities for solitude" on some trails. Alternative 4 will allow day use to increase but does not propose managing for greater solitude. I would prefer a proactive approach that manages for fewer encounters on selected trails. These would not necessarily be the most popular trails; they might include ones currently offering solitude where that experience could most readily be maintained.

Questions 1. How will you enforce limited parking times at the new pull-outs? I know signs were mentioned in the webinar, but time limits have a way of getting stretched without adequate enforcement. Will you have the resources? What will keep social trails from developing at the pull-outs? To a degree, pull-outs encourage motor vehicle use, also. 2. Would it be possible designate parking for people staying at the campground (or lodge) before and after a multi-day hike in the backcountry? This has been a logistical challenge in the past. 3. At an earlier stage in this planning process, I believe there was a proposal to pull the dining hall away from the river along with some cabins. But I don't see the dining hall mentioned now. Is this not considered feasible? 4. I am not sure of the difference between a visitor center and a contact station. Will the new one be large enough to accommodate the levels of use experienced at the current one (which gets very crowded) as well as a bookstore? 5. In the section on ORVs, only the stairstep morphology is mentioned as a geologic value. I have always been impressed by the glacial polish to be found on slopes above the river. Could that be added as a value to be protected? Of course, there are other glacial features, too.

Correspondence ID:	182	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,10,2013 20:54:20				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I congratulate you on the Tuolumne River Plan. My only concern is the reduction of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp to levels too low to adequately take care of the hikers and riders wanting to use it. It seems it would curtail the High Sierra Camp Loop walks and rides if there are inadequate beds at any one of the camps. The day hiker might be the loser with this reduction.				
Correspondence ID:	183	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,10,2013 21:25:30				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I am 64 and have been hiking the high sierra camps for 15 years. I stay in the tent cabins on independent hikes, sometimes I hike solo, some summers I hike with up to 6 or 8 in a group. Of the plans offered, I choose plan 4. I haven't had the time to read the whole plan document and don't know why it only addresses Tuolumne Meadows and Glen Aulin camps. I love to fish (catch and release) at the camps as it is a beautiful place to fish. I have been told by camp personnel quite a few years ago that the forest service has discontinued stocking due to a variety of reasons. That may be well and good but at least tell guests to practice catch and release whenever possible and use barbless hooks, etc so the remaining trout will be there for our enjoyment. It would be nice to have some rafts or small inflatable boats at Merced Lake for the guests to use. It is such a nice lake and would be great to be able to go out in it. Also for May Lake. You could cut back on the food at the camps and make it simpler and also keep the cost down for us that aren't wealthy. The cost of the high sierra camps has gone up dramatically the last decade. The impact on the trails from the mule trips is quite pronounced from the disturbance of the trail as well as the copious amounts of mule and horse dung all over the trail. There is a need for supply mule trains but the other passenger carrying ones could be eliminated and limited to the valley..				
Correspondence ID:	184	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,10,2013 21:25:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I oppose alt 1 and 4 if they would reduce accessibility to Glen Aulin HSC. Glen Aulin HSC allows the public who may not be able to carry full backpacking gear to experience and see the beauty of the Tuolumne canyon, and its use must not be restricted. Also I support full access for boating on the Tuolumne. Rafting and Kayaking has less environmental impact than hiking or rock climbing and should no longer be prohibited. thank you [REDACTED]				
Correspondence ID:	185	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 07:42:26				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Oh my gosh! I understand the need to move tents back from the river at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp, but to reduce the already small number of overnights from 32 to 20, seems to present undue hardship to the loop trail hiking program, campers, staffers, and all interested parties. I worked at Glen Aulin in the summer of 1966 and then completed the loop trail in a group led by a				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

ranger in the summer of 2008. I wish you could retain the 32 number, but move the tents back from the river to a new location, to retain the potential for even a few more people to visit the camp overnight.

Correspondence ID: 186 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 10:57:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative 4, "Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences" but without any increase in maximum day visitor use. I support removal of the unneeded fueling station and mountaineering store in Alternative 4. I also support increased public transport into and within the Park. Among actions common to all of the alternatives, I support the needed changes to protect the River and the meadows, including removal of roadside parking and the addition of offroad parking.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 187 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 12:57:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Seems like a good plan to me. I assume the reduction at Glen Aulen is based on usage record

Correspondence ID: 188 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 15:01:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Not in favor of discontinuing the use of stock. Some people are not able to walk around as easily as others. for some it is a the only way to see TM beyond the road. Yosemite has survived with the horses and mules for years. It is not like the stock is roaming free. there are already designated trails for the stock. Maybe reduce the amount of people allowed on the rides or the amount of rides that go out. Do NOT completely take away the day rides. There is a place to meet in the middle, it's called compromise.

Correspondence ID: 189 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 15:02:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Park People,

I support Alternative 4. We must improve the visitor experience and safety at Tuolumne Meadows/River. I am very glad parking will be restricted along the road at Cathedral Peak TH. This is a very dangerous situation.

I support more public transportation both to and within the Park. We really must do more to reduce our carbon footprint. The NPS should lead on this front.

I support removal of the gas station and mountaineering store. This will be an economic boon to the communities outside the Park, particularly Lee Vining. We go to the park to see nature, not to buy stuff.

I am happy to see the restoration of meadow and riparian habitat.

Thanks for letting me comment.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 190 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 16:42:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: under the plan the removal of the beds at Glen Aulin camp would severely restrict the use of the 5 camps as a circle route, we have done it a few times and actually one camp was closed and we did a 18 mile hike between camps one day, it was a long and tiring day. i believe in order to let most people enjoy the out door camps and high sierra camps no changes to #s should be done.

regards. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 191 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 17:20:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a born and raised mountain boy and veteran I have been going to Yosemite ever since I can remember. My family has worked there and supported the national park for over 25 years. It is my firm belief that the stables have been and will continue to be a large part in young adults lives! There is a vanishing number of places one can go to learn the hardworking trade of horsemanship. I have seen firsthand young adults changing their lives working at the stables, learning new skills, taught to work hard, having pride in their work, and learning the country lifestyle!

Correspondence ID: 192 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 17:59:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the proposed alternative four.

I spent a wonderful week last fall in the park doing the High Sierra Loop Trail. I noticed the heavy negative environmental impact of the horse trips, particularly in the Tuolumne Meadows area. The Glen Aulin area also seemed to be overused as well with quite a bit of degradation to the trail and camp area. It seems to me that the measured reductions of use would be most beneficial to the long term health of the park while still allowing significant use by visitors. Thank you for considering my comments on this matter.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 193 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 18:48:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Have been camping with my family in Tuolumne every summer for the past 25 years. I support alternative 4 while recognizing the real impacts of visitation on the resource. The degradation of the trails is primarily due to horses - do the math on mass of a human vs a loaded horse. Compare the trails without daily pack trains vs those with. I've used the horse services but feel we need to reduce their impact. The pack trains to the high Sierra camps (which I would hate to see closed) are high impact and there must be something we can do to lessen their impact short of diminishing the HSC services. Lets get some smart people working on this with the wranglers and also exploring alternatives to horses.

Please resist the temptation to make the Tuolumne experience into a hotel experience - making it completely comfy, with plentiful hot showers and private bathrooms would come at terrible cost to the aesthetic of the site - let the folks in lee vining serve these needs.

Correspondence ID: 194 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 18:49:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'd like to voice my strenuous oposition to any reduction in proposed number of tents at the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (and any of the other High Sierra Camps)

The current camp capacity of 32 guests is already a very small number, making it already incredibly difficult for those visitors wishing to see one of the most beautiful and remote parts of Yosemite.

I have been fortunate enough to stay at the High Sierra camps on 3 different ocaisions, each time being fortunate enough to get space through the lottery system or a last minute cancellation.

Please don't restrict this rare and precious opportunity by decrasing the very small capacity that is already in place.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 195 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 20:18:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Tuolomne River Plan presentation is very clear and interesting. The proposed parking capacity will be expanded from 533 to 914. Why public transportation alternative is not considered, it would have smaller environmental impact and improve

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

experience of the meadows by reducing the number of cars. I think that increasing the number of parking spaces is not the right way to go for the future.

Correspondence ID:	196	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	retired - Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 21:14:29				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	We are for Plan 4, I don't think removing the gas station is a good idea. You will need housing for a Rangers and staff at the new Stables site when the NPS corral and DNC are combined. You can't mix the stock as they carry disease that might be detrimental to other stock animals				

Correspondence ID:	197	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	self Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 22:13:23				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Having been a lifetime hiker and back country devotee of Yosemite, I believe that efforts should be made to preserve and enhance access to the High Sierra Camps and to allow these unique entities to continue as they have been functioning historically. Equally, horse and mule riding should remain unchanged.				

I am worried here that there is misplaced concern by stakeholder groups regarding perceived ways that park visitors may be permitted to have a rugged outdoor experience. This goes far beyond hiking and backpacking, but to the entire gamut of High Sierra Camps, horse packing, and day rides in the Tuolumne Meadows.

Personally, I would like to see similar venues in Yosemite, similar to the European refuges that exist along the Haute Route in France/Switzerland and similar byways, where recreational opportunities exist during all seasons of the year.

If a visitor seeks to enjoy Yosemite and stay overnight at one of the High Sierra Camps, sleep on the ground, or ride a mule in the back country, the NPS should be accommodating of a variety of perspectives versus attempting to limit them.

Correspondence ID:	198	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 23:50:46				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I love the Sierra High Country and while I am in favor of the majority of your plan, I OBJECT strongly to the severe limitation that is proposed by the drastic reduction of overnight capacity at Glen Aulin Sierra High Camp. Such a measure would destroy many hiker's ability to complete the loop in its present form. Many of hikers rely on the high camps to give up a back country "feel" that we would otherwise be unable to access on our own do to limits in time / resources / ability. Please leave Glen Aulin as it currently stands.				

Correspondence ID:	199	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,12,2013 09:25:02				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I just spent 8 days at the Tuolumne camp and high sierra camps. please do not change anything. What you are proposing is far to limiting.				

Correspondence ID:	200	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,12,2013 12:00:21				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I am concerned about the reduction of sites at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp to 20 from 32. It is extremely difficult to win the lottery to visit the Yosemite Wilderness camps. The reduction in sites will make it even more difficult for most of us to have a chance to experience the beauty of the Yosemite back country.				

My wife is 65 years old with back injuries that prevent her from carrying a full pack. We still love the Yosemite back-country. The High Sierra camps allow us to enjoy the Yosemite back country without having to carry the weight of a full pack loaded with tent, sleeping bag, pad and stove.

Glen Aulin has a Shangrila type beauty. By reducing the tent sites at the High Sierra camp, you are discriminating against people with age and disabilities who still love the wilderness.

Is there not another solution such as treating and packing out human waste that would prevent the reduction in sites?

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Thank you for your consideration. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 201 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,12,2013 12:46:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Tuolumne River Plan, alternative 4, as presented is prefect. The plan when implemented will let future generations enjoy the meadow. Reduced street parking and keeping visitor facilities about the same is what should be done.

I do have a minor suggestion and that is that a trail guide with signs be made for the new trail from the new Contact Station to Parsons Lodge. I suggest this to help first time visitors to the meadow appreciate the meadow more. Getting to know how the meadow was formed by the glaciers, the history, John Muir activities, and sheep grazing, are some things that will help them understand what an amazing place it is. I would also suggest signs pointing out the names of the surrounding peaks and domes.

Correspondence ID: 202 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,12,2013 17:39:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a strong supporter of the High Sierra Camp system, I have read with much interest the Tuolumne River Plan's discussion of water usage, waste disposal, septic system, etc. at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp.

I agree completely with replacing the flush toilets with composting units, eliminating day saddle trips, and all reasonable efforts to reduce water usage. However, I believe that the preferred Alternative 4's plan to reduce the number of beds at Glen Aulin from 32 to 20 is excessive.

The High Sierra Camps make it possible for those who are not capable of backpacking to see and learn about the Yosemite backcountry. A key component of the High Sierra Camp system is the ability to hike all or part of the loop from camp to camp. This affords the opportunity to experience the diverse backcountry between the camps rather than doing multiple in-and-out hikes. With only 32 beds, Glen Aulin already has the smallest capacity of the five camps. Sharply reducing the capacity at Glen Aulin would make it impossible for many to have the opportunity not only to experience the Glen Aulin area but also to hike between Glen Aulin and May Lake. Many fewer people would be able to coordinate a five-camp complete loop hike.

I suggest trying a more modest reduction in capacity at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp -- perhaps to 28 beds. Prohibiting stays for more than 2 nights at the Camp would also help. Restricting usage of the nearby backpacker's campground would also help -- they get their potable water from the spigot at the High Sierra Camp! I reluctantly support the idea of eliminating the meals-only option at Glen Aulin -- it would help achieve some of the Plan's goals, but at the detriment of those who are only capable of light backpacking (without food, bear canister, etc.). You could always make a further capacity reduction to 24 or 20 beds later if necessary, but an excessive initial reduction would be hard to reverse.

Correspondence ID: 203 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,08,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: March 6, 2013

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a Colorado resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

My family and I use boating as a way to be together and enjoy the natural world. We have done lots of rock-climbing, backpacking and photography all over the park and it seems silly to keep people off the river's. It is just another way to enjoy this amazing environment with way less impacts that other approved uses. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	204	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern:				

After reviewing the Alternatives, I am dismayed at any further limitations on commercial stock.

I am an avid environmentalist. But I do not believe there is any conclusive evidence that pack trains' use of trails and grazing has any cumulative negative impact.

I believe that studies concluding otherwise have been skewed in favor of extremist viewpoints.

In August of 2011, I participated in a 5 day horseback trek into the high country, camping at the Merced River and at Emeric Lake. This was a lifelong dream fulfilled.

Because of my physical limitations---I have Rheumatoid Arthritis---this was the only way I could enjoy the interior of my national park.

For people who are unable to hike long distances, there is no option for seeing the grandeur of the high country in person. For the outfitters, the ability to graze is essential for efficient operation.

There is evidence (that has been ignored) that grazing actually improves the health of the meadows.

Mules and horses were instrumental in building the trails and opening the park to tourism. In addition to their historic presence, it has not been proven to my satisfaction that their continued use is detrimental in any significant way. In my experience, people on foot leave far more evidence of their passing. Mountain bike's knobby tires tear up trails far more than hooves.

If you apply more limits to commercial stock in the parks and eliminate day rides, you are not only limiting access. You are harming local economies.

Please be smart about this and amend Alternative 4.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	205	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear friends in Yosemite,				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the options for Tuolumne Meadows and the surrounding area.

Of the various alternatives, I prefer no action, followed by alternative 2, then alternative 3.

I think it is wrong-headed to restrict the current access and services in the high camp, and the mules that supply them. Allowing a more diverse body of visitors to the high country than just hard-core backpackers increases public appreciation and ultimately support for the park. If you shut everyone out, they won't be there to object when some corporate pawn in a powerful position decides we should mine or dam Yosemite Valley. Also, the presence of the rangers and High Camp staffers helps to educate visitors, and also encourages better behavior and treatment of the wilderness.

Again, thanks for the chance to comment. I hope you'll find a plan we can all live with, that protects the park and allows visitors to experience the wonders of Yosemite.

Best wishes, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	206	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Mr. Neubacher Thank you for proposing limited access for boats to Yosemite.				

There are numerous alternative rivers outside of Yosemite which offer places for modern paddler, none offer the experience to enjoy a river without frequent interruptions by boats. Such a unique experience -a wild river without modern boats- is the type of river esthetic the Wild and Scenic River Act sought to protect.

Thank You

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	207	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please do not reduce the number of people able to use Glen Aulin on any given night. This is an amazing introduction to the Yosemite back country / wilderness for many people who might not ever experience it otherwise. The back country of Yosemite gains more protections when people can visit and find out what treasures are truly there.				

There are ways to mitigate the impact that people have in the area without such a radical reduction in the numbers as is proposed in the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Tuolumne River Plan/DEIS).

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards, [REDACTED] Glen Aulin visitor, summer 2012

Correspondence ID:	208	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Hi, I vote for Alternative 2. My second choice is No Action. I have been coming to Yosemite Na. Park for years, and the High Country never appeared too crowded to us when we went there. If this is not the correct way of providing input, please let me know. Thank you, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	209	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	I used to backpack near Tuolumne Meadows many years ago.				

Correspondence ID:	210	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,06,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,

Attached is a letter to express my support of opening the full length of the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers to recreational boaters.

Thank you for your time and dedication to our National Parks. They are, I believe, our greatest accomplishment.

Attached letter:

3/6/2013 Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Dear Superintendent Neubacher, I am writing this letter to express my support of opening Merced and Tuolumne Rivers in their entirety to recreational boaters. I am an avid kayaker who has traveled the country paddling some of the best rivers to be found. While my home base is in Colorado, to date, my favorite place I've ever visited is Yosemite National Park. To experience the magnificence of that area from the calm, quiet space of my kayak on the water would be a remarkable experience. Boating (kayaking and canoeing) is a low--?impact and wilderness--?compliant way to experience the natural beauty of any area. With the proper management plan and regulations these rivers could experience very little impact compared to that of hikers, campers, recreational vehicle enthusiasts, and even climbers. Boaters should have the option of paddling a river that meets their abilities and flows thru public land. Kayaking has transformed my life. It has given me a greater appreciation for natural beauty, wilderness, and solitude and led me to become a Wilderness Ranger, Leave No Trace Instructor and a general naturalist. Boating incorporates all senses and is in many ways therapeutic. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 211 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,07,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear NPS:

Yosemite National Park is a place I hold sacred. My now late father began taking my sister and me to the park, including the High Country, when I was 11 years old. Stays at Tuolumne Meadows and the High Sierra Camps were an integral part of our experience.

I see that one of the proposed plans would eliminate the tent cabins at Tuolumne and Glen Aulin. I certainly understand the need to reduce stress on those areas, but please do not deny people the full-service experience of those camps. Their beauty is unsurpassed and "breakfast and dinner in the big tent" are wonderful. I still remember a fabulous bowl of slow-cooked oatmeal I had at Glen Aulin when I was a kid.

Not everyone wants the full "backpacking" experience. The tent camps provide an opportunity to get out and savor the High Country without having to carry all one's equipment or set up and break down camp every day. I imagine they also provide a great experience for the people who work at the camps.

It seems, after reading the plans, that Plan 4 is the most viable all around, and I urge you to go with this plan.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 212 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,06,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Neubacher,

I am writing you to discuss the Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. I am a whitewater kayaker that has enjoyed kayaking in national parks all over the country including the Great Smoky Mountains national park in TN and NC, Black canyon of the Gunnison national park in CO, Kings Canyon national park and sequoia national park in CA. I have traveled through Yosemite

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

only to get from one side of the divide to the other; I have never utilized its full outdoor beauty and recreational potential mainly due to the fact that whitewater/river recreation is off limits.

I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to river recreational use. The outdoor activities that the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers offer are extremely low impact, the infrastructure to access the park is already in place via roads and trails. There are many sections of river that range in difficulty from class 1-5 and would allow yet another avenue for the public to enjoy the beauty of Yosemite national park. I know that if you open the rivers to travel I will along with many of my friends and family visit and explore the park.

Thank you for your time,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	213	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,06,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Hi, I'm an expert level class V kayaker originally from Ca. I travel to the Sierras at least once a year to kayak. It is always with regret that I think about Yosemite and how the paddling opportunities are so severely restricted. We are talking about one of the most amazing places in the world! My sport is low impact, and I feel that it is only fair that I should be allowed to pursue my sport without unreasonable restrictions. I've had the opportunity to raft the legal section of the Merced in the park a couple times. They have been some of the best experiences I've had in Yosemite. You get many of the great views of the valley. Please consider allowing responsible use of the rivers in the National Park. Thanks, [REDACTED] WA				

Correspondence ID:	214	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,06,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Superintendent Don Neubacher				

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389

Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a California resident and a Class III-V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

As a new father and a lifelong avid fan of wilderness and rafting, the thought of being able to share Yosemite and these priceless rivers with my children is a dream I would love to see come true. California already has some great whitewater, but too often I see it being dismissed in favor of Idaho, Utah, or Colorado as destinations. Opening these waterways would change that dramatically. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	215	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,06,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	3/6/13 Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park ? Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov Dear Superintendent Neubacher, As a California resident and a Class 3+ paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating. Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities. I grew up boating in California and they are memories I have will last a lifetime. To often I have spent my adult life boating in other areas of the country due to lack of availability in California. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating. Sincerely, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	216	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,06,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 6, 2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389

Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a Montana resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. Living in the heart of Western Montana I am well aware of these types of river access concerns. Not to many years ago our very own Yellowstone National Park was at the crossroads similar to the one Yosemite is facing. Unfortunately, the decision to open the beautiful rives of Yellowstone National Park to boated fell on deaf ears. I am hopeful that you and your staff will be more open minded and take into account comments like mine and many others who truly respect our nation's river systems and only wish to enjoy them while floating through creations natural corridors.

As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

I find myself on river corridors throughout much of the spring, summer and fall, an experience that I share with my closest friends and family as often as I can. I travel throughout much of the West in pursuit of these opportunities. If Yosemite National Park were to open all of its Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne River miles, I would be there at the first opportunity to enjoy your park and say thank you the best way I know how, but floating through the park. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	217	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 5, 2013 Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park ? Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov Dear Superintendent Neubacher,				

I am writing to support opening more rivers in Yosemite Park to kayaking. I am avid paddler who loves paddling around Yosemite on whitewater big and small(class II-V+). As someone who lives in California, I would love to see more of the rivers to the park opened to kayaking. Yosemite has some of the most spectacular rivers and whitewater of any place on earth, and it seems a shame to have a blanket restriction forbidding much of it.

From an impact perspective, kayaking has a minimal impact on the river and surrounding land. Boating is easily regulated and can help the park offer more activities without overwhelm its fragile ecosystems.

Thank you for considering opening more of the Merced and Tuolumne watersheds.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	218	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	3/5/13				

Superintendent Don Neubacher

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389

Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a frequent visitor to Yosemite National Park and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	219	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Neubacher,				

I am writing to ask that you consider allowing whitewater boating on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers in Yosemite. Paddling is, by nature, extremely low-impact, and kayakers have an excellent record of environmental responsibility in keeping our rivers clean and healthy. Opening these rivers would require little to no regulatory energy, as paddling in other areas of the Sierras works just fine with no regulation whatsoever. Please consider allowing the personal freedom to enjoy this incredibly rewarding sport in the park.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	220	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please open Yosemite to paddling. The Merced and Tuolumne are beautiful rivers and should be open to paddling. Paddling is human-powered, place-based, low-impact, quiet, non-consumptive, skill-based, and Wilderness-compliant. In short, it is exactly the kind of activity and experience that the Park system was created to foster. Banning boating on our public rivers doesn't line up with National Park System policy, and prohibiting paddling on Wild and Scenic Rivers is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their individual skills and abilities. Thank You, [REDACTED]				

[REDACTED] Managing Partner 4 Corners Riversports [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	221	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park ? Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov Dear Superintendent Neubacher, I spend half the year in California in the foothills of the Sierra. I am a backpacker, climber and also Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river. I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on the Park's Draft Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. Paddling throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years. It is past time to correct this. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I support opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to paddling. Paddling is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Paddling should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, paddlers should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities. More so than climbing, paddling is self-regulating as far as matching difficulty to ability.

Paddling is a pure and simple way to experience the park. It is like floating a trail instead of backpacking it. It appeals to me more and more as my body ages*:) happy

Please reconsider your preferred alternatives for both plans and make sure paddling the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne rivers are open to paddling. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	222	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Superintendent Don Neubacher				

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a California resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

I have taken my 4 children and wife to Yosemite and many other national parks many times, and we also raft and kayak together as a family often. I have been around the world camping, hiking and boating, and I truly believe that Yosemite is unrivaled its beauty and as a natural treasure. To see Yosemite from the river and experience the park would be remarkable and exactly in the spirit of our National Parks. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	223	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Neubacher, I am a Class 4-5 paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating. Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities. My family and I would really enjoy boating together all over the US. It has been a passion that was passed down to me and I have passed it down to my children. A boating trip through Yosemite would be a vacation of a lifetime! Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 224 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Hello, American Whitewater has brought to my attention your plans to revamp Yosemite's plan for the future, and I would like to ask you to strongly consider allowing kayaking within the park boundaries. I work for a nonprofit called First Descents that takes young adult cancer fighters and survivors on weeklong adventure therapy trips (ie kayaking). I know that my organization would love to have the opportunity to share beautiful places like Yosemite with less deserving people who may not be able to get there on their own. I think allowing access to the parks waterways in a way that promotes both stewardship of the land and conservation is exactly the kind of promotion the National Park system needs in order to get future generations excited about protecting our natural areas. We bring in over 600 participants a year into national parks such as Glacier, Great Smokey Mountains, Arches, The Tetons, Rocky Mountain, to name a few and we would love to be able to go to Yosemite in the future. I am not trying to simply expand our programs, but I truly feel that exposing people to these areas is the only way to understand why we need to keep fighting for them. I have seen the power of these areas as a place of healing and I want nothing more than for every opportunity to be given to different demographics to experience the places I love so much. Thank you for considering this in your proposal and feel free to contact me with any questions. -- [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 225 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: I recently visited and fell in love with Yosemite. I am also an avid whitewater kayaker. It is not hard to imagine that I encourage you to lift the ban on boating the Tuolumne River. It seems like a natural step considering visitors can hike and camp in pristine wilderness areas, climb El Cap and other great rocks, and even hike to the top of Half Dome....all with a permit system that maintains the environment and quality of the experience. It seems like paddling the Tuolumne would fit with all the other incredible experiences. And like climbers, hikers and wilderness backpackers, paddlers tend to be very respectful to their environment that we treasure.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on this important issue [REDACTED] Sent from my iPad

Correspondence ID: 226 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Please open up Yosemite to kayaking. We are respectful, and very low impact to the environment. There are incredible opportunities in that park, it's a shame it is currently illegal to paddle there. Thank you, and feel free to contact me any time. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 227 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: I hear you are considering allowing paddling on the river...I would love to paddle the Tuolumne! -- [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 228 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,06,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: PLEASE DO ALL YOU CAN TO SAVE THE YOSEMITE HIGH CAMPS, ESPECIALLY THE RANGER-LED TRIPS. THEY ARE AN INVALUABLE ASSET. THEY TEACH CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION IN A UNIQUE WAY TO PEOPLE WHO MIGHT NOT GET SUCH A POWERFUL MESSAGE. THANK YOU. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 229 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,06,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Enjoying rivers and nature from the water is an experience that should not be banned anywhere. Please consider access for

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

boaters who act in a responsible manner. It is easier to convince people to protect something that have had the pleasure to enjoy.
Regards, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 230 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,06,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov Dear Superintendent Neubacher, As a traveler and avid whitewater paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

For over 20 years I've been a whitewater boater, and have travelled to many areas with my family in pursuit of those perfect days on the water. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 231 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,12,2013 22:27:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please accept my comments on the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. I support Alternative 4 "Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences." However, I believe there must not be any increase in maximum day visitor use. Yosemite is so popular and receives so many visitors, any increase would be very harmful to the natural resources and damaging to the river as well as to the visitor experience.

I support the Actions Common to all Alternatives, which removes roadside parking and adding additional off-road parking. These actions would protect the river and the meadows. Removing the unneeded fueling station and mountaineer store is desirable and protects the meadow and the river.

Increasing public transit into the park and within the park would allow more people to visit without increasing automobile traffic would help preserve a rewarding visitor experience and help keep air pollution down.

Yosemite is a treasure and every American deserves to have it protected and preserved for a wonderful visitor experience for now and for the future. Thank you for a proposed management plan that could afford that protection.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 232 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,12,2013 23:22:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The plan with the preferred alternative, I support. I believe it is the best way to support the restoration of the meadow while maintaining access to all types of visitors, not just citizens who prefer back packing in. One request I have is to reexamine retaining commercial horse day rides. This is another way for visitors to experience the meadow in a way reminiscent of the original explorers.

Correspondence ID: 233 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Received: Mar,13,2013 00:25:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

In reviewing all the options for the Tuolumne River DEIS, I'm concerned that the preferred option (4) lacks some of the better attributes of restoration than the others. One would think that a preferred outcome from an environmental impact assessment would have restoration of habitat a primary concern and emphasis.

Like myself, those of us who have had the pleasure of enjoying Yosemite NP natural beauty using the facilities that are currently provided, there is a tacit understanding and acceptance that resources are limited. Each year, there will be those who are fortunate, and those that aren't, to make Yosemite a vacation destination due to those limitations. Thus to support an option that does not focus on the best restoration plan seems contradictory to the best interests of our natural resources.

I'd be curious to know if any consideration was given to upgrading and/or making the current public facilities more eco-friendly, rather than spending funds on expansion of those facilities, however "slight" that expansion seems.

Correspondence ID: 234 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,13,2013 18:42:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You make no mention of May Lake , Sunrise , and the other camp sites ... Does this mean you are abolishing them.... This is one of the most special spiritual places in America ... Has this land been sold to China in trust... Please there must be another way to keep the land and trees open to hikers and overnighers at Sierra camps. It is such a treasure .It breaks my heart to hear this be called progress, when in reality , special interest groups have rallied to take this from the common folk [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 235 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,13,2013 20:44:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for allowing the public to comment on the Tuolumne River Draft EIS. I am a member of the Tuolumne Group Sierra Club, Audubon, and Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center. Wilderness and nature is very important to me. A clean and safe world is very important to me. Yosemite National Park is a very special place to me. The Tuolumne River is very dear to me, I have hiked, biked, swam, and paddled along most of its length. Thank you again for considering my comments.

Levels of recreational use should be given a lower priority than protecting the river and all of the living things that depend on it. Restoration is very important. Campsites such as Loop A campsites and the adjacent road segment that squeezes into the river corridor and restricts wildlife movement should be removed or modified. The Tuolumne Lodge facility should be removed, or moved or reconstructed further back from the river. Although Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is used by some visitors to Yosemite, it has a huge impact on the wilderness values of the Tuolumne River. Stock impacts are impressive (I have hiked many times to Glen Aulin, and have backpacked along the Grand Canyon of Tuolumne several times. This camp should be converted into a backpackers camp or removed to lessen the impact to the Tuolumne River.

Tuolumne Meadows is very crowded and congested. Visitors should be dispersed along Tioga Road to help protect the Tuolumne River.

Correspondence ID: 236 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Chair Sierra Club Bay Area Wilderness committee Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,13,2013 22:06:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative 4, "Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences" but not an increase in maximum day visitor use. I want the removal of the unneeded fueling station and mountaineering store, including removal of roadside parking and the addition of offroad parking, and transit within and into the Park. Please, lets preserve it's wild beauty and remind ourselves that less is more.

Thank You, [REDACTED] Chair Sierra Club Bay Area Wilderness Committee

Correspondence ID: 237 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,13,2013 22:16:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Preferred Alternative's (Alternative 4) specific proposal to reduce overnight lodging at Glen Aulin HSC from 32 guests to 20 guests is unsupported by the TRP, and is unnecessary to achieve the stated goal of protecting and enhancing river values. Further, the proposed drastic reduction of guest lodging would have a severe and immediate impact on persons of limited physical abilities (to wit, the young, the elderly and the mildly disabled) who rely on available accommodations in High Sierra Camps to provide them access to the Yosemite wilderness.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Table 7-13 illustrates that Alternative 4's primary goal for Glen Aulin is to mitigate the risk to water quality by reducing daily water consumption from the present 600 gallons to 500 gallons. Since I am neither an environmental nor hydrological engineer, I accept that such a reduction of water use is appropriate. The proposed reduction from 600 gallons per day to 500 gallons per day represents a reduction of 16.7%.

The preferred alternative suggests that in order to achieve a 16.7% reduction in water consumption, the number of overnight guests at Glen Aulin HSC must be reduced from 32 to 20 -- a 37.5% reduction. The draft Comprehensive Management Plan does not explain why such a drastic reduction in overnight guests is necessary to reduce water use by 16.7%.

While I don't profess to any special knowledge of water use, logic would suggest that there is some minimal level of water that would be used regardless of the number of overnight guests. For example, kitchen use (such as washing pots and pans) and cleaning common areas would seem unrelated to the number of guests. Rather, the water use factor most relevant to the number of guests would be individual consumption related to flushing toilets, personal hygiene (washing hands and brushing teeth) and personal hydration (drinking). Some minimal additional water may be used in group food production, but that quantity is probably insignificant compared to individual use. Presumably, the largest individual use relates to toilet flushing.

Alternative 4 already proposes to mitigate risks to water quality by replacing flush toilets with composting vault toilets (page 6-22); therefore, reducing the number of overnight guests at Glen Aulin HSC would not affect that aspect of individual water use. Indeed, it would seem that eliminating toilet flushings of the present number of 32 guests would more than generate the desired daily reduction 100 gallons, and that any reduction of the number of guests is unnecessary to achieve that result.

Persons impaired by physical limitations need the High Sierra Camps in order to participate in the Yosemite wilderness experience. The High Sierra Camps are frequently used by grandparents to introduce their grandchildren to the wonders of Yosemite, thereby passing on to future generations the stewardship necessary to preserve this magnificent resource. The proposal to reduce the accommodations for overnight guests at Glen Aulin HSC would severely impact those who are unable to carry camping gear. That impact seems especially unfair to the young, the elderly and the mildly disabled when the stated goal of reducing water use can be met by other means ? and indeed appears to be already met by the proposal to eliminate flush toilets and provide composting toilets for guests.

Before proceeding with the proposal to reduce the number of guests at Glen Aulin HSC, an analysis must be made of the water use reductions that can be achieved by other means. Let's not throw away the baby with the bathwater!

Correspondence ID:	238	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 08:57:42				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I agree with alternative #4. Although I wish things could stay as they are, or even revert to the old days, I realize we must do something to continue to allow the park to meet all its natural functions. This includes allowing humans into its borders to hike, camp, hunt and fish.				

Correspondence ID:	239	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (CSERC) Conservation/Preservation				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	CSERC Comments Part 1 of 3				

CSERC, Box 396, Twain Harte, CA 95383 Comments submitted on March 13, 2013

Introduction to CSERC's comments in response to the Tuolumne River Plan

It is clear from the prolific amount of analysis and information in the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Management Plan, that Park planners have invested a huge amount of time and effort into the thick Tuolumne River Plan document. The extensive amount of public outreach, webinars, and in-Park meetings all reflect the Park's commendable efforts to engage the interested public and to provide a reasonable range of alternatives for consideration.

As a long-time planning participant and one voice of the interested public, CSERC's staff has also invested extensive time and energy over many years in an attempt to be an informed, balanced, and proactive advocate for visionary management decisions that would leave a positive legacy for future generations.

As has been expressed in our staff's direct conversations with Mike Yochim, Don Neubacher, and other Yosemite Park staff, CSERC is deeply disappointed in the selection of the Preferred Alternatives for both the Tuolumne River Plan and the Merced River Plan. The CSERC staff believes that the Preferred Alternatives for both Plans are in direct conflict with strong messages

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

that the Park Service has provided to the public about the need to protect Yosemite's precious resources for future generations. The Duncan video (which has been presented at numerous Park planning meetings and workshops) is touted by Don and the planning staff as a reflection of the inspiration that motivates the Park staff. Yet as CSERC has pointed out, that video shows no crowds of people, no busy parking lots or crowded roads, no congested trail or busy picnic areas, and none of the resource impacts that come from too many people visiting and using the Park. Instead, the video shows pristine, natural scenery along with wildlife and beautiful plants. The video makes it appear that Yosemite and other National Parks are carefully nurtured natural wonderlands being managed primarily for ecological health instead of the Parks actually being incredibly crowded money-makers for the concessionaires and for gateway businesses.

CSERC fully recognizes the importance of the National Park Service desiring to work harmoniously with gateway counties and business interests to maximize jobs and economic prosperity for communities close to National Parks. But as we emphasize in the following comments, the clear mission of the Park Service is to prioritize management of the precious resources of iconic landscapes so as to pass on the Park ecosystem in as healthy a condition as possible to future generations. Only in as much as that key goal can be realized is it then appropriate to provide high levels of overnight lodging, extensive amounts of day use visitation, and substantial amounts of parking or other accommodations to serve high recreational demands.

Unfortunately, as the Park staff is obviously aware, political and economic pressures are strong to maintain the status quo and to produce a high level of profit and economic benefits from marketing Tuolumne Meadows or Yosemite Park overall. There is little incentive for Park planners or Park decision-makers to stand firmly for prioritizing ecological health instead of maintaining high levels of visitation. To shift away from the status quo produces political risk.

Change is often difficult for many people or business communities or political representatives to accept, especially if it requires a lower expectation of revenues from Park operations. The easy path is to always stay on course with the status quo and to take no more than incremental small steps toward enhanced management actions. It takes resolute commitment to design and approve visionary management actions that will, in the long term, best protect Tuolumne Meadows or Yosemite Valley or the river corridors of the Tuolumne River and Merced River systems.

With these comments, CSERC thanks Mike and the rest of the Tuolumne River Plan team for being good communicators, frank realists, highly professional planners, and dedicated Park Service employees. We appreciate the challenges and competing pressures the planning staff faces.

It is obviously our Center's hope that the clarity of our input combined with carefully worded legal arguments will positively influence the final decision for this Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. In particular, we emphasize that it is prudent for the Park planning staff and the eventual Plan decision-maker to consider past court direction related to "degradation" within Wild and Scenic River corridors and to consider strict mandates to adopt user capacity levels that truly protect outstandingly remarkable resources in all of their complexities.

Last, and perhaps paramount for legal consideration of these comments, we believe it is imperative that the Park distinguish between "desired by some segment of the recreating public" and "necessary" when it comes to facilities and uses proposed for retention within the river corridor.

That challenging distinction between "necessary" and "desired by the recreating public" is especially important when it comes to the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp, the Tuolumne Lodge facility, and the A-Loop of the Tuolumne Meadows Campground.

Recommendation of Alternative For the greatest compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, with the General Management Plan, and with the Wilderness Act, CSERC strongly advocates for the selection of Alternative 1: Emphasizing a Self-Reliant Experience. However, given our understanding of Park staff priorities and the political pressures facing the Park Service, our Center is recommending a modified Preferred Alternative 4 as being the middle-ground compromise that is feasible and better meets the legal and ecological requirements of the planning process.

We again emphasize that we believe that Alternative 1 provides the most visionary and sustainable management direction overall. If the Park was positioned to choose strictly on what would be the best legacy for future generations, we are comfortable that the Park would select Alternative 1. Given political realities, we strongly urge the Park to consider the legal arguments and resources at risk in moving to adopt a modified Preferred Alternative.

Glen Aulin BACKGROUND FOR SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp reflects a philosophical management direction that is no longer consistent with more enlightened Park Service objectives and management direction of recent decades. In the past, Park Service officials desired to build political support for the Park system and for preservation of wilderness by enticing well-to-do and politically connected visitors to come to luxurious lodges such as the Ahwahnee or other prominent facilities. They made it convenient for city dwellers to "rough it" in conveniently located tent cabins with hot meals easily available as at the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge. The High Sierra Camps, including Glen Aulin, were created to provide for unnecessary, but "desired" amenities such as clean

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

beds, wood heat, showers, and hot meals that softened the ruggedness of "wilderness" camping.

Today the Park Service overall recognizes that the core NPS mission is not to provide convenient lodging that brings in profit for concessionaires or even for gateway communities. As will be emphasized numerous times in these comments and also in our Center's Merced River Plan comments, the Park cannot justify satisfying visitors' desires for lodging facilities if those facilities create any significant negative impact (especially within a designated Wilderness or within a Wild and Scenic designated river segment).

If the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River Management Plan should ever be evaluated by a court for compliance with legal regulations, CSERC strongly asserts that the court will agree that providing convenient (and highly profitable) lodging or amenities should never trump compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA). In particular, CSERC believes that a court will judge that a facility, use, or operation is not "necessary" when it simply fills desires of visitors who prefer convenience in contrast to a more direct experience with wild nature. The Park's socio-economic consultant stated clearly at the Workshop in the Yosemite Valley auditorium that if lodging or some other use is not provided INSIDE the Park, private interests will respond to the market need and provide the desired lodging or use OUTSIDE the Park. Thus, instead of making decisions based upon customer preferences or desires for conveniences, the Park Service must prioritize its core mission ? which in Yosemite Park is to protect legacy resources and natural splendor as a sustainable heritage for future generations.

The Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is a small island of non-wilderness commercial operation in the heart of a great wilderness region and directly in the heart of a WILD segment of the Tuolumne River. If it was not already in place and instead was being considered for approval today, the Park Service would never approve the Glen Aulin Camp operation.

? Glen Aulin results in commercial food service, lodging and over-night stays taking place within an island of non-wilderness that lies within the heart of a Congressionally-designated Wilderness ? a direct conflict with the surrounding land's designated purpose.

? Glen Aulin's presence along the main river corridor and the main trail along the Tuolumne River means that for the majority of backpackers, equestrian trekkers, and hikers who travel that Wilderness and Wild River segment corridor, the Glen Aulin encampment (and the ripple of high use that spreads from the Camp) detracts from the wilderness experience. In particular, seasonal structures with cement floors, the presence of all of the supply facilities, the concessionaire employee facilities, the water tank, pipelines, showers, corrals, and assorted other facilities all CUMULATIVELY combine at the site and in the surrounding area to eliminate the sense of undisturbed natural wildness of a Wilderness Experience or a sense of wild, untrammled nature where man leaves only footprints and takes only memories.

? As will be underscored further in these comments, the supplying of goods for customers and supplies for the needs of concessionaire employees results in pack stock traveling repeatedly along the Glen Aulin trail throughout the field season. The trail impacts of the stock as well as a variety of other negative impacts from the commercial stock supply operation all create varying levels of significant impacts for the affected environment.

? Encounters with the frequent strings of pack stock heading to Glen Aulin cause hikers, backpackers, or equestrian visitors along that main wilderness route to have a sense of crowding and congestion compared to the encounters they would have without the pack stock heavily utilizing the trail.

? For reasons not spelled out in the EIS, Yosemite Park management has allowed (up to this time) the completely illegal extension of five water lines, a water tank, and a water intake to all be located outside of the non-wilderness boundary (7-9). To re-state this point, THE PARK SERVICE HAS BEEN BREAKING THE LAW BY OPENLY VIOLATING THE WILDERNESS ACT AND ALLOWING DEVELOPMENT/ARTIFICIAL INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE PLACED ON LAND OFFICIALLY "OFF-LIMITS" TO SUCH USE BECAUSE IT IS WILDERNESS.

? Additionally, it is acknowledged briefly in the DEIS that helicopters are used to carry out administrative use of Glen Aulin (7-8). In the Preferred Alternative, "The replacement storage tanks, filter tank, and surge tanks would be flown in by helicopter" as would other project related materials (7-89). FLYING A HELICOPTER INTO THE YOSEMITE WILDERNESS AND DESCENDING INTO THE ISLAND OF NON-WILDERNESS APPEARS TO BE A VIOLATION OF THE WILDERNESS ACT AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED AS AN ALLOWABLE ACTIVITY IN ANY OF THE ALTERNATIVES.

Based on the many issues and points of information shared above, CSERC provides the following specific comments concerning the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp and the Preferred Alternative's retention of the Camp with reduced numbers down to 20 campers.

1) NEED TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL LAW First and foremost, it is legally necessary for Yosemite Park to rectify the Wilderness Act violations created by the presence of facilities associated with Glen Aulin. Removal of the water intake and the waterlines must be done promptly and without delay in order to meet the legal requirements of the Wilderness Act. Coming into compliance with the Wilderness Act thus requires the Park planning staff to abandon plans to extend the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp water line into Wilderness in dry years as proposed under the Preferred Alternative. We recommend the Park implement

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

water conservation measures instead, which may include temporary closure of the camp during times where there is not enough water to support normal camp operations.

THE PARK MUST ACKNOWLEDGE IN ITS FINAL EIS THAT THE TRESPASS OF THE WATER INTAKE LINE AND ASSOCIATED WATERLINES INTO DESIGNATED WILDERNESS IS ILLEGAL AND A VIOLATION OF THE WILDERNESS ACT. THE EIS SHOULD IDENTIFY THE ACTION TO BE TAKEN TO CORRECT THE VIOLATION AND THE PLANNED TIMING OF SUCH ACTION.

NO MATTER WHICH ALTERNATIVE (OR COMBINATION OF ALTERNATIVES) AND WHICH PLAN OF OPERATIONS AT GLEN AULIN MAY BE SELECTED, THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE MUST BE MODIFIED TO INCLUDE WATER CONSERVATION MEASURES INSTEAD OF EXTENDING THE WATER LINE INTO DESIGNATED WILDERNESS TO ACCESS WATER SUPPLY AVAILABILITY FOR THE CAMP DURING LOW WATER YEARS.

CSERC also asks the Park to limit the use of helicopters to emergency situations and to cease the use of helicopters for administrative use and transport of materials into Glen Aulin.

FLYING LOW THROUGH THE WILDERNESS INTO THE TINY BUBBLE OF GLEN AULIN APPEARS TO BE A VIOLATION OF THE WILDERNESS ACT AND SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED IN ANY OF THE ALTERNATIVES SELECTED.

2) REMOVING GLEN AULIN BEST MEETS LEGAL DIRECTION OF THE WSRA CSERC asserts that to most fully comply with the WSRA requirement to remove unnecessary facilities from the river corridor, the entire Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp should be phased out and removed. Elimination of the entire Camp would also allow the area to be eligible to be designated as Wilderness, which would be most compatible with the surrounding landscape and the WILD designation of that river segment. The Park's argument that the camp is "necessary to allow visitors with a broader range of physical abilities to enjoy a wilderness experience along the river" is invalid and unjustifiable for the following reasons:

A. The Wilderness accessed en route to Glen Aulin can be accessed by those same users on a day visit to areas in close proximity to Tuolumne Meadows. There is nothing implicit in defining a wilderness experience that it must take place far beyond the portal into a vast wilderness. Those with physical limitations who cannot hike for long distances or carry their own pack a long distance (such as all the way to Glen Aulin) have countless options for enjoying a wilderness experience along the river even if Glen Aulin is eliminated. There is nothing inherent in a Wilderness experience that requires an overnight stay. Visiting the river close in to Tuolumne Meadows and within officially designated wilderness does not require someone to carry a heavy pack. Thus, those with some physical limitations are fully able to have a wilderness experience even if they are not transported to and from a camp with amenities plopped down amidst surrounding wilderness.

B. Most important in response to the EIS claim, CSERC counters that the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp itself is not technically Wilderness, nor does the experience one has at the Camp itself constitute a "wilderness experience." The experience of staying at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is not a Wilderness experience, as stated under the Definition of Wilderness Purposes (C-8 ? C-11) for the following reasons:

o Education ? While there are educational opportunities presented by the interpretive tours and talks offered by the NPS and commercial groups at and near the camp, those educational opportunities do not depend on the presence of an overnight commercial camp. In addition, the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is not educating people about true Wilderness experiences or teaching them Wilderness skills because those staying at the camp do not have to utilize many Wilderness skills because the concessioner is being paid to complete many of the tasks that would require use of Wilderness skills.

o Historic - "Historic uses" (in a designated Wilderness) are defined by court rulings as those that "emphasize the wild, untrammeled, and natural character of the land in its historic state?" (C-11) " 'historic use' refers to preserving the wilderness character of the land so that each visitor may encounter it in its historic state, as undeveloped as it was when the first humans experienced it" (C-11). These rulings lead to the declaration that "no commercial services are necessary for the realization of the historical purposes" (C-11). Glen Aulin absolutely does not meet the criteria for a historic use in Wilderness, and thus it should not be considered "necessary" to providing visitors with a Wilderness experience, regardless of the physical capabilities of those visitors. In addition, the court ruling for Olympic Park v. Mainella states that despite the Park service referencing "the historic pattern of shelter construction and recreational use in concluding that the 'setting, association and feeling are significant aspects of historic use within the Park' ? while this may be true, this type of usage is in the past and a new value has been placed on the land?" (C-10, C-11). Glen Aulin does not emphasize the wild, untrammeled natural character of the land, nor does it allow visitors to experience the land as undeveloped as it was when the first humans experienced it.

o Scenic - Glen Aulin, while surrounded by scenic areas, itself violates the definition of a scenic area because it is not fully "natural and untrammeled," and it certainly does not provide for visitors the opportunity to "observe the natural landscape of wilderness." It is a human development that in terms of wilderness purism can be viewed as marring the otherwise pristine

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

landscape surrounding it.

o Conservation ? The numerous resource impacts caused by the extensive amount of stock use needed to supply Glen Aulin directly conflicts with the conservation purpose, which calls for "actions that help to maintain the Wilderness in a largely natural and untrammelled state, with native biodiversity intact and natural processes uninterrupted" (C-10). There are marked impacts from the camp-supply stock animals on natural processes and biodiversity, including direct impacts on wetlands in and around the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp, as well as impacts on water quality and vegetation in the camp, along trails and in corrals.

Most important in terms of rebutting the EIS, CSERC reminds the Park staff that Glen Aulin does NOT provide a Wilderness experience. Sleeping on a cot/bed in a structure with a permanent foundation and getting water from a water system are just two examples of Glen Aulin not providing a wilderness experience. Thus, the excuse that it is needed for that purpose is invalid.

C. CSERC also disputes the EIS claim that maintaining this intrusive camp with facilities in the midst of Wilderness is important in order to provide for those with limited physical strength and who otherwise might not reach this remote site. The range of physical capabilities that fall into the categories between being able to hike into a wilderness and being able to ride pack stock or hike without heavy weight is narrow. There are already additional limitations on those who can utilize those services, including that riders must weigh less than 225 pounds, that riders must be over the age of 10, and that all children must have riding experience (as read in yosemitepark.com's section on Pack and Saddle Trips). For those who wish to utilize pack stock to carry their gear, but opt to hike themselves, the concessioner states that their trips require "strenuous hiking" and request that customers "pre-condition." We would hope that any court review of this issue would carefully consider this advisory requirement. This obviously reinforces the narrow range of limited physical abilities that are provided for by the commercial services. The Park admits in the document that only "a relatively small number of visitors would benefit by being able to access the wilderness with support from a commercial outfitter or park concessioner?" (8-187). Further decreasing the range of visitors these commercial services serve are the costs associated with using a commercial service to access the Wilderness. The cost alone of utilizing commercial services can be enough to prevent most of those who couldn't otherwise access Wilderness from being able to take advantage of those services.

D. The Park states that there are "equal opportunities for mobility impaired individuals to use commercial stock trips to visit the Yosemite Wilderness" (C-16). While the Glen Aulin area and immediate surrounding Wilderness is unique in that it is also in a Wild and Scenic river corridor, it is not the only location for mobility impaired users to access Yosemite's Wilderness.

THE ABOVE EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT GLEN AULIN HIGH SIERRA CAMP IS NOT "NECESSARY" TO PROVIDE A WILDERNESS EXPERIENCE TO VISITORS WITH LIMITED PHYSICAL ABILITIES.

TO BE IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE WSRA, THE FINAL SELECTED ALTERNATIVE SHOULD REQUIRE THE PHASING OUT OF AND COMPLETE REMOVAL OF THE GLEN AULIN HIGH SIERRA CAMP SO THAT THIS ISLAND OF NON-WILDERNESS WITHIN A WILD RIVER SEGMENT CAN BE MANAGED AS AND DESIGNATED AS WILDERNESS. THE BACKPACKERS' CAMP COULD BE KEPT, AT CAPACITY, AND THE COMPOSTING TOILET COULD BE UPGRADED AS A TRULY LEGITIMATE NECESSARY FACILITY. EVERYTHING ELSE ASSOCIATED WITH THE GLEN AULIN HIGH SIERRA CAMP SHOULD BE REMOVED TO BRING IT INTO COMPLIANCE WITH THE WILDERNESS ACT AND THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT.

3) GLEN AULIN CAMP AFFECTS SCENIC VALUES Despite the fact that most of Glen Aulin is not within a designated Wilderness, its presence violates several regulations regarding the scenic quality of this designated Wild area of the river corridor. The 1980 Yosemite General Management Plan states that the Park will "permit only those levels and types of use that are compatible with the preservation or protection of the scenic resources and with the quality of the viewing experience." The Park's adopted VRM system requires that Wild Segments meet VRM Class I objectives, which state management should "preserve the existing character of the landscape?level of change to the landscape should be very low and must not attract attention." The Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is visible from portions of the Wilderness, attracts attention and does not preserve the existing character of the otherwise Wild landscape. Some wilderness visitors see Glen Aulin as "an intrusion upon their wilderness experience of this highly scenic area."(8-183)

BASED ON THIS, OUR CENTER ASKS THAT THE FINAL EIS ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE PRESENCE OF THE GLEN AULIN HSC VIOLATES SPECIFIC REGULATIONS REGARDING SCENIC QUALITY OF THIS WILD SEGMENT OF THE RIVER. ACCORDINGLY, THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SHOULD NOT BE SELECTED AND A MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE SHOULD BE CHOSEN.

4) STRUCTURES ARE IN 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN IN WILD RIVER SEGMENT Our Center also finds that the presence of any structures within the 100-year floodplain at Glen-Aulin violates the free-flowing requirement set forth by the WSRA. The "potential" to impede flows (8-32) should not be taken any less seriously than a guarantee that flows would be impeded. Removal of the three tent cabins that are within the floodplain under the preferred alternative would be a step in the right direction, but ultimately that limited action still leaves the actions proposed for the Camp in the Park's preferred alternative in violation of the WSRA.

WE ASK THE PARK TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT LEAVING STRUCTURES WITHIN THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

AT GLEN AULIN DOES NOT PROTECT THE FREE-FLOWING CONDITION OF THE RIVER, A REQUIREMENT OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT. SELECTION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE THAT LEAVES PERMANENT STRUCTURES IN THE FLOODPLAIN AT GLEN AULIN, INCLUDING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, PUTS THE PARK IN VIOLATION OF THE WSRA.

5) INCONSISTENCIES IN PLANNING MAPS We are also concerned with the inconsistencies between the map for Glen Aulin presented on page 7-89 and the floodplain map of Glen Aulin presented on page 8-30. The location of the trail to Cold Canyon is inconsistent between the two maps, which is concerning considering the trails proximity to the camp and to Conness Creek, as well as the fact that there is no direct discussion about potential impacts on any wetlands that may be in the area. There is no floodplain or high water mark shown for Conness Creek, which is problematic given the extremely close proximity (less than 100 feet) of the proposed new septic tank and leach mound to Conness Creek and especially concerning given the either shallow, mineral non-hydric soils or hydric wetland soils that are present there (8-10).

THE PARK NEEDS TO INCLUDE IN ITS FINAL EIS REVISED MAPS THAT ACCURATELY REFLECT THE LOCATIONS OF TRAILS, FACILITIES, FLOOD PLAINS AND THE WETLANDS ASSOCIATED WITH CONNESS CREEK AND THE GLEN AULIN HIGH SIERRA CAMP. THE PARK MUST ALSO ACKNOWLEDGE THE IMPACTS AND ASSOCIATED RISKS OF TRAILS AND FACILITIES ON THESE WETLANDS.

6) GENERATOR USE IN THE MIDST OF WILDERNESS AND IN WILD SEGMENT The use of generators at Glen Aulin has the potential to significantly impact the soundscape of this Wild section of river and the surrounding Wilderness. Up until this time, public information about the use of generators at the Camp was not widely known.

IN THE FINAL EIS, THE PARK MUST ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF GENERATOR USE AT GLEN AULIN ON THE SOUNDSCAPE OF THE CAMP AS WELL AS THE SURROUNDING WILDERNESS, UNDER THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE. IF THE AREA IS ELIGIBLE TO BE DESIGNATED WILDERNESS AND IS MANAGED AS SUCH, AS OUR CENTER RECOMMENDS, THE FINAL EIS MUST SPECIFY THAT GENERATOR USE WILL BE DISCONTINUED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE WILDERNESS ACT.

7) UPGRADE OF SEPTIC SYSTEM WILL NOT ENSURE END TO INCIDENTS CSERC is aware from past years of communication with Park staff that there have been at least two incidents of septic leaching at Glen Aulin over past years. The preferred alternative would spend \$1.1 million for various improvements at the Camp including a new septic tank. However it appears that the tank and leach field would still be located in an area that is mapped as a legal wetland and is potentially in the Conness Creek floodplain. The potential for future new leaching incidents would remain.

CSERC ASSERTS THAT THE FEIS SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THAT REPLACING THE EXISTING SEPTIC SYSTEM DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT FURTHER LEACHING INCIDENTS WILL BE PREVENTED AND THAT THE LOCATION OF THE SEPTIC SYSTEM AND LEACH FIELD ARE INDEED IN AN AREA THAT MAY POTENTIALLY BE DEFINED AS A WETLAND.

8) STOCK USE ON GLEN AULIN TRAIL CREATES UNACCEPTABLE IMPACTS According to the EIS, 75% of the total stock use on the Glen Aulin trail is concessionaire stock, and 50% of total stock use is to supply Glen Aulin Camp(8-175). In 2011 over 768 stock passes were documented that were directly tied to the maintenance and supplying of the Glen Aulin Camp (7-6). The trail is heavily impacted by so much stock use? manure spreads invasive weeds; there are water quality effects, and there is a considerable amount of negative encounters for those attempting to walk along the river into this world famous wilderness We are submitting a photo of the Glen Aulin trail and unacceptable resource impacts as was provided to Park staff at the meeting in the superintendent's office.

IN THE FINAL SELECTED ALTERNATIVE, THE PARK SERVICE MUST IDENTIFY HOW REDUCED IMPACTS FROM STOCK USE WILL ALLOW FOR THE GLEN AULIN TRAIL TO BE MANAGED SO AS TO MINIMIZE WATERSHED IMPACTS, MINIMIZE DEGRADATION IN A WILDERNESS AREA, AND MINIMIZE ENCOUNTERS THAT DEGRADE THE WILDERNESS SENSE FOR BACKCOUNTRY USERS.

9) IF ELIMINATION OF THE CAMP IS NOT SELECTED, ADOPT ALTERNATIVE 2 IF THE PARK SERVICE IS NOT WILLING TO CLOSE GLEN AULIN CAMP AND NATURALIZE AS IN ALTERNATIVE 1, THEN CSERC STRONGLY URGES THE PARK TO MANAGE GLEN AULIN AS SPELLED OUT IN ALTERNATIVE 2 AND CONVERT THE CAMP TO A SEASONAL OUTFITTER CAMP, BUT WITH THE LOWER NUMBER OF GUESTS THAT IS SUGGESTED IN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (20 RATHER THAN 32).

THIS IS TRULY THE MIDDLE-GROUND COMPROMISE, LEGALLY COMPLIANT ALTERNATIVE. CONVERTING GLEN AULIN TO A SEASONAL OUTFITTER CAMP WOULD GREATLY REDUCE WATER USE (WHICH OUR CENTER NOTES WOULD ELIMINATE A POTENTIAL NEGATIVE PUBLICITY LAWSUIT OVER A WATER LINE AND INTAKE TRESPASSING INTO CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED WILDERNESS). A SEASONAL OUTFITTER CAMP WITH NO MORE THAN 20 GUESTS WOULD ALLOW THE CAMP TO BE NATURALIZED AND BECOME FULLY ELIGIBLE FOR POTENTIAL DESIGNATION AS A WILDERNESS ADDITION, WHICH CERTAINLY IS MORE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING VAST WILDERNESS AND MORE COMPATIBLE WITH THE WILD

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

RIVER DESIGNATION FOR THAT RIVER SEGMENT. THE STONE BUILDINGS, CONCRETE CABIN FLOORS, AND THE WATER TREATMENT SYSTEM WOULD BE REMOVED. WITH THE COMPOSTING TOILET, THERE WOULD BE NO WASTEWATER SEPTIC TANK AND LEACH MOUND TO FAIL. BECAUSE OVERNIGHT SADDLE TRIPS WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED, THE RIPPLE EFFECT OF STOCK USE ON THE TRAIL AND IN SURROUNDING AREAS WOULD BE REDUCED CONSIDERABLY.

BASED ON THE ABOVE, OUR CENTER BELIEVES THAT TRUE LEGAL COMPLIANCE WOULD BE TO PHASE OUT AND REMOVE THE GLEN AULIN CAMP; BUT IF IT IS DEEMED TO BE TRULY "NECESSARY" (WHICH WE DISPUTE), THEN CSERC URGES THE PARK TO ADOPT THE ACTION PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 2 AND CONVERT GLEN AULIN TO A SCALED DOWN SEASONAL OUTFITTER CAMP, LIMITED TO PROVIDING FOR A REDUCED NUMBER OF 20 GUESTS INSTEAD OF 32.

Correspondence ID:	240	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (CSERC) Conservation/Preservation				
Received:	Mar, 14, 2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	CSERC Comments, Part 2 of 3				

Tuolumne Meadows Lodge BACKGROUND FOR SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The Tuolumne Lodge is a classic example of commercialization that would never, ever be considered if it was proposed to be constructed today. It is also a classic example of an incredibly high level of profit for the concessionaire. But the location of the Lodge's facilities and the concentrated effects that 1,600 customers a week have on the surrounding river corridor is in direct conflict with the Wild and Scenic River Act and good Park management.

The tent cabins, dining reception-kitchen facility and various other structures are NOT iconic Park architecture nor are they inspiring or artistically in harmony with the spectacular scenic Tuolumne Meadows area landscape. Instead the structures are seasonal, functional, and unattractive.

The main complex building is located so close to the river that it results in anyone walking on that side of the river being prevented from having a natural experience or easily moving up or down stream without feeling as if they are walking through a private facility. The Lodge truly violates any management objective for keeping facilities away from the river for a multitude of solid reasons. The conflicts with the WSRA are numerous.

1) TUOLUMNE LODGE IS NOT "NECESSARY" IN THE RIVER CORRIDOR Being able to spend the night in a Wild and Scenic river corridor is a luxury, not an entitlement to visitors who come there. The Park planning staff has claimed that the Tuolumne Lodge is "necessary to provide accommodations for visitors who choose not to camp or who are unable to camp."

Our Center disputes the claim that Tuolumne Meadows is such a remote location that visitors need to be provided lodging. If visitors do not wish to camp, or are unable to camp in the campground, there are affordable lodging accommodations within a reasonable distance from Tuolumne Meadows. Motels in Lee Vining, only 14 miles from Tioga Pass, offer accommodations for a roughly equivalent cost as the Tuolumne Lodge, and those lodging options provide far more benefits for the customer. It is not the legal role of the Park to attempt to accommodate for the desires of every person who visits the Tuolumne River corridor. "Desired" services and "necessary" services are not the same.

The Lodge's 276-person capacity provides accommodations for a small portion (roughly 10%) of the overnight visitors who come to Tuolumne Meadows, yet it negatively affects a large percentage of both day use visitors and overnight visitors and has a dramatic effect on the river corridor. In addition, under the Socio-economic section for Alternative 1, which calls for the removal of the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge and the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp, the Park states: "It is assumed that the majority of visitors displaced from the scenic segments of the Tuolumne River corridor would be accommodated in other areas in the gateway communities" (8-264). Obviously the Park would not make this assumption if those out-of-Park accommodations in gateway communities were considered to be located at an "unreasonable distance?"

THE PARK MUST ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE TUOLUMNE MEADOWS LODGE IS NOT A NECESSARY FACILITY IN THE RIVER CORRIDOR. THE PARK SHOULD REVISE ITS STATEMENT THAT THERE ARE NO ACCOMMODATIONS WITHIN A "REASONABLE DISTANCE" OF THIS "REMOTE LOCATION" TO REFLECT THE ACCOMMODATIONS OFFERED WITHIN A REASONABLE DISTANCE IN LEE VINING, ONLY ROUGHLY 20 MILES AND LESS THAN 30 MINUTES DRIVE FROM TUOLUMNE MEADOWS.

2) THERE IS NO JUSTIFICATION FOR KEEPING ALL 276 BEDS Even if the Park somehow determines that the Tuolumne Lodge must be retained, there is no "need" to maintain all 276 beds when the facility is located so close to the River and is located in the midst of the river corridor. The blockage of movement along the corridor is undesirable for both people and wildlife. Reducing the number of tent cabins and significantly downscaling the Lodge facilities would produce recreational as

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

well as ecological benefits.

THE FEIS SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THERE IS NO LOGICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR RETAINING THE CURRENT LEVEL OF BEDS AT THE TUOLUMNE LODGE AND THAT REDUCING THE NUMBER OF TENT CABINS AND SCALING DOWN THE FACILITY WOULD REDUCE IMPACTS IN THE RIVER CORRIDOR.

3) AT THE LEAST, THE LODGE SHOULD BE RELOCATED Even if the Park determines that it judges the Tuolumne Lodge to be "necessary" despite CSERC's arguments to the contrary, there is no legal justification for keeping the reception/dining/kitchen facility so close to the River. Either the entire Tuolumne Lodge facility should be phased out and eliminated or the final plan should require the Lodge facilities (reception/dining hall/kitchen/other structures) to be reconstructed further back from the River (no facilities within 150' of the River) and the entire camp area should be redesigned to be more in harmony with the Wild and Scenic designation. If there is going to be a lodge operation bringing 20,000 to 30,000 or more customers to the concessionaire each summer season in the Wild and Scenic corridor, the facilities should be designed, built, and sited so as to be so inspiring, so in harmony with the site, and so minimally detracting from the landscape scenery that future generations praise the structures as examples of building and siting WITH an iconic landscape, not in conflict with such a precious place.

THE FEIS SHOULD SPELL OUT THAT THE LODGE WILL BE ONLY BE RETAINED IF IT IS REDESIGNED AND RELOCATED NO CLOSER THAN 150' TO THE RIVER AND IS RECONSTRUCTED WITH A DESIGN THAT BLENDS HARMONIOUSLY WITH THE SURROUNDING LANDSCAPE.

4) EIS FAILS TO DISCUSS SHOWER UPGRADE IN THE WATER CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS The EIS does not provide the detail that is needed for evaluation of the upgrades proposed to be made to the Tuolumne Lodge shower house. The estimate of 10 gallons per shower and 35 showers a day seems extremely low and needs more detail in the plan to ensure its accuracy (7-99). Will the number of showers be regulated? Will the amount of water used per shower be regulated, and if so, how? With water consumption levels being so close to the maximum allowed under dry year conditions, and with the closure of the shower facilities being one of the conservation measures instituted once that threshold is reached, it is not logical to upgrade the shower houses to provide more showers and higher levels of water consumption. In addition, increasing withdrawals from the Dana Fork, which is already at capacity, to provide for the luxury of showers, with likely underestimated use and water consumption levels, is irresponsible and illogical. In light of climate change, the frequency of closing the existing shower houses will in all likelihood increase, making the impacts and costs of providing the luxury of shower facilities completely unjustifiable.

UPGRADING THE SHOWER FACILITIES AT THE TUOLUMNE LODGE TO PROVIDE FOR CAMPER SHOWERS IS AN UNNECESSARY SERVICE THAT IS INAPPROPRIATE FOR THIS SCENIC RIVER SEGMENT AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED AS A PART OF THE FINAL PLAN. IF THE PARK STILL CHOOSES TO INCLUDE THE SHOWER UPGRADES, AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE PROPOSES, THE PARK SHOULD, IN ITS FINAL EIS, INCLUDE SPECIFIC DETAILS ABOUT HOW ASSOCIATED WATER USE WILL BE REGULATED.

A-Loop Campsites Should Be Removed BACKGROUND FOR SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The A-Loop portion of the Tuolumne Meadows Campground lies in close proximity to the River. Early in the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Management Plan process, Park planners brought up the issue of having campgrounds close to the River due to a variety of negative effects caused by such proximity. First, the campers understandably move to and from the River and create trampling, social trails, disturbance of wildlife, and various other environmental effects from being so closely located with their camps.

Second, the proximity of 67 campsites so close to the River detracts significantly from the natural river experience for the many day users, backpackers, or others who are hiking along the river corridor heading south from the main road. To have a natural river experience, it is not desirable to be close to campfires, people talking loudly, vehicles parking or leaving, or the visible presence of literally hundreds of people along a short stretch of river.

Most important in terms of the WSRA and compliance with legal direction, the Park is required to remove facilities and uses that are not necessary. As the following comments show, A-Loop is not necessary for the Park to provide a substantial amount of campsite availability at Tuolumne Meadows.

1) Inconsistency with the Yosemite General Management Plan In the 1980 General Management Plan that is still the overall programmatic policy document for Yosemite Park, the Plan specifically calls for the removal of the campsites and the road closest to the Lyell Fork of the Tuolumne River. Given clear GMP direction to remove that A-Loop string of 67 campsites, it is incumbent upon the Park Service to comply with the GMP and to remove those sites that are in close proximity to the river.

2) Damage to environment and water quality caused by campsite use In Appendix H, restoration needs for the Tuolumne Meadows area describes the negative effects of the rip-rap along the A-Loop that was placed there after the 1997 storm event caused erosion that was working towards the road and campsites(H-27). The restoration description in the Appendix spells out that the presence of the hardened campsites and the road creates negative effects. There is more than ample evidence in the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Appendix H description of the problems caused by the road and the campsites to justify removing A-Loop.

3) A-Loop is unnecessary and is inconsistent with WSRA A-Loop is located too close to the river and flies in the face of compliance with the WSRA. The Park could only retain A-Loop if it could be shown to be "necessary" for recreational use, yet that is not the case. There are currently 304 campsites (considered to hold up to 6 campers each) at the Tuolumne Meadows campground plus 7 group sites (capable of holding 30 campers each) plus 26 backpacker sites (K-11) (that for whatever reason are not counted in the tables or in the total count given for campers at the campgrounds). In total the current campsites and backpacker sites could result in a maximum amount of 2060 total campers.

If the 67 campsites in Loop A are removed, at 6 campers each that would diminish camping capacity down to 1,658 total campers. That is still a huge amount of camping that the Park Service would be making available for recreational use at Tuolumne Meadows. Reducing the number of campers in the campground would also help to lower overall water demand, as well as reduce the strained capacity of the minimal bathroom facilities as discussed in Appendix K of the DEIS (K-13). Keeping A-Loop is not necessary for providing a high level of recreation use for camping. Accordingly, any court reviewing the adequacy of the final decision for the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Management Plan would certainly not buy the argument that the Park must leave campsites crowding into the river corridor in order to provide campsites - since 1,658 campers can still have that opportunity at Tuolumne Meadows.

Thus the Park must comply with the WSRA that requires removal of facilities that are not truly necessary within the River corridor. The A-Loop campsites and road are clearly not necessary, both because so much camping is already provided and because camping so close to the River is neither necessary nor consistent with environmental practices. Similar to the point raised in these comments previously, if the Park does not provide a camping opportunity INSIDE the Park, then a private or national forest campground will have a greater amount of use OUTSIDE the Park.

The bottom line is that the Park has a clear and legal responsibility to remove such unnecessary facilities, including A-Loop.

IN THE FINAL EIS, THE PARK SHOULD EITHER ADOPT AN ALTERNATIVE THAT REMOVES A-LOOP OR MODIFY THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SO THAT A-LOOP AND THE ROAD THAT LIES CLOSE TO THE RIVER (AND SERVES A-LOOP) ARE ALL REMOVED, RESTORED, AND THE SITES NATURALIZED. THIS IS NECESSARY FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE WSRA AND WITH THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN DIRECTION THAT HAS BEEN SPELLED OUT FOR MORE THAN 30 YEARS.

Necessary Facilities Analysis 1) The Park argues that many current facilities in the river corridor are necessary because they were constructed to facilitate visitor use and resource protection in the Park's past. This argument relies heavily upon the debatable assumption that the Park Service chose only to construct facilities that were absolutely necessary for visitor use between the 1920s and the river's designation. Obviously, CSERC disagrees that "necessity" was the driving purpose behind many facilities being constructed. The strict regulations now being required for management approval of retaining facilities within the river corridor are a direct result of the Wild and Scenic River designation in 1984. Prior to this designation, regulations were much more lenient for development in the Tuolumne Meadows area and elsewhere along river corridors in the Park. There was no legal constraint tied to a facility being deemed to be "necessary" prior to the Wild and Scenic designation in 1984.

2) As noted above, the Park's justification for retaining so many existing facilities is at least partly based on the fact that the facilities were built, therefore they were necessary. Thus the Park looks back to past Park decisions as somehow having important value that must be accepted as valid today. Yet that argument is completely disregarded when past Park decisions support a different outcome than what present Park staff is recommending. While the Park is ready and willing to justify the necessity of facilities in the river corridor based on the fact that past Park management allowed for them, the Park blatantly ignores some explicit management directives made in the same period by Park decision-makers. One such example is the 1980 General Management Plan that calls for the removal of the Campground A-loop, an action that is not proposed under the preferred alternative but is included in Alternative 1.

3) Reduction of the number of sites in the campground by half in the 1980 GMP shows that the Park is capable of constructing facilities they deemed were necessary, and then removing or reducing those facilities once Park staff realized they were excessive or not protecting resource values. Our Center strongly disagrees with the grandfathering in of services and facilities because of the claim that they must have been necessary because they were constructed by prior Park managers. The Park Service should acknowledge that the construction of a facility before the Wild and Scenic designation does not equate to any justification of criteria showing "necessity." 4) Table A-1, page A-9, shows that the store and grill are necessary because "a campground of 300 sites necessitates at least a basic store, to avoid excessive traffic to and from Lee Vining, Crane Flat, and/or Yosemite Valley." Yet, the gas station isn't necessary for use levels under the preferred alternative because "gas is available in Lee Vining and at Crane Flat, both of which are less than 40 miles away." These two planning staff justifications contradict one another. If a gas station is not necessary because of the proximity of similar facilities, then the store and grill should not be deemed necessary because similar facilities are the same distance away. Part of experiencing a remote and rugged natural setting is having to cope with the limited access to supplies and conveniences. The Park service does not need to be in the business of providing conveniences for those who irresponsibly come to remote places unprepared. The Park service should be educating their visitors about coming prepared to remote locations, not enabling their visitors to come unprepared at the expense of those

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

who do come prepared.

CSERC URGES PARK PLANNING STAFF TO ENSURE THAT THE FINAL SELECTED ALTERNATIVE IS FULLY CONSISTENT WITH THE WSRA DEFINITION AND INTENT CONCERNING "NECESSARY."

Visitor Parking and Regional Transit 1) While it is pleasant and rewarding for Park visitors to be able to take a scenic drive over Tioga Pass, the concentration of so many cars passing through and driving around the Tuolumne Meadows vicinity detracts from the visitor experience. Considering that "visitors arriving by automobile have accounted for 96% of Tuolumne visitation over the last decade," the effects of vehicles should be given more consideration than the preferred alternative provides. One of the five broad goals of the 1980 Yosemite General Management Plan is to "markedly reduce traffic congestion." This management directive can hardly be considered achieved by simply designating parking spaces and pulling cars away from the meadow fringe. Drivers unable to find parking places will continue to contribute to traffic congestion as they circle around looking for a parking spot (5-69). To markedly reduce traffic congestion will require more, such as working towards replacing some significant percentage of personal vehicles with regional transit as one realistic strategy for visiting Tuolumne Meadows. Comments from the public share that an "increased level of service and reliability is needed to encourage people to make greater use of the system and decrease congestion on roadways." This is a concept that is barely mentioned and vaguely outlined in the DEIS (7-26).

CSERC ASSERTS THAT THE PARK SHOULD MODIFY ITS PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SO THAT IT OFFERS MORE OPTIONS FOR ARRIVING AT TUOLUMNE MEADOWS OTHER THAN BY PERSONAL VEHICLE. THIS INCLUDES INCREASING THE EASE OF USE OF PUBLIC TRANSIT ? IN PART BY INCREASING THE CAPACITY OF THESE SERVICES. TO MAKE PUBLIC TRANSIT EFFECTIVE AND TO REDUCE PRIVATE VEHICLE CONGESTION, THE PARK SHOULD DO MORE TO EDUCATE THE GENERAL PUBLIC ABOUT THE AVAILABILITY OF AND POSITIVE IMPACTS OF UTILIZING TRANSIT OPTIONS. PUBLIC TRANSIT SHOULD BE FEATURED AS A POSITIVE WAY OF REACHING TUOLUMNE MEADOWS AS PART OF THE PARK'S INITIAL, PROACTIVE APPROACH, INSTEAD OF USING IT AS A RESPONSE TO A MANAGEMENT TRIGGER, AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE PROPOSES.

2) The argument that increasing regional transit by 135 people will reduce the quantity of cars (6-21) is unjustly based on the assumption that those 135 people are taking the bus instead of a personal vehicle, when it is equally likely that some of those people would not be able to reach Tuolumne Meadows without the assistance of regional transit because they could not afford it or did not have access to a vehicle.

IN ITS FINAL EIS, THE PARK SHOULD NOT EQUATE AN INCREASE OF 135 PEOPLE USING REGIONAL TRANSIT TO A DIRECT EQUAL DECREASE IN PERSONAL VEHICLES AND THE ASSOCIATED PERSONS ARRIVING AT TUOLUMNE MEADOWS.

3) Overnight Visitor Parking in Alternative 4 is more than is needed using the numbers provided in the proposed Maximum Overnight User Capacity. There are 250 trailhead parking spots allowed for overnight visitation that are not associated with the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge or the Campground (7-112). Since the overnight visitor capacity for the Wilderness and Glen Aulin combined is 370 people per night (7-88) it makes no sense for an allowance of 250 parking spots for this population. We recognize however that 58 of those spots are meant to accommodate the concessionaire stables. Using the Park provided estimates of an average of 2.9 people per car (7-86), 192 overnight parking spots will accommodate over 550 people.

CSERC QUESTIONS THE PURPOSE BEHIND ALLOWING A LARGE NUMBER OF OVERNIGHT VISITOR PARKING SPOTS THAT EXCEEDS THE ALLOWED NUMBER OF OVERNIGHT VISITORS. IF SUCH A HIGH NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES IS NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE OVERNIGHT VISITORS, THIS SHOULD BE DISCUSSED IN THE FINAL EIS. IF THERE IS NOT A NEED FOR THIS MANY PARKING SPACES THEY SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE PLAN ALTOGETHER.

4) The DEIS states in the preferred Alternative 4 that the proposed increased parking spaces "would accommodate 99% of existing peak season parking demand and accommodate the projected 3% annual visitation growth through 2013." (8-241) With a 3% annual growth in visitation projected, it is hard to see how the planned parking strategy effectively handles visitation into the foreseeable future. If the User Capacity is already realized by 2013, allowing more people to enter the area via shuttle and bus services once parking is full (7-26, 8-241) only contributes to congestion of this zone and strains the resources that are already maxed out with the numbers provided in Alternative 4. As shared in the DEIS, "The calculation of day use capacity is based on people at one time and represents the number of people who can be received in the corridor at one time without adverse impact on river values and without substantial interference with public use and enjoyment of those values."(6-5).

CSERC CONTENTS THAT IF THE USER CAPACITY AS PRESENTED IN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE IS TRULY THE CAP WHICH IF EXCEEDED WILL RESULT IN AN IMPACT ON RIVER VALUES, THEN PLANS SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED (AS ON PAGE 7-26 AND 8-241) ON HOW TO BRING MORE PEOPLE INTO THE TUOLUMNE MEADOWS AREA ONCE PARKING IS AT CAPACITY ON A REGULAR BASIS. THE FINAL REPORT SHOULD ESTABLISH A TRUE USER CAPACITY AND OUTLINE A PLAN THAT WILL RE-DISTRIBUTE VISITORS

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

TO OTHER AREAS OF THE PARK ONCE CAPACITY HAS BEEN REACHED.

Parsons Memorial Lodge There is no legitimate "need" to have a road maintained to provide access to the Parsons Memorial Lodge. The Plan and planning staff suggest that vehicle access is necessary to carry heavy loads to support the educational programs that support the historical value of Parsons Memorial Lodge. Our Center provides educational programs for 8,500+ participants a year at schools. The presenter carries a screen, an extension cord, a large old-style slide projector, and as many as three carousels of slides. The presenter may carry these all around a school to and from distant parking spots. There is no reason that the Park cannot create a pole sling for two people to carry a bulky load of educational items to and from Parsons Lodge without the need for vehicle access. It is up to the Park to be setting an example for keeping Tuolumne Meadows natural and the site surrounding Parsons Memorial Lodge non-motorized.

THE PARK SHOULD ELIMINATE THE UNNEEDED ROAD-VEHICLE ACCESS TO PARSONS MEMORIAL LODGE IN THEIR FINAL EIS SO AS TO BETTER PROTECT WATER QUALITY, BETTER MAINTAIN A MORE NATURAL SETTING, AND TO SHOW THE VISITING PUBLIC THAT THE PARK IS TALKING THE TALK AND WALKING THE WALK BY MINIMIZING ROADS IN THIS ICONIC LANDSCAPE.

Trails 1) Our Center finds the standard of encounter rate of no more than 10 groups per hour, 80% of the time, under Alternative 4 to be too high to honestly provide a quality wilderness experience. The next lowest encounter rate, posed by Alternative 2, is only 4 groups per hour 80% of the time. For the preferred alternative, CSERC advocates for a more middle-ground rate of 7 groups per hour, 80% of the time. This is especially important given that current rates for two of the most popular trails are as follows: Lyell Canyon - 7.37 groups per hour, 80% of the time, Glen Aulin ? 6.8 groups per hour, 80% of the time (C-15). Sentiment from public comments show that these rates are already being seen as high enough to degrade their experience. Letting that amount grow by at least 3 more parties an hour 80% of the time over a period of 3 years will likely lead to fast growing discontent and degradation of visitor's Wilderness experiences on these trails.

The fact that the park is using group numbers instead of individual numbers of people to make their assessment in trail crowding is also disturbing. The present limit on numbers of people per group on day hikes in wilderness is 35 people (7-7). This leaves the potential for people to encounter well over one hundred people per hour on these popular day hikes, truly inhibiting visitors from having a wilderness experience. Our Center urges the Park to upgrade its user survey methods to be able to account for individuals on the trail and provide a more useful set of data that will help establish realistic encounter rates on the trails.

IN THE MEANTIME, THE PARK SHOULD LOWER THE STANDARD OF ENCOUNTER RATE TO NO MORE THAN 7 GROUPS PER HOUR, 80% OF THE TIME. THE STANDARD FOR ADVERSE IMPACT SHOULD BE LOWERED TO 10 PARTIES PER HOUR, 80% OF THE TIME OVER A THREE-YEAR PERIOD.

2) The creation of a new trail to the South of the Tioga Road is unlikely to discourage or prevent visitors from simply crossing the road and going out into the meadow or walking along the North edge of the road where their view of the meadow is unobstructed by traffic. More aggressive management practices would be necessary to keep visitors from further trampling the meadow along the road's edge and to eliminate the safety hazards posed by pedestrian traffic along the highway.

THE PARK SHOULD MODIFY ITS SELECTED ALTERNATIVE TO INCLUDE MORE AGGRESSIVE MEASURES TO KEEP PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC FROM BECOMING A HAZARD AND FURTHER IMPACTING THE MEADOW BETWEEN FACILITIES ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF TIOGA ROAD.

Biological ORV's 1) SPECIAL STATUS AT-RISK SPECIES ARE IGNORED DESPITE THEIR NEXUS TO THE ORV'S IN THE RIVER CORRIDOR While our Center supports the restoration and protection of the designated Biological values of subalpine meadow and riparian complex and low-elevation meadow and riparian complex, we find that the Park's condition assessment and management concerns are incomplete because they do not appropriately address the special status plant and wildlife species whose populations have been degraded since the time of designation. The conditions assessment and management concerns sections do not address the impacts on lost species via the impacts on their historical habitat. For example, there is no discussion of the impacts of stock needed to support the Glen Aulin HSC on the special status plant species present at Soda Springs, which the trail passes very closely. The following points prove that the designated Biological Outstanding River Values need revision:

A) The omission of special status plant and wildlife species as a Biological ORV is unjustifiable because they do indeed meet the definition of an ORV. ? Many special status plant and wildlife species owe their "location or existence to the presence of the river" (5-2). *Carex buxbaumii* and *Triglochin* spp., special status plant species, depend on and are found at Soda Springs, which is located "within 0.25 miles of the river," another specific criteria for "river dependent" values (5-2).

? This omission is also unacceptable because the text of the Wild and Scenic Rivers act actually states that "certain selected rivers, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural or other similar values?" (1-2). Many of the special status species rely upon the river and its "immediate environments," although the Park claims they do not. Our Center definitively disagrees with the analysis that special status plant

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

and wildlife species are not river dependent.

? The Subalpine Meadow and Riparian Complex is directly affected by the plant and wildlife species that exist or existed there. Hydrologic processes, generalized riparian vegetation, and meadow vegetation composition are addressed, but wildlife species are completely omitted, despite the park admitting, in regards to both the Sierra Nevada Yellow Legged Frog and the Yosemite Toad, that specific species directly affect the health of this habitat complex (8-103, comment C and E below)

? "Both terrestrial and aquatic species depend on riparian ecosystems for their year-round availability of water, nutrients, food source and organic matter" (8-83).

B) "Historically, there were a number of populations of Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frogs within the Tuolumne River Corridor. Current data suggest there are no longer any populations of this species within the river corridor" (8-103). Despite the Park's clear acknowledgement of the loss of this special status species since the Wild and Scenic designation, there is no mention of this loss under the established Biological Value. The "conditions at time of designation" segment on pages 5-16 through 5-18 mentions that "the diversity of plants and animals currently present was probably also present in 1984," yet does not account for the loss of ANY species. The current condition segment on page 5-19 claims that "in spite of historical disruptions?the meadow and riparian complex still provide habitat for a diversity of plant and animal species, including special status species such as?Yosemite Toad"(5-19). This assessment is misleading considering that Yosemite Toad has not been found in Tuolumne Meadows in "many years," and is only known to occur in 17 sites in the Tuolumne River corridor (8-104).

C) In addition, the loss of the Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog has "likely had a substantial impact on the health of the native aquatic ecosystems where they formerly occurred" (8-103). These aquatic ecosystems are part of both the habitat complexes designated as ORVs, yet there are no management actions proposed to restore the Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog as a part of protecting and enhancing this ORV. The loss of the species can be attributed to two major factors: "the impact from introduced, non-native fish, and Chytridiomycosis?" (8-103), neither of which are directly addressed.

D) The Park's proposed Wilderness Sierra Nevada Yellow Legged Frog Reintroduction and Trout Eradication Project lends support to the feasibility of reintroduction of this species. None of the sites proposed in the EA for that plan are located in Tuolumne Meadows, as indicated on the map on the last page of the document .

E) Yosemite Toads "appear to be an important link in energy and nutrient cycling between wet meadows, lakes and adjacent terrestrial ecosystems" (8-104). The loss of the species "could affect food webs and nutrient cycling, with potentially significant and important consequences for selected Sierra Nevada high-elevation ecosystems, especially aquatic habitats associated with wet meadows" (8-104). Despite the Park's above statements about the importance of Yosemite Toads to the wet meadow habitat included under the Biological ORV, the Park does not recognize the impacts associated with the loss and potential reintroduction of this species. F) The Park states that for the Biological ORV, the "revised description places more emphasis on the attributes of the meadows that make them an ORV: their relatively high biological integrity and size" (F-2). Relatively high biological integrity is reliant upon a diversity of species of plants and wildlife, which were removed from the ORV statement. The presence of populations of rare, threatened and endangered species is inherently "rare, unique or exemplary." G) The Park's "High Elevation Aquatic Ecosystem Recovery and Stewardship Plan" is insufficient for addressing the populations of both the Yosemite Toad and the Sierra Nevada Yellow Legged Frog. The aforementioned plan has been in the Alternatives/EA stage since July of 2008, and the Park has still yet to release an EA. M-4 shows the plan as "scheduled for public review in 2012." As of March 8, 2013, there is still no available EA or a new estimate of when it will become available. The importance of these species is too great for the Tuolumne River Plan to abdicate the responsibility for the recovery of these species to another plan.

FOR THE ABOVE REASONS, THE PARK SHOULD INCLUDE RESTORATION OF SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES THEMSELVES, NOT JUST RESTORATION OF THE HABITAT THEY MAY UTILIZE. THE HABITAT COMPLEX VALUES LISTED AS BIOLOGICAL VALUES DO NOT SUFFICIENTLY ADDRESS SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES. OUR CENTER ASSERTS THAT THE PARK SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE SPECIAL STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES AS BIOLOGICAL OUTSTANDINGLY REMARKABLE VALUES, AND THEREFORE SHOULD INCLUDE MORE SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO "PROTECT AND ENHANCE" THOSE VALUES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WSR. THIS INCLUDES SETTING A "POSITIVE TRAJECTORY" FOR THE DEGRADED VALUE OF THE LOSS OF MANY OF THESE SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES IN THEIR NATIVE HABITATS.

2) COWBIRD EFFECTS TIED TO STOCK USE ARE NOT ANALYZED OR DESCRIBED The great diversity of songbirds in the overall Tuolumne River corridor contributes greatly to both of the habitat complexes listed as Biological Outstanding River Values. However, the threat posed by non-native cowbirds (associated with stock use) to these native songbird populations is not formally addressed in the plan. The threat posed by cowbirds is important and meaningful due to the sightings of cowbirds "in the stock use areas of upper Lyell Canyon" (8-86). The loss of biodiversity via the loss of native songbird populations within these habitat complexes would be an unacceptable degradation of an Outstanding River Value that must be protected against via management actions set forth in the Plan. Reduction of stock use in the canyon is not sufficient to protect against this threat.

THE THREAT TO NATIVE SONGBIRD POPULATIONS POSED BY THE INCREASED RISK OF NON- NATIVE COWBIRDS ATTRACTED BY STOCK USERS MUST BE MANAGED BEYOND THE REDUCTION IN STOCK USERS

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE BOTH HABITAT COMPLEXES DESIGNATED AS BIOLOGICAL ORVS. PREFERABLY, THIS MANAGEMENT WOULD BE THE ELIMINATION OF OVERNIGHT STOCK USE IN LYELL CANYON.

Correspondence ID:	241	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (CSERC) Conservation/Preservation				
Received:	Mar.14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	CSERC Comments, Part 3 of 3				

Stock Use 1) The impacts of Stock on wet meadows and riparian areas are dramatic and have substantial consequences. Setting a date for stock to graze in certain river corridor areas based on averages of observations gathered over an unspecified amount of time will not guarantee that these sensitive areas are not being impacted by hoof-punching and trampling by stock. The difference of only a few days can be substantial for these sensitive, highly impacted environments.

IN ORDER TO BETTER PROTECT BIOLOGICAL ORVS, ESPECIALLY IN LYELL CANYON, THE PARK SHOULD SET OPENING DATES FOR STOCK USE EACH SEASON BASED ON HYDROLOGIC AND RANGE READINESS CONDITIONS INSTEAD OF SETTING A SINGLE DATE BASED ON AN UNSPECIFIED RANGE OF DATA COLLECTION.

2) The Park did not complete formal wetland delineation for Lyell Canyon, but vegetation data indicates there is wetland vegetation in areas of the canyon (8-47). Wetlands and associated vegetation are more sensitive to the impacts of Stock use. Given that, during the highest use year of 2007, both segments of Lyell Canyon surveyed (for the 2008 Stock Use Report) comprised 56% of the total stock use nights in the high-use meadows surveyed, it is especially important to delineate wetlands so they can be better protected from stock use impacts.

THE PARK SHOULD INCLUDE IN ITS FINAL EIS SPECIFIC PLANS TO DELINEATE WETLANDS IN LYELL CANYON SO AS TO BETTER PROTECT THE HABITAT COMPLEXES PRESENT THERE FROM THE THREATS POSED BY STOCK USE.

3) The Park's concern about displacing stock to currently less impacted areas by eliminating or greatly limiting stock use in Lyell Canyon is valid. However, that concern can be addressed through education and trailhead quotas. It is not justification for the continual degradation of wetlands and riparian areas that should be protected and enhanced as part of the habitat complexes selected as ORVs.

THE PARK SHOULD REMOVE ANY LANGUAGE THAT JUSTIFIES STOCK USE IN LYELL CANYON BECAUSE OF THE POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACTS ELSEWHERE IN THE PARK.

The stretch of Lyell Canyon where overnight use occurs is at most 8 miles from Highway 120. It is not unreasonable for stock users to travel farther than this to protect river values.

THE PARK SHOULD MODIFY ITS SELECTED ALTERNATIVE TO ELIMINATE OVERNIGHT STOCK USE IN LYELL CANYON ENTIRELY.

4) Giving preference to groups having more than a "recreational" purpose over those who have solely a "recreational" purpose is unlikely to have an effect on use in Lyell Canyon. It is highly unlikely that any commercial group, knowing these restrictions are in place, would fail to argue that their group's visit has a "scenic" purpose as well, given the obviously scenic nature of the area. The division of uses based on these purposes is misleading in that it implies these management practices represent a positive change to use patterns in this sensitive, highly impacted area.

THE PARK SHOULD NOT ALLOW ANY COMMERCIAL USE IN THE LYELL CANYON ZONE DURING PEAK USE TIMES DURING PEAK USE MONTHS, REGARDLESS OF THE "PURPOSE" OF THE VISIT. OUR CENTER DISPUTES THE EFFECTIVITY OF PRIORITIZING COMMERCIAL USES BASED ON "SCENIC" VERSUS "RECREATIONAL" PURPOSES.

5) The claim that changes made to concessioner stock use will result in a decrease in stable operations, which will ultimately lead to a reduction in "localized risk to water quality at the current location of the concessioner stable" (8-43) does not reflect the changes made by the increase in stock kept there associated with the relocation of NPS stable operations to the concessioner stables. Page 8-224 addresses concerns about the combination of the stable operations, but it does not address whether the combination will increase the risk to water quality from the stables. No numbers are provided to show how many fewer stock (if any) will be kept at the stables for concessioner use due to the changes proposed in the preferred alternative, nor are any numbers provided for the amount of stock the NPS uses and will need to be kept at the combined stable site. The capacity of the concessioner stable (110 head of stock), and the capacity of the NPS stables (up to 60 head of stock) are provided, but no

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

information is given regarding how often, if ever, that capacity is and will be met.

IN ITS FINAL EIS, THE PARK SHOULD PROVIDE PROJECTED NUMBERS FOR THE AMOUNT OF STOCK TO BE KEPT AT THE COMBINED FACILITIES AS PROPOSED UNDER THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SO THAT THE ASSOCIATED IMPACTS CAN BE QUANTIFIED AND MANAGED FOR IF NECESSARY.

6) In 2011 the Park Service documented 768 stock passes for the purpose of setting up, taking down, and servicing of Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (7-6). This number clearly demonstrates the intense pressure resources face and the need for stock impacts to be addressed. There is no mention in any of the Alternatives on mandatory reductions of pack stock trips to supply/maintain Glen Aulin HSC, despite the acknowledgement of the impacts that pack stock has on resources as well as the wilderness experience of visitors in that zone (7-6, 7-21). Although trails that fragment wetlands in this area are planned to be re-routed through restoration efforts, the threats to water quality, trail widening, and the impact to visitors' wilderness experience remain.

IF GLEN AULIN IS ALLOWED TO REMAIN IN ITS LOCATION IN THE FINAL EIS (AND AS STATED PREVIOUSLY, CSERC URGES THAT IT IS NOT ALLOWED TO STAY), A PLAN OUTLINING THE REDUCTION OF STOCK NEEDED TO SUPPLY GLEN AULIN SHOULD BE DETAILED ACCORDINGLY WITH THE REDUCED SERVICES THAT WILL BE REQUIRED FROM THE DOWNSIZING OF THE CAMP, TO WHATEVER EXTENT THAT REDUCTION IS.

Water 1) Our Center is concerned that if the preferred alternative is selected, the increase in water consumption up to a level so close to the maximum will become quickly problematic. The strategy proposed for the preferred alternative does not take a proactive, climate-change-based approach. A 4.3% buffer is very small, especially considering that the Park admits that an unknown amount of water is leaking from their underground systems. In addition, the water consumption levels do not plan at all for the impacts of climate change.

"Climate change has been identified as one of the highest priorities for the NPS, and the agency has already undertaken a number of actions? including Yosemite." (8-243). Despite this statement the Park does little to address climate change other than plan on how it will work to increase energy efficiency with future projects and work to reduce GHG's with Park activities. While the plan briefly mentions what will be done if flows drop to a low level, it is overall vague and suggests only temporary solutions to what will become a permanent problem. It is irresponsible to not factor climate change into the water consumption plan currently.

While the exact amount and timing of the change may be uncertain, the Park is aware that climate change is likely going to increase the periods of low flows in the Tuolumne. "Data from the 2011 Waddle and Holmquist study show that in 25% of the study years, flows fell below 3 cfs on 47 or more days" (5-87). This equates to an already high number of days where water conservation measures will be necessary given the consumption levels proposed in the preferred alternative. With so many years that already experience the need for water conservation methods over many days of peak visitation, it makes no sense to allow for the increase in water supply when the likely trend will be that the summer flows of the Dana Fork will be less in years to come. Yet the DEIS does not directly address this issue in the plan.

Additionally, the affect on aquatic habitat from water withdrawals is insufficiently prioritized. The DEIS shares "The Waddle and Holmquist study (2011) concluded that withdrawals at or less than current levels and durations are likely to have a minimal impact on downstream habitat" (5-89). This infers that an increase in withdrawals will have a negative impact (albeit minimal) on aquatic habitat. The document justifies this by stating that they will minimize withdrawals and enact mandatory conservation measures when flows in the Dana Fork reach a critical low flow level of 1 cfs. CSERC contends that allowing minimal impact is already unacceptable in the light that one objective of the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River Plan's is to protect and enhance the river's ORVs. In addition, we considered the following section on page 5-87: "an increase in the abstraction rate could increase the number of days when flows reach extreme low levels, which would further decrease aquatic habitat during periods of low flow. For example, increasing domestic water withdrawals by 50% would decrease aquatic habitat by 44%, a decrease that could jeopardize the microorganisms (ephemeroptera, plecoptera, trichoptera) dependent on that habitat (Waddle and Holmquist 2011)." Following this provided calculation, our Center calculated that increasing water intake from the river from the present stated level of 64,141 gallons per day (gpd) to 66,778 gpd in the preferred alternative, although it may fall within the "buffer" provided of up to 70,000 gpd, still will result in a 1.09% decrease in aquatic habitat. This clearly does not meet the objective of protecting and enhancing ORV's.

IT IS NECESSARY FOR THE PARK TO REVISE AND REDUCE WATER CONSUMPTION LEVELS TO BETTER ANTICIPATE LONGER, LOWER FLOW PERIODS EXPECTED TO OCCUR BECAUSE OF CLIMATE CHANGE, AS WELL AS TO ENHANCE INSTEAD OF DEGRADE AQUATIC HABITAT.

2) The Park service has inconsistent, incomplete, and difficult to analyze data concerning water consumption in Tuolumne Meadows. Table 7-15 the Park states that water consumption is at 64,141 gallons per day, yet in Chapter 5 the DEIS shares that water withdrawals presently average at 65,000 gallons a day (5-87). This is over 850 gallons more than the stated present condition, and makes our Center question the accuracy of withdrawal limits proposed for the range of alternatives. This is just

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

an example of the lack of data concerning the water needed for Tuolumne Meadows facilities.

In the DEIS section evaluating the free-flowing conditions of the Tuolumne River, the Park shares "An unknown amount of the water withdrawn from the river leaks from underground pipes (part of the aging water delivery system in Tuolumne Meadows) before it can be used" (5-87). It further goes on to state "An aging water supply system that lacks adequate storage capacity, loses water through leaking supply lines, and does not take full advantage of available water conservation technologies poses a management concern because it makes water use less efficient than it could be" (5-88).

The Park clearly acknowledges that unknown quantities of water are being lost daily through its water intake system and that there is a deficiency of water conservation methods. The water being lost could easily provide for the amount of water needed to satisfy the demands of the facilities in the proposed alternative, if the leaky pipes are upgraded and strict water conservation technologies are utilized. The Park shares that "Water use at specific facilities is not metered; therefore, it is not possible to determine use at discrete locations" (8-25). It seems logical that the Park could figure out how much water is being lost between the water treatment facility and specific facilities by installing meters at these locations.

CSERC URGES THAT THE PARK PRIORITIZE FIGURING OUT HOW MUCH WATER IS BEING USED, WHERE THE LOSSES ARE OCCURRING IN THE INEFFICIENT SYSTEM, AND HOW MUCH CAN BE CONSERVED. OUR CENTER STRESSES THAT THE PARK ADDRESSES THESE NEEDED FIXES FIRST, BEFORE EVEN CONSIDERING INCREASING THE WATER INTAKE LEVELS FROM THE CURRENT AMOUNT.

3) The wastewater treatment ponds on the north side of the Tioga Road and the associated wastewater line that runs below the river and the meadows, both pose a risk to water quality. Road access is required, but could be eliminated with the relocation of the wastewater treatment ponds to a site on the south side of the road, as proposed by Alternative 1. This relocation would, however, rely upon a reduction in water consumption levels. The removal of the risk to water quality is justification enough for the reduction in water consumption levels. It is not justifiable to leave the wastewater treatment ponds in their present location, posing a risk to water quality and ORV's, because of the proposed water needs. Water consumption should be based upon the capacity of a NEW facility placed in a location that is protective of river values.

OUR CENTER ASSERTS THAT THE CURRENT LOCATION OF THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PONDS IS NOT PROTECTIVE OF RIVER VALUES AND THAT THESE FACILITIES SHOULD BE RELOCATED TO A SITE THAT IS MORE PROTECTIVE OF WATER QUALITY. RELOCATION OF THE PONDS SHOULD NOT BE DEEMED INFEASIBLE IF THEIR RELOCATION RESULTS IN A REDUCTION IN TREATMENT CAPACITY THAT REQUIRES REDUCTION IN WATER CONSUMPTION LEVELS.

IN ITS FINAL EIS THE PARK SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THE ENVISIONED PLAN FOR THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES. BECAUSE THESE FACILITIES PLACE CLEAR RESTRICTIONS ON LEVELS AND TYPES OF VISITOR USE, IT IS INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE PARK TO LEAVE THIS ASPECT OF THE PLAN OPEN-ENDED. THE PARK SHOULD REMOVE ANY LANGUAGE THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR THE RETAINMENT AND UPGRADE OF THE WASTEWATER CONTAINMENT PONDS "IF TECHNOLOGY IS NOT AVAILABLE" TO MOVE THOSE FACILITIES TO A MORE PROTECTIVE LOCATION.

4) It is unclear if the increase in water demand and subsequent increase in water treatment needs requires an upgrade to the wastewater facilities. Page 8-43 states "The increase in average daily water withdrawals would slightly increase the demand for wastewater treatment at Tuolumne Meadows. An upgrade and redesign of the wastewater treatment plant, treatment ponds, and sprayfields at their current location would accommodate this increase and reduce, but not eliminate, water quality risks at that location." These upgrades will have substantial impacts on the corridor, which may be avoided if the upgrades are instead made unnecessary by reducing water demand.

THE PARK SHOULD MAKE CLEAR IF THE INCREASE IN NEEDS FOR WATER TREATMENT REQUIRES AN UPGRADE TO THE EXISTING FACILITIES.

5) The necessity of the Wastewater Containment Ponds is attempted to be justified in an unacceptably brief table on page A-6, which states: "sufficient visitor use continues to necessitate wastewater treatment." While that much is obvious, the size and capacity of the ponds is a variable that directly affects the "necessity" of those facilities operating at specified capacities.

THE PARK SHOULD ADDRESS THE NECESSITY OF THESE FACILITIES TO OPERATE AT A HEIGHTENED CAPACITY IN ITS FINAL EIS.

Additional Points of Concern

? We request the FEIS include a detailed map of the final redesign of the campground that includes clear and accurate representation of wetlands, riparian zones, and specific locations of individual campsites and facilities.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

? The length of current parking spaces at the campgrounds is reportedly 35 feet to accommodate large RVs. For the majority of sites in the campground, 35-foot long parking spaces are not needed. CSERC strongly advocates for redesigning the campground, reducing the length of the majority of parking spaces and either allowing more campsites within the campground area, or using the additional freed-up space to create additional day use parking or to provide for more buffering between existing campsites.

? As noted at the Groveland meeting, CSERC staff identified that, until the small print below Table 7-3 on page 7-16, the numbers of parking spaces do not consistently add up.

? Page 7-95 claims that the site of the fuel station and mountaineering school will be restored to natural conditions, whereas most other places in the document state that parking will be added at that location. We request the Park make consistently clear whether there will be parking or restoration at the site of the fuel station and mountaineering school.

? The impacts of displaced visitors creating new turnouts is not adequately mitigated or managed for. There are currently 129 pullouts between the Cathedral Lakes Trailhead and Tioga Pass, many of which exhibit damaged vegetation and bare ground, and create erosion problems due to the sloped nature of the pullouts (H-19). We request more management direction to protect against "new impacts on native subalpine vegetation communities along the road corridor" (8-82) from visitors who have been displaced from the Tuolumne Meadows corridor.

CLOSING SUMMARY

In summary, we re-emphasize the following key points:

Glen Aulin: Removing the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp completely would best meet legal direction of the WSRA. Removal allows the High Sierra Camp area to be fully eligible to be included in the surrounding Yosemite Wilderness. The Camp is unnecessary and is not providing a true Wilderness experience. Removal would reduce the intense levels of livestock impacts experienced by hikers and affecting the environment. If removal is not deemed the best action by Park planners and decision-makers, CSERC strongly recommends at a minimum that the action described in Alternative 2 for Glen Aulin be made the management direction ? removing permanent structures, scaling down the camp operations, making the area fully eligible to be designated wilderness, and reducing the number of guests to no more than 20 guests.

There is an immediate need for Yosemite to comply with the law- all artificial structures (water lines, water tanks, etc.) that have been placed in designated Wilderness need to be removed promptly.

Tuolumne Meadows Lodge: CSERC urges for the planned removal or relocation and reconstruction/redesign of the Tuolumne Meadow Lodge facilities- It is not necessary, there is no need for 276 beds especially when it directly affects the Scenic river corridor. This facility needs to be set back to be at a minimum of 150' from the river and redesigned and reconstructed (if retained) in a way that is more harmonious with the surrounding environment.

A-Loop Campsites: Remove and restore all campsites and roads in the A-Loop part of the Tuolumne Meadows Campground- The retention of the A-Loop campsites and road segment is inconsistent with the Yosemite General Management Plan, it is damaging to the river environment, is inconsistent with the WSRA, and is unnecessary. To protect and enhance the river values and the overall river corridor, removal of unnecessary facilities is pivotal. Necessary Facilities Analysis: We urge the Park to reconsider the appropriate, legal definition of what is "Necessary" in a Wild and Scenic River corridor- Past choices to build facilities cannot justify those facilities as necessary today, and present visitor volumes don't justify the continued retention of commercial services in this crown jewel of the Sierra Nevada.

Visitor Parking and Regional Transit: Increased parking and a tiny amount of regional transit ridership to Tuolumne Meadows will not address growing visitation impacts and will not meet the legal requirement to determine a User Capacity that protects resources. Adding more parking spaces does not address issues of increasing overcrowding and the effect that has on the Wild and Scenic section of the Tuolumne River and the ORV's associated with it. A true user capacity needs to be established and a strategy laid out on how to handle visitors once that maximum is reached by re-directing them elsewhere.

Parsons Memorial Lodge: The road to Parsons Memorial Lodge should be removed- it is not justifiably needed and will be a positive example that the Park can make to show stewardship of water quality and the environment.

Trails: Proposed group encounter rates will detract from the Wilderness experience ? our Center urges that the Park truly strive to lower the mean encounter rate on high volume trails to a level that will still provide a Wilderness experience for hikers, and adopt a standard of no more than a group encounter rate of 7 groups per hour 80% of the time. Additionally building a trail to the South on Tioga Road will not resolve issues with social trailing in the Meadow and traffic hazards- more aggressive measures are needed to manage pedestrian traffic crossing the highway and creating social trails in the meadows.

Biological ORV's: There is a need to address special status plant and wildlife species in the Biological Values in the ORV

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

section of the EIS- they are an integral part of the ecosystem and essential to the proper functioning of aquatic and riparian habitats. The re-introduction of these species into areas they have been extirpated from should be one of the highest priorities outlined in the EIS. Additionally, the impact of cowbirds on the native songbird population and a plan to control their population needs to be addressed in the EIS.

Stock Use: The EIS needs to better protect wetland, riparian, and other sensitive habitats from stock threats. Opening dates for stock use should be set every season in accordance with "range-readiness", wetlands need to be fully mapped in Lyell Canyon to better protect their habitat, overnight stock use should be removed from Lyell Canyon, and allowing pack stock use for commercial groups on the grounds that their trips have a "scenic" purpose should not be part of the Plan. Additionally, the Park needs to quantify the number of stock (Park Service stock included) that will be held at the concessionaire stables to allow for proper analysis of their environmental impact.

Water: The water intake amounts proposed from the Dana Fork are not sustainable and could likely be harmful to aquatic resource values. Consumption levels push the margin of what will impact aquatic habitats and fails to account for climate change affecting water availability; conservation of water and repairing of the present pipelines are needed rather than allowing any additional water to be withdrawn. Another major concern needing addressed is the presence and capacity of the current water treatment facility. The location should ideally be changed to the location proposed in Alternative 1 to protect water resources, and the needed future capacity of and plan for the wastewater treatment plant should be assessed in the final EIS. IN SUMMARY, CSERC URGES PARK PLANNING STAFF AND THE PARK LEADERSHIP TEAM TO NOT TAKE SMALL, INCREMENTAL STEPS THAT BASICALLY MAINTAIN THE STATUS QUO AT TUOLUMNE MEADOWS. DECADES OF INCREASING USE AND CONCENTRATED RECREATION DIRECTLY AROUND THE CORE AREA HAVE RESULTED IN DIMINISHED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH AND A REDUCED QUALITY OF THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE.

CSERC PRESSES PARK STAFF TO BE VISIONARY, FAR-THINKING, COURAGEOUS, AND GROUNDED IN THE BELIEF THAT DOING WHAT IS BEST FOR THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THIS PRECIOUS PLACE WILL BE LOOKED BACK AT BY FUTURE GENERATIONS AND PRAISED.

Thank you for considering these comments.

██████ executive director On behalf of the CSERC staff, board of directors, and members

Correspondence ID:	242	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 13:01:46				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Having visited Tuolumne Meadows since a young child -probably some 60 years!- I was delighted to see the area getting this attention and I wholeheartedly agree with all the proposals. Glen Aulin does need cutting back and I think Tuol could use further eliminating of campsights as well, but the plan is basically sound and sounds good. It is my favorite place on earth because it is deep I my soul. It makes one feel very protective as a parent would.				

Correspondence ID:	243	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 13:52:27				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Sir, 3/14/13				

I appreciate this opportunity to respond to the T.R.P. The Planning Team has done a terrific job to help one understand the dynamics of the Tuolumne River Plan. The Alternatives presented in theme formate is very helpful.

My concerns deal with Parking, Carrying Capacities, Water, Day use, and Resource protection. These issues are based on my preferred Alternative #4.

Parking: 1- with regularized shuttle bus service, additional day parking could exist just outside of Tuolumne Meadows. I believe Gaylor Pit could be better developed for this purpose along with the proposed N.P.S. housing.

Carrying Capacity: 1-with the water storage at 60,000gal/day I would feel more comfortable realizing a Tuolumne P.O.A.T. equal to Alternative#3(4,166), with Day use absorbing the difference. A drought can occur any time and it is best to manage for the worst case senario.

2-Carring capacity is only as good as its inforcement. Parking sites need accurate placement and monitoring. Curbing and rock berms due a lot to alleviate roadside parking.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Resource Protection: I-I was unable to recognize Largest Patch Index (LPI) work on the NORTH/EAST side of the Lyell Fk. Here there is 4mi. of Social trail eroding long stretches of meadow from years of neglect.

2-There are two obvious,well recognized Social trails that drastically need attention. The trail from T.M.Store to Parsons Lodge and one Known as the Glen Aulen 'short cut' near Pothole Dome. I'm not infavor of Boardwalks. So what to do? Limit parking in these areas to time and number of sites. Discourage access with barriers.

All else appears to have been recognized for me in Alternative #4, with future improvements and/or up grades.

Thanks for your excellent effort.

Correspondence ID:	244	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	American Mountain Guides Association Recreational Groups				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	03/15/13				

Don Neubacher Superintendent, Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Re: American Mountain Guides Association Comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

The American Mountain Guides Association (AMGA) welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the Tuolumne River Plan (the plan). We believe that collaboration and input from all members of the public is essential to properly managing our National Parks. We look forward to working with Yosemite National Park (YOSE) in their planning processes to provide the best possible experiences for the visiting public, conserve this amazing climbing resource, and support the mountain guiding profession.

About the AMGA The American Mountain Guides Association (AMGA) is a national 501(c)(3) non--?profit organization that has been supporting mountain professionals for over 30 years. The AMGA inspires an exceptional client experience by being the premier source for training, credentials, resource stewardship and services for professional mountain guides and climbing instructors in the United States. The AMGA is an educational institution, an accrediting body, and a standard setting organization that is our nation's sole representative to the twenty--?five member--? countries International Federation of Mountain Guides Associations (IFMGA), the international governing body responsible for guiding standards around the world.

Since its genesis in 1979, the AMGA has grown to represent over 2,500 members that are represented in 49 states and 13 countries, over 30 accredited guide services and educational institutions, and 60 Corporate Partners. Each year the training provided by the AMGA reaches over 700,000 people through direct contact between certified guides, climbing instructors, accredited businesses, and their clients. The AMGA provides education, training and certification in the disciplines of alpine climbing, rock climbing, and ski mountaineering. It also raises the standards of guide services and climbing schools with regard to safety, Leave No Trace practices, client care, education, and wilderness stewardship. The AMGA adheres to the strictest of standards that are rigidly enforced to ensure our certified guides, climbing instructors, and accredited businesses are the nation's preeminent experts on climbing and ski mountaineering best practices.

Comments In general, the AMGA supports the Preferred Alternative with a few modifications. Given that many items in the plan are integral to the climbing experience in Tuolumne, but not specific to the mission of the AMGA, we will defer to the Access Fund's comments for specifics regarding items such as camping.

The AMGA believes that the climbing school should be retained. The Preferred Alternative calls for removal of the mountaineering shop, climbing school, and the gas station. It discusses the availability of fuel and shopping in Lee Vining, but does not specify any viable options for moving the climbing school. Given the historic nature of the Yosemite Mountaineering School, and the valuable services it provides to the visitors in Tuolumne, we would like to see the school remain in the Meadows. It would be appropriate to move the facility to place it in a more centralized location, such as the Tuolumne Lodge, in order to centralize operations and mitigate impacts.

Guided climbing and instruction should continue in Tuolumne Meadows, and we support measures that will enable that. The moderate summer temperatures and greater availability of rock sites suitable for teaching make it a key venue to this important visitor opportunity.

In addition to comments on the concession climbing facility in Tuolumne, the AMGA would like to provide comments on the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Determination of Extent Necessary for commercial services in wilderness. We support its intent of complying with the Wilderness Act and applicable case law. We also believe that credentialed mountain guides provide a valuable service to the public, as well as serve as an underutilized partner for stewardship of the land.

? Due to the increasing numbers of climbers who, for various reasons are not able to learn all of the skill sets involved in this lifetime sport, there is a corresponding need for professional mentors ? the credentialed mountain guide. It takes year or decades to develop the skills and judgment to independently operate in alpine rock terrain. Style preferences, risk tolerance, skill level, terrain knowledge and equipment expertise vary widely amongst the public. The AMGA believes the public must have the option to experience the outdoors in a style that is appropriate for them. For some, the use of a non--?profit or for--?profit guide service is an essential option in order to experience the wilderness safely and responsibly.

? Perhaps due to the language employed by the Wilderness Act regarding "commercial services", there has developed among some wilderness managers an underlying bias against guides and members of the public who choose to utilize a guide. It should be noted that all climbers are recreational members of the public, regardless of whether they are guided or self--?guided. Hence, a certain amount of commercial services are necessary for realizing the public purposes of wilderness.

? AMGA credentialed guides promote the preservation of wilderness character. In essence, they are a Resource to the Resource. They facilitate the public's access to opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. They connect the public with the natural, undeveloped world. They integrate Leave No Trace principles into their teaching and their leadership, setting an example for both the guided and self--?guided public. Indeed, the environmental footprint of a guided climbing party is identical, or many times, less than the self--?guided party.

? The AMGA supports the use of both non--?profit and for--?profit commercial services ? provided they are trained and qualified at the industry standard ? as essential options for the public to experience the wilderness. Currently there are seven NPS units that recognize AMGA certification and/or accreditation as important prerequisites for obtaining a Commercial Use Authorization; thus ensuring that their permit holders provide the highest level of safety practices and resource stewardship. While many guides that currently operate in YOSE are AMGA certified, it will be beneficial for the long--?term quality of mountain guiding to require appropriate professional credentials.

We would also like to provide specific comments on the language utilized in the Determination of Extent Necessary. ? In section 5C, under the exception to educational provisions, we respectfully disagree with its premise. While Leave No Trace should be a prerequisite for all wilderness visitors, not all visitors to Yosemite Wilderness are even aware of the existence of such a program or ethos, nevertheless the subtleties and practice of it. Guides are a crucial interpretive conduit of the LNT ethic to the public.

? Section 6E sets a maximum amount of 2 "commercial groups" per trail, per day. While this may be appropriate for hiking groups of 12, it is not clear whether this would prohibit a guided climbing party from accessing a climbing area through the river corridor. The AMGA would like to see clarification on this point, in that we would not support such a prohibition, even a de facto prohibition.

? Section 8A(1) requires any permit holder, be it concession, CUA, or SUP, to submit "proposed itineraries by May 1 or as soon as possible" for a lottery for use that summer. Any itineraries submitted later would be allocated on a first--?come, first--?serve basis under the same criteria as the lottery. While this may be a practical system for a pack outfitter who plans regular group trips, it seems inflexible for smaller operators who may serve walk--?in (or last minute) visitors, such as the climbing school. We would like to see this clarified in a favorable manner.

? Section 8A(2) requires "documentation that employees are trained and qualified to provide such education". In the case of climbing skills instruction, what criteria does the park use to determine qualification? We recommend that YOSE require AMGA certifications for all climbing guides, as it is the sole internationally recognized credential to guide on the terrain offered in the park. We would be happy to discuss the benefits further with both Wilderness and Commercial Services staff.

? We firmly support Section 8B, giving preference to the lowest--?impact proposal between groups with the same wilderness purposes. We believe it is essential that guided users maintain the highest level of wilderness stewardship, and serve as an example to the self--?guided public.

The AMGA thanks you for the opportunity to provide comments on this important plan. We look forward to serving as a resource and partner to the park in the planning process. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions, or for more information about AMGA certifications.

Sincerely,

██████████ Outreach and Advocacy Director

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 245 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,14,2013 15:16:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comments on the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River Draft EIS

1. Overall I found the document to be well written and comprehensive. I believe the efforts to restore the meadow and eliminate the roadside parking will have long term beneficial results. So overall, I give the plan good marks. 2. My comments will be directed into areas that I believe need to be changed or studied further. 3. Glen Aulin a. Overall the decision to reduce (in the Preferred Alternative) the capacity of the camp from 32 visitors per night to 20 appears to be arbitrary. It will undoubtedly impact the capacity of the High Sierra Loop?one of the world's best wilderness experiences. The decision driven by the desire to reduce horse traffic on the trail and waste disposal issues. The only solutions considered were access reduction. Why did you not ask: what can we do to maintain capacity? You partially answer the question in Alternative 3 where you allow for a 600 gallon per day water capacity and only reduce the capacity to 28 visitors per night. b. I recommend that you take temporary measures at Glen Aulin, making no permanent changes, until a comprehensive study of the High Sierra Camps is made as part of the Wilderness Plan. I also recommend that the planners take the approach of looking at the supply and waste disposal problems from a positive (what do we have to do to make this work) rather than from a negative (what do we have to eliminate) approach. With the exception of upgrading the waste water treatment facility, I could not find any discussion of this kind of positive approach problem solving in the document. Looking at how other wilderness camps similar to Yosemite's HSCs solve these problems either in the US or elsewhere in the world would be one idea. Use or development of new technology would be another. One of strengths of Yosemite's managers over the years has been the innovative approach to problem solving. I trust you will take a similar approach to the High Sierra camps. c. I do not support the Glen Aulin solution offered in alternative 2. Reducing the camp to a seasonal outfitters camp is a bad idea as it destroys the whole High Sierra Camp experience. However, this approach could be considered as an alternative approach to a holistic examination of the future of the High Sierra Camps as part of the Wilderness Plan. I probably would not support it as a Wilderness Plan alternative going forward except if it allowed HSC capacity to expand and open up the experience to more people. 4. Whitewater boating. Only alternative 2 offers any solution here and I couldn't find much descriptive detail. I recommend that you extend this solution to the preferred alternative including both the Lyell Fork and Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne. Yosemite is a world class climbing location with similar rescue and safety challenges as would be found by letting boaters have access to this magnificent stretch of river. 5. Water usage: a. I found your estimates for water usage (table 7-15) to be confusing. For example you assume that each visitor to the Store/grill consumes 5 gallons per person per day. The only water consumption available to a visitor would be the grill itself (food preparation and cleanup) and the restroom. Your average consumption figures appear to be high, especially since you've accounted for restroom usage with campers, lodge guests and employees elsewhere. Only day visitor usage should be counted. b. If your calculations for water usage at the store/grill are correct, assigning the same usage at the visitor center is not. There is no food preparation or cleanup needed at the visitor center, only the restroom. Assuming that each visitor consumes 5 gallons of water for each visit to the visitor center is not reasonable since not every visitor uses the facility. Even if they did, 5 gallons per restroom use is excessive. These calculations are important since the total usage of these two facilities represents 8800 gallons per day of the 67,000 gallons per day. c. The assumption of 100 gallons per day per campsite in the campground seems high as well and that accounts for about half of water consumption in the Meadows. I could not find any source for your assumptions; perhaps they are buried elsewhere in the document. Since water usage and the capacity to draw water from the Dana Fork is key to your planning, I think you should be more forthcoming in how you arrived at these usage assumptions. 6. Relocation of the visitor center. Main reason appears to improve visitor access to the trail across the Meadows. The term visitor contact station and visitor center are confusing. A visitor contact station would appear to be a "smaller" less complete facility than a visitor center. Given that the current visitor center is very small it couldn't get much smaller or more limited. If the vision is for a smaller visitor center, then I recommend that you rethink. Sierra Meadows, and Tuolumne Meadows in particular, play a critical role in watershed management. This is a wonderful opportunity to educate the public. Meadows play a key role in meadow in the hydrology of the entire watershed. You should center a facility that will act as a attractive and enticing greeting and educational facility for the visitor. 7. Why are you keeping the recreational vehicle dump station? If you are getting rid of the gas station (OK), then save 1600 gallons of water a day and dump the dump. This seems to be an inconsistent priority. 8. Table 7-16, location 2, alternative 4. Adding a trail to parallel the road is a good idea. Suggest it accommodate pedestrian as well as bike traffic. It should also be constructed with a water permeable surface.

Correspondence ID: 246 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,14,2013 16:04:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having worked in Yosemite for the concession services in the past, I feel that the are discussed - while sensitive and beautiful - offers an educational opportunity to many, like myself, that go on to work for environmental agencies to protect the overall well-being of our air, water, wilderness, and ecosystems or gives a comprehensive understanding and lifelong support for our planet. I feel the no alternative option is the best route to take. I agree that parking along Highway 120 can be an issue but when considering the rest of the plan access to the natural beauty is what changes one's conscious understanding of our planet and its resources. I have faith that the people that love the park, work for NPS, work for the concession services, etc. take seriously the do no harm ideals and make efforts to correct anyone or anything that goes against that stance. Whether pack animals, lunches at Glen Aulin, day trips to lakes and trails near Tioga Road, campfire talks, pictures taken from no more than 3 feet from the car - the park is a wild area that has utilitarian resources that should be maintained for everyone. The park is vital as a teaching tool for humans. Another area of focus might be removing the Hetch Hetchy dam when thinking of preserving the natural systems in the park.

Correspondence ID: 247 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,14,2013 17:49:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: TRP Free flowing ? hydrology of the meadow ? for years there has been the question of how much of an effect do roads and paths have on the hydrology of the meadow. I feel that there should not be a path from Tuolumne store to Parsons, and definitely not a more developed one. We should limit the access in order to protect the meadows (this is true of all of the "social trails" that cross the meadow.) The current established routes are along the old road ? it should be kept to that.

Visitor center ? seems like a good idea to move it across from the soda springs trailhead. New location, but a location that makes sense (by the store = bad idea!) And converting the VC parking to trail head parking also seems like a good idea.

No road side parking sounds great! This will positively affect everyone's safety as well as the view-shed! But why are we focusing on making more parking lots available and not looking at alternate ways of transporting the visitors? (Encouraging people to leave RVs and personal vehicles at their campsites ? away from Tuolumne - if they are just traveling to Tuolumne for the day) Also for campers and lodge guests to leave their vehicles in their spots rather than driving the mile or 2 to the trailhead (reliable shuttles every 15 minutes and a severe lack of parking at destinations would probably accomplish this!)

Poopenaut Valley and dam release ? excellent ? keeping the research going and making this un-natural instillation function in conjunction with nature in the best possible way. Requiring the best management techniques on this, and continuing monitoring and research to guide these policies).

Wild segments: I feel discontinuing day trail rides from Tuolumne is preferred. But continuing the 4-6 day trips offered by the stables (accessibility to the high country).

Glen Aulin ? Should remain at 32 visitors per night (current load), and the toilet facility should be converted to a vault/composting toilet system that effectively works. (Reducing the # to 20 would cripple the "loop" system. The ranger led loop trips are an important part of our park's heritage, and an important way to provide accessibility and create visitors with deep thoughts on preservation and conservation ethic. This helps to gain public support for our parks and wilderness.) The high camp system began the same year as the Park Service. Mather - the first director of the park service encouraged their development and felt strongly that we get support of the Parks and wilderness preservation by taking folks out into it and guiding them through an experience that allows them to learn, experience, and fall in love with the land. After all it has been shown time and time again that we preserve/protect those things that we love.

A temporary tent cabin type of dwelling should remain an option for Employee housing in Tuolumne. Tent cabin are less formal, thus harkens to the rustic nature of the parks and the park staff. The permanent cabins in Tuolumne seem to be plagued with rodent issues. The tent cabins are dismantled, and thus do not provide winter habitat for rodents (and all the health risks accompanied by them ? hanta for example) Also the tent cabins (in Tuolumne and the high camps) are an important link to our rustic roots. These dwellings allow their inhabitants to live civilly while being more in contact with their environment. The people who live in them have professed to feel more part of the environment because the materials that constitute the "tent cabin" allow them to experience the light changing as well as the ambient noise of the natural environment around them with a comfortable yet rustic experience.

Thank you all for your time and diligence on these matters.

Correspondence ID: 248 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,14,2013 21:19:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First I'd like to say I have been living and working in Yosemite for ten years. The idea of removing tents from Glen Aulin would only harm the camps positive influence on guests to the Park. If water use is the concern for removing tents and limiting meal services, I feel the camp should eliminate flushing toilets instead. Composting toilet facilities are far better for water conservation and the surrounding environment.

Removing the Gas station and mountaineering school also would limit guest convenience for fuel and recreation oportunities. As for consolidating stables, this seems to be a way to confuse and complicate handling of animals between two separate entities. Also stopping day rides seems to me to be a limit to our ADA guests, can they take a wheel chair on the trails? Iam sure that's not allowed or some one who would not be able to walk under there own power on the uneven trails. Taking day rides from our visitors sounds like limiting backcountry access to a select group of people.

Combining employee housing would create a problem for employee relations. Having housing spread out a little over a few spots helps keep Pack behavior and the feeling of congested housing in a Wilderness setting limited. I do feel the concessions housing at the Lodge should be moved farther away from the river and kept at a fair distance from guest accommodations. Eliminating any employee housing areas from where they stand now would only offer more of an impact on other more delicate areas. Also not having housing at areas with food or cash would invite animals or theft, not to mention unsupervised horses or

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

mules by the appropriate number of care takers would also invite problems.

I feel the parking at Cathedral Lakes trail head should have some parking spots made but nothing on the north side of the road. Anything on the north side would only impact the meadow more. I also drive the roads for work or for pleasure and believe that Tioga road is fantastically narrow and with out a shadow of a doubt unsafe for motorist and horribly DANGEROUS for cyclists. As a cyclist myself I have always felt discriminated against with the lack of ANY appropriate shoulder for bikes or for motorists to avoid hitting cyclists on the many sharp blind corners. The choice to ride in the Park is taken at GREAT risk to cyclists as to the appalling non bike friendly roads. The idea of keeping Tioga the same as to retain a historic feel or to not impact the land on either side is irresponsible and puts visitors safety at risk. Road side curbing will only prove to restrict an already too narrow road and restrictive road. A walking path along side the road is a great idea as long as it is also a bike path, if it were, it would eliminate the bike car conflict on the road, at least that would help for cyclists.

Correspondence ID:	249	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 22:28:37				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please do not reduce the size of Glen Aulin camp. The high Sierra camps provide great opportunities for the very young and older folks to experience the back country. I have visited the camps and my love for Yosemite and our parks system has deepened from these experiences. The camps need to be upgraded to reduce their impact on the environment. They appear to have been neglected over the years. We should invest in them, not eliminate spaces at them . Please allow future generations to experience the beauty of the backcountry and keep Glen Aulin at present size.				

Correspondence ID:	250	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Tuolumne River Trust Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 22:44:47				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Attn: Mike Yochim Re Whitewater boating submission from [REDACTED] for consideration, Mar 15, 2013. You asked me at the meeting in Yosemite Valley on February 21 to discuss the feasibility of a whitewater takeout on Forest Service managed land on the main stem Tuolumne. I spoke with Dusty Vaughn, Groveland District Recreation Specialist, 962-7825 ext 525, gdvaughn@fs.fed.us about that ww takeout. Dusty said that the stretch of TR from park boundary to Early Intake is listed as boating Area A in the Forest Service/BLM CMP. He would favor a takeout at the Kirkwood/Preston Falls trailhead on river right, located just upstream from the Kirkwood Powerhouse at Early Intake. My topo map gives this takeout as about river mile 105.7 As I remember from my last visit ca 1981, there is parking and a worn, rudimentary campground with a bare bank for landing and takeout. O'S Dam is about river mile 117.4, Poopenaut V is river mile 115 and park boundary is river mile 111. The river trip from O'S to Kirkwood/Preston trailhead would be about 11.7 miles. My contact who ran this stretch in ca 1974 still feels it was 23 miles because it took 4 days. My contact probably ran O'S to Poopenaut V in a single day since it is 2.4 miles which my contact calls "an exceptional run." I'm sure camping in Poopenaut V would be a joy also, before carrying out for those not going on to Early Intake. Continuing: "From [Poopenaut] down is a portage fest of large bolder slab and fields of choked rapids, but some of the best scenery I've ever seen with granite domes coming vertically straight down to the river's edge." Photos are available of that trip. There were a lot of portages, so I guess that second segment took three days, but the memories have lasted 39 years which made the difficulty worth the trouble. Given what little I know, boaters will probably opt to put in at O'S with an option of either a one day with some wanting an overnight in Poopenaut V before carrying out, or 3 day additional trip to reach Early Intake.				

Correspondence ID:	251	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:22:32				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Our family spends 2 weeks every summer camping in Tuolumne - usually in A loop. I'm generally in agreement with your preferred alternative (#4). In fact, I'd support any of the plans EXCEPT # 2. Whatever you do, please do not expand recreation!				

We love A loop, and would be delighted if it stayed open, but if you feel it is necessary to close it to protect the river, then I support that. Reduce the size of the RVs that are accommodated in the CG. Why do people need such large RVs? In fact, one summer I was riding my bike along the Tioga Road and I got pulled over by a ranger because I was in the way of the big RVs driving along the road.

I'm glad to see you are thinking of reducing day horse rides. I would go further and eliminate horses entirely. They are high impact on the environment, they poop all over the trails, dust up the trails, and disturb solitude. Why do we need horses? If people want to hike the HS camps and can't carry their own stuff they should hire a porter, not a horse, to carry their stuff.

I agree that we don't need the mountaineering school or fuel station.

I would also recommend that the rangers enforce rules on campsite occupancy. During the busy season I've seen 10-12 people on a site. This has heavy impact.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Oh yeah, and the plumbing in the CG needs an upgrade!

Correspondence ID:	252	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 08:01:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	As a visitor and lover of Yosemite and its wildness, I very much favor Alternative 4. The Park is in grave danger of overcrowding already. Limits are necessary. Public transportation is a really good idea. Have really liked the system in Zion NP.				

Correspondence ID:	253	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 08:31:30				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The focus of changes should be to encourage people to get out of their cars and experience the park in a non-motor-vehicular way. For this reason several of the changes in the "preferred" alternative are, to be kind, totally illogical, or to be honest, downright stupid.				

The most glaring examples of incredibly ill-advised proposed changes include the following:

1. Changes at Glen Aulin

A. Reducing the number of beds The "preferred" solution to existing problems is to allow LESS people to enjoy the HSC experience? That's freaking brilliant. If the new waste system proves incapable of handling the existing number of guests, reduce that number ? tent cabins can be relatively easily dismantled and removed. But until such time as that proves to be the case, keep the number of guests as it is. Alternatively, reduce the number as per the "preferred" solution, but revise the Plan to state that if the new waste system proves capable of handling this number, incrementally increase the number until the existing number is reached or the system's capacity is reached, whichever comes first. B. Discontinuing "wood for heat stoves in visitor tent cabins to reduce the need for stock use to supply wood to the camp." The HSC camps provide a modest level of comfort for those who prefer it to backpacking. Maybe the hard cores who feel even a marked trail is nature despoiled consider HSC guests to be wimps, but who cares what they think?, don't stay at them if it's not your cup of tea but don't impose your values on everybody else like the self-centered a-holes you are. HSC guests are out of their cars and experiencing the park away from pavement, and isn't that the important thing? So why do anything to lessen their comfort and possibly discourage their patronage? As to the reason for this proposed change, I will address that in my comments about pack stock.

C. Discontinuing "'meals-only' service for people who are not lodge guests to reduce demands for water use and waste disposal." Water use? The river that fills Hetch Hetchy can't spare the amount of water required for this practice? Wrong. Waste disposal? Here again, if the new waste system proves incapable of handling whatever additional increment of waste is created by this practice, discontinue it then, NOT now. If non-guests are willing to pay for overpriced meals that bring a substantial profit for the concessioner, at least some of which will be reinvested in services the concessioner provides, why on earth discontinue this practice without better reasons than these unfounded, unproven ones?

2. Changes regarding pack stock (horses/mules)

"Concessioner stock day rides into the wilderness would be discontinued to reduce hiker-stock conflicts on trails. On an average year, less than 100 visitors on commercial trips using stock would be displaced from trails in the Tuolumne River corridor." Define "hiker-stock conflict" for me, because I've done a lot of hiking and never witnessed anything that meets my definition of a conflict between hiker and stock. Does the act of a hiker and stock crossing each other's paths constitute a conflict? Not to me. And how often does it happen anyway? If at all in the course of a day's hiking, once (or maybe twice if either party is doing an out-and-back). And when it does, what's there to it? You step off the trail for at most 30 seconds and exchange a nod or smile or "hello". Certainly a more pleasant interaction than the scowl you receive from one of those same a-holes who would never stay at a HSC camp and feel their whole day is ruined if they don't go all the way through it without seeing a single person. Self-centered people like this remind me of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, who feel every street should have one car lane and 6 bike lanes ? they propose changes that serve only their self-interest; "the greater good for the greater number" is an unknown concept to them. Some of the proposed changes in the "preferred" alternative obviously have the self-centered influence of people like this behind them. All that aside, if on an average year less than 100 visitors on commercial trips using stock would be displaced by this change, why does any change need to be made when the impact of the targeted activity is so miniscule in the first place? Leave well enough alone. "Discontinue concessioner stock day rides into wilderness to eliminate conflicts on trails and enhance opportunities for self-reliance" [italics mine]. You've got to be kidding -- the moron who wrote this ought to be fired just for their awful writing, never mind their bad ideas. So besides eliminating non-existent hiker-stock conflicts, THIS is your other reason to discontinue stock rides? Exactly how do stock rides interfere with this noble goal?, if you lose the trail and then find it again when you see horse droppings?, meaning instead of relying on yourself you relied on horseshit? Speaking of horseshit, that's exactly what this proposed change is a load of. So when you're lying on the side of the trail with a ruptured appendix and a pack train comes along and offers assistance, if you're so hung up on being self-reliant just say "no thanks, I'm good." See?, your opportunities for self-reliance don't have to be any less enhanced just because you have contact with stock.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

3. Day use trail management "Day use on trails near Tioga Road would be managed to preserve opportunities for solitude" ... "If necessary for maintaining use levels within this standard, day use wilderness trailhead quotas would be implemented for major trail segments, including Lyell Canyon, Glen Aulin, Cathedral Lakes, and Dog Lake". I enjoy solitude as much as anybody. But a statement that dayhikers could potentially be denied access to wilderness trailheads if use levels exceed standards does not belong in the Plan. I'm sure the bureaucrats who came up with these proposed standards can point to irrefutable science behind the standards, but however well-meaning this proposal is, it is badly misguided, because when it comes to dayhiking, even on wilderness trailheads solitude should be sacrificed for access if a trail's popularity unfortunately makes it impossible to have both. For overnight hikes, definitely keep a quota system, but do NOT implement one for day use. Managing use levels for day use for reasons other than solitude, such as Half Dome or if a trail is physically overwhelmed by the sheer number of hikers, is a good idea; doing so for no other reason than solitude is a bad idea.

4. Mountaineering shop Why remove the mountaineering shop? It poses no risk to water quality like the fuel station. How essential is a post office in the middle of Tuolumne Meadows? Not at all. Stamps could be sold at the store, and mailing a letter is something that can be done almost anywhere, it doesn't have to be mailed HERE ? your Tuolumne Meadows experience is not diminished one iota if you can't mail a letter until you get to Lee Vining. However, products sold at the mountaineering shop are things someone might actually need for the activities they are planning to do HERE, so why eliminate the convenience of providing the opportunity to buy them HERE? Unless enough space to sell the products sold by the mountaineering shop can be obtained by expanding the store and/or converting the post office, KEEP it.

5. Additional restrictions on commercial use in wilderness "During the peak use months of July and August, commercial groups having only a recreational purpose would no longer have access" (Glen Aulin zone) or "would be restricted to Monday/Thursday only" (Lyell Canyon zone); "groups having an educational or scenic, as well as a recreational, purpose would continue to have access". In theory this is probably OK. But in reality it probably opens a can of worms. The distinction is pretty gray, for example, between a commercial rock climbing group with only a recreational purpose and a commercial rock climbing group with a scenic or educational as well as a recreational purpose. Any location to do rock climbing in Yosemite is scenic; how do you tell a commercial rock climbing group that they can't access these zones on a weekend because their purpose is only recreational?

Correspondence ID:	254	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 08:35:07				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear Planning team,				

I am opposed to reducing the number of beds at Glen Aulin. It is already the smallest camp and this would reduce the capacity of the "loop". I am also opposed to eliminating all roadside parking unless there are shuttle stops at all pullouts where climbing currently is involved. Employee housing at ranger camp is historic use and should be maintained not demolished. Day use should not be expanded and overnight use should not be reduced. Do not close the meadows but the wagon road should be replaced with a non-hydrology altering alternative. Upgrade the campground and change the direction of flow. Restore some sites too close to the river. remove tent cabins too close to the river. Make sure the bridges do not alter hydrology.

Thanks, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	255	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 12:35:40				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I understand that there must be some compromise to both preserve and share the incredible beauty of Yosemite, but I feel strongly that the reduction of beds at the Glen Aulin High Camp is a mistake. Please rethink the reduction of overnight guests at Glen Aulin (a change in the water and/or waste technology? higher use fees for GA?)...It would be a shame to lose the ability to share amazing Glen Aulin with the number of guests it has accommodated in the past.				

Thank you for your hard work, Friend of Glen Aulin

Correspondence ID:	256	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 13:01:23				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The current level of urbanization of Tuolumne Meadows is incompatible with the concept of a wild and scenic river. Alternative 2 perpetuates, and may worsen, current conditions, and it should not even be considered. The Preferred Alternative allows for too much congestion. A compromise between Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 would come closer to what the US Congress wants the NPS to accomplish. The Preferred Alternative seeks to please everybody, especially the concessionaire, but does not give sufficient emphasis to what is meant by WILD. Inasmuch as the NPS projects an increased number of visitors to YNP in the future, it should start thinking outside the box. Devil's Postpile NM/Red's Meadow, a miniature YNP, shows none of the congestion and erosion you find at Tuolumne Meadows, despite the large number of visitors. A mandatory shuttle is the key to its success, and, I submit, is what YNP needs. I have been a regular Yosemite visitor during the past 50 years, I can attest that				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

the visitor experience has deteriorated during the period. I wish future generations could experience what I experienced half a century ago, and not the growing urbanization of the Park ongoing today.

Correspondence ID:	257	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 19:04:31				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	March 15, 2013				

Don Neubacher Superintendent Yosemite National Park Yosemite, CA 95389 SUBMITTED VIA PARK WEBSITE & VIA U.S. MAIL

RE: Comments on Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan and Draft EIS

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

Please accept these comments on the Tuolumne draft Wild and Scenic (W&S) river management plan. I am a 30 year resident of [REDACTED] and a regular user of the Park, particularly Tuolumne Meadows and Yosemite's extensive wilderness. I regularly hike or trail-run along W&S sections of the river including in Lyell Canyon, on the Mono Pass trail (Upper Dana Fork) and on the Waterwheel Falls trail accessed via Tuolumne Meadows, and occasionally use these and other areas as starting points for overnight backpacking trips. I work for a non-profit conservation organization and thus am familiar with wilderness regulations and issues, although I am submitting these comments as a private citizen.

I am deeply concerned about how the Park proposes to manage human use alongside the river corridor both in and outside of wilderness (i.e., along both the Wild and the Scenic river segments, respectively).

Scenic River Segments

Although there are definitely problems with parking and pedestrian and motorist safety along the Tioga Road in Tuolumne Meadows, and particularly at the Cathedral Lakes trailhead and around the Tuolumne store, the practical impact of the Park's proposal to limit parking will be to reduce overall visitor use and enjoyment of the Meadows and environs. Given how Americans passionately love their national parks, and with the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service coming up in 2016 and big celebrations planned in Yosemite, the Park Service cannot let the Tuolumne high-country become a "drive by" portion of Park, i.e., one where visitors drive into the Park, cannot find a place to park in the river corridor and therefore are forced to drive on through, thus being deprived of the essential Tuolumne experience. The Park must find ways to accommodate visitors in a way that protects resources and allows continued enjoyment.

I fully support expanding parking lots in appropriate locations to address the parking problems and eliminating some of the more problematic dirt parking areas (e.g., Cathedral Lakes trailhead and Tuolumne store), but I request that the Park consider expanded parking lot capacity beyond the proposal to increase parking in the Meadows area by only 100 vehicle spaces. Well over 100 cars park daily in summers along Tioga Road in Tuolumne Meadows, and these visitors should be accommodated. Also, I am unclear whether the Park Service also plans to eliminate parking along the dirt road that leads from the Lembert Dome parking area to the stables; this is a safe place to park off the highway and accommodates many visitors. Rather than eliminate parking here, if that is proposed, the Park Service should improve the way in which parking occurs in this area (e.g., marking spots, avoiding impacting meadow edges) instead of eliminating parking for an additional 100 or more vehicles.

Alternatively, the Park Service should ensure that a shuttle system is developed and fully implemented as mitigation for the loss of available parking due to implementation of the preferred alternative. In addition to the town of Lee Vining being an appropriate parking area and shuttle stop, other options should also be considered including the popular dirt parking area just east of Tioga Pass (which should be paved to accommodate more cars) and possibly expanded parking somewhere west of Tuolumne Meadows (e.g., Crane Flat vicinity or Porcupine Flat campground?) so that visitors could ride a shuttle to the Meadows from either the west or east side of the Park. In addition to a shuttle from Lee Vining to the Park, a shuttle from Tioga Pass to Tuolumne Meadows should run more frequently to allow visitors to make more frequent and shorter trips into and out of the Park.

I support reducing but not completely eliminating the extensive user trail network in the Meadows themselves. People need to be able to walk to the river to dangle their feet in the river or have a picnic in order to experience the magic of this wild river and of Tuolumne Meadows. I would suggest phasing meadow and trail restoration so that there remain opportunities for visitors to experience "their river" on an intimate basis.

One unintended consequence of limiting parking in the Tuolumne region is that this may place additional pressure on other areas along highway 120 to accommodate the demand for day hiking. For instance locations such as Tenaya Lake and the Sunrise trailhead or the Porcupine (North Dome) trailhead may become more popular day-hiking destinations, however any

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

increased use of day hiking in these locations should not also be proposed to be limited as a result of the reduction in parking in Tuolumne Meadows.

Although the DEIS states that "undesignated roadside parking would continue to be allowed along Tioga Road west and east of Tuolumne Meadows" (DEIS at 7-28), it states in other parts of the document that "the roadside parking along Tioga Road will be eliminated" (DEIS at ES-9) and "All the action alternatives would eliminate roadside parking along Tioga Road?" (DEIS at 5-68). Thus it is unclear if the Park proposes only to limit parking in the Meadows or if there are existing (or future) plans to also limit parking in other portions of the river corridor, which parallels the Tioga Road nearly up to Tioga Pass. If the latter is a possibility, then the Park must commit to doing additional NEPA analysis and public review if it decides to propose limiting other parking on Tioga Road outside of the Meadows. Included in this public review must be an analysis of alternative sites that could provide access to trails and the river along the Tioga Road outside of Tuolumne Meadows. Dirt parking areas along the highway east of the Meadows access some old trails that allow the visitor to experience the "wilder side" of Yosemite. One example is the lower Gaylor Lakes trail, an historic trail that can only be accessed via a small dirt parking area along the road. Other pullouts allow the visitor to access the unmaintained trail that parallels Tioga Road in many places, and the un-trailed Yosemite wilderness. And, the popular Mono Pass trailhead (promoted by Park staff as a wonderful place to hike) is woefully small for the consistent demand to hike here, thus much parking occurs alongside the highway (as a side-note, the parking lot here really needs to be expanded to provide a reasonable number of parking spaces). Pullouts along this section of the highway also allow the visitor to stop adjacent to the scenic river segments upstream of the Meadows to experience this tumbling section of the river. The impact to visitors of reducing parking in these locations has not been assessed, nor have reasonable alternatives been proposed.

The DEIS also notes (ES-9) that "visitor capacity will be enforced" under all alternatives; I understand that Park intends to do this via applying "social encounter" criteria in designated wilderness along the Wild segment but it's unclear if or how the Park will enforce visitor capacity along the various Scenic River segments adjacent to the Tioga Road.

Wild River Segments

I strongly oppose the Park's proposal to use wilderness visitor encounters along the wild segments of the river (i.e., Lyell Canyon, Mono Pass trail) to monitor and (likely) restrict wilderness day use on popular Yosemite trails (see, e.g., DEIS at ES-9). See also DEIS at 5-75: "The plan will establish an indicator and management standard for wilderness trails that are within a day's hike of Tuolumne Meadows? If encounter rates increase despite these efforts, the NPS will establish a day use permitting system and make necessary changes in the backcountry quota system to better manage for opportunities for solitude;" and DEIS at 7-87. The plan also proposes "implementation of a day use trailhead quota system if determined necessary." (DEIS at 5-75; see also DEIS at 7-87.) This "social engineering" approach is entirely inappropriate in Yosemite's much-loved high country.

I fully support protecting wilderness resources by using tried and true wilderness restrictions such as camping at least 100 feet from water, not trailing stock in alpine meadows, taking action to restore damaged trails and meadows, etc. But to use social considerations, and especially in a little-headed river plan (as vs. normally high-profile wilderness management plans), to attempt to limit use is going too far. In fact, it gives the appearance that the Park may be attempting to insert sure-to-be unpopular social encounter criteria into the river plan to establish a new and stringent and precedent for managing wilderness use that will then be applied to the upcoming Wilderness Stewardship Plan. The Wilderness Stewardship Plan is the appropriate venue for analyzing significant changes in wilderness management direction, and NEPA in fact requires that parts of proposals which are inter-related must be analyzed in the same impact statement. Any inclusion of new wilderness restrictions, particularly based on controversial social criteria, need to be analyzed in the Wilderness Stewardship Plan in order to comply with NEPA regulations.

I also think the approach to manage the wild river corridor via social encounters ("no more than ten parties per hour, 80% of the time;" DEIS at ES-14) is poorly thought out. For instance, there are many day hikers (many of them local residents of Mono County, where I live, but also visitors from throughout the U.S and the world) who make the annual 18 mile round-trip trek to spectacular Waterwheel Falls during the high runoff season. The Park should not limit day hiking visitors' ability to enjoy their Park by placing onerous restrictions such as day use quotas and permits on them. Similarly, during high-season for Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) through-hikers and John Muir Trail hikers, one will likely see well over 10 parties per hour in Lyell Canyon, especially as one gets closer to Tuolumne Lodge. This is especially likely to be true for the PCT hikers during dry years when water is limited on other sections of the PCT or during high-snow years; in both cases hiker use is consolidated as vs. spread out during years where there is sufficient water and not too much snow. Day hikers who wish to enjoy this spectacular section of the PCT and the John Muir Trail should not be "penalized" due to a large influx of PCT or John Muir Trail hikers on this remarkable and popular trail.

As someone who has extensively used the off-trail backcountry of Yosemite, I also know that this portion of Yosemite is completely uncrowded. Venture 10 minutes off any major trail, even on the Lyell Canyon, Vogelsang or Glen Aulin trails, and you will see no one. Yosemite's backcountry is not only less crowded but more pristine than that of neighboring Forest Service-managed wilderness areas such as the Ansel Adams and John Muir wildernesses. The Yosemite wilderness user who hikes on the Park's trails is accustomed to seeing a lot of people, especially in the first mile or two and at major destinations such as Lyell Canyon Basecamp (not a place day hikers typically reach) or Waterwheel Falls, both in the W&S river corridor. Those who don't like the experience of seeing a lot of hikers can easily venture off the trail and find perfect solitude.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Rather than limit use on some of the most popular trails in the Yosemite backcountry, including the world-class John Muir Trail/Pacific Crest Trail, the Park Service should abandon its proposal to limit day-hiking (or overnight) use based on social encounters. If there are specific corrective actions needed to protect the natural resources of the wild river corridor in heavily used areas (e.g., Lyell Canyon or the downriver (Tuolumne to Waterwheel) areas) such as restoring impacted meadows adjacent to the river or re-routing trail segments to avoid further damage, the Park should take those actions. The "social encounter" criteria should be abandoned in this river management plan. If the Park wants to propose such limitations on wilderness use, it should be done through the forthcoming Yosemite Wilderness Stewardship Plan, where the impacts of the proposal will be fully disclosed and the public that uses Yosemite's wilderness will have ample opportunity to debate and comment on the proposal.

Horseback Riding

I do not support elimination of day-rides in Tuolumne Meadows. I've rarely seen horses on any trails in Yosemite's high country except en route to Glen Aulin and Vogelsang to supply the High Sierra camps, on the Mono Pass Trail during the annual Indian Walk and their sign on the trails in the wet meadows of Lyell Canyon. If some people wish to experience and enjoy their Park wilderness by riding a horse (especially those who are unable to hike), they should be able to do so.

I also do not support the proposed reduction in overnight commercial use in places like Lyell Canyon. Some packers travel through Yosemite from the Ansel Adams Wilderness and this new restriction might make it difficult for them to continue these trips. Stock use should be managed to protect natural resources and, as with impacts from day-hikers or backpackers, corrective actions should be taken to limit natural resource damage before further restricting use. Instead of the proposed reduction in use, one action that could be taken to mitigate damage to the trail in Lyell Canyon would be to re-route short segments of the trail that go through particularly wet sections of meadow to the adjacent forest habitat. I do not know enough about grazing impacts in the meadows of Lyell Canyon to comment on those.

Finally, I do not support the DEIS's statement that stock use should be reduced "to enhance the opportunity for a wilderness experience along the river with a reduced potential for conflicts between hikers/backpackers and stock users." DEIS at 5-75. I feel this statement is discriminatory, unprofessional and unnecessarily suggests an inherent conflict between hikers and equestrians, both of whom legally have the right to utilize and enjoy the wilderness resource, subject to wilderness regulations. A perceived lack of tolerance among wilderness users should not be employed as a reason to reduce either pedestrian or equestrian use in wilderness.

Proposed significant changes to wilderness management such as instituting a quota system for day hikers or reducing commercial use should be addressed in the forthcoming Wilderness Stewardship Plan, not the Tuolumne River plan. It is only through the wilderness plan that such changes can be considered in context and their impacts (including cumulative impacts) fully analyzed.

I hope you will seriously consider these comments. Because of all the attention to the Merced River Plan which was released at the same time, I fear that the many users and lovers of Tuolumne Meadows region have paid little attention to the release of this plan. I expect that these comments may represent the views of some other people who love and support Yosemite National Park and its spectacular wild river and wilderness resources, but who do not want to see responsible visitor use that is appropriately managed to protect natural resources unduly limited.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Address]

Correspondence ID:	258	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Received:	Mar,16,2013 03:28:04
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	I am very concerned at the thought of removing some or all of Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. The tradition of the high camps goes back to the beginnings in Yosemite. (1916). These camps offer an opportunity to people like me that are not able to backpack with a 40-50 lb pack. The loop is amazing, and I can travel through the camps with my 20 lb day pack because these camps exist. I understand that there is an impact on the trails that connect the camps, however, with 95 percent of the park being designated wilderness, it seems like this is a fairly low percentage of the wilderness/wilderness experience that is effected. Re: water/stream/lake - it does seem odd to have ever put flush toilets in these backcountry outposts, so I am in favor of converting those camps with flush toilets (like Glen Aulin and Merced Lake) to composting /vault toilet systems.
------------------------	---

I feel strongly that the occupancy of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp remain at the current size of 32 beds (8 guest cabins)

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Glen Aulin is already the smallest camp in the system, and it seems like changing water use (flush toilets converted to vault toilets) will mitigate any issues directly associated with the camp.

My dream is to go on a ranger led 7 day loop trip in the next few years. With the reduction of the size of the camp, I fear that you will be taking away that dream. (The ranger led loop trips stop in every camp, and have a total of 14 participants. With an occupancy of 20 - I can't imagine that these ranger led loops will be able to continue. And that would be tragic. It would signal the end of an accessible way to experience the backcountry/wilderness for people like me.)

Trails in Tuolumne Meadows proper: I feel improving the trail from hwy 120 by the RV dumping station out to Soda Springs is a great idea - perhaps a boardwalk makes sense there. However I am concerned with the path from the store to soda springs/parsons lodge. It seems like the part of the meadow across from the TM store gets excessive use. It is highly impacted by people trampling the plants. I think it is important to restore the meadow there and to direct people to the proper trails. This trail (store to Parsons) should be removed or minimized in usage. It should NOT become an official trail. In a plan that talks about hydrology and scenic beauty, I am surprised that there would be any options that created more official paths across the meadow.

Better signage/educational information - for people to understand the proper way to interact with the meadows. Many visitors don't know the difference between a sub-alpine meadow and a sporting field. Signage (directing people where to go, and informing them to be careful of the fragile ecosystem, and general ecological information is important.) People come to see the meadow, but generally are not sure why it is important other than to get an open view or a bit of sun.

No more roadside parking is a great change. But please link that with better Transportation to and from Tuolumne as well as within Tuolumne. Shuttles every 15 minutes, like the valley would go a long way towards this. Also better options on how to get to Tuolumne for day use from the valley or the many campgrounds along the Tioga Pass Road. (It is most important to get people to leave their cars at their campsites/lodges, and use the transportation provided - and for that transportation to be as convenient as possible) my current experience has been standing on the side of the road at a sign waiting 1/2 - 1 hour or more for the shuttle to arrive.)

Just a thought- How amazing would it be to be able to hop on a "Yosemite Shuttle" at SFO (for all of the non-california visitors) and go to the park with out having to rent a personal vehicle! In a time where climate change seems to be the biggest single thing that will effect Tuolumne (and for that matter Yosemite, California, USA, the earth) we should be looking at the bigger picture, how do we get people to leave their cars behind, rather than creating new places for us to park our vehicles. Please work with other parks, cities, and transit systems to create responsible/convenient options and move this forward.

I love seeing the tent cabins in Tuolumne. It reminds me that this part of the park is only accessible to us for part of the year. Nature rules there - we just get to come in a perch for a bit. Meaning - solid structures look like us imposing on the environment, whereas these simple dwellings exemplify how we can be in a place in more of a temporal way. Comfortable and yet simple and temporary.

Correspondence ID:	259	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 06:33:23				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support plan 4. Glen Aulin is my favorite of the high sierra camps and it would be a shame to close it completely.				

Correspondence ID:	260	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 07:48:01				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	This plan seems fine, although it doesn't seem to change a whole lot. I agree that there don't need to be trail rides at T meadows. To me and my family the real need is additional parking, either at the visitor's center or elsewhere. The piles of cars at the trailheads is unsightly and downright dangerous. If there was a large, central parking lot back in the trees and people were encouraged or even made to take the shuttle bus, it would be a vast improvement.				

Correspondence ID:	261	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 13:36:23				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Our Yosemite Experience September 2012: Our Seven Day High Sierra Ranger Guided Full Loop Hike With Meals and Lodging				

March 16, 2013

Any extreme plan that reduces access to any group of the population would not serve the intended purpose of set aside lands

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

called National Parks. The education of all visitors about the history, geography, and their personal behavior, is the best way to protect this precious environment specifically and our entire planet Earth. Exclusion is not an option; education is the key to every positive outcome.

My Wife, Anita and I are retired and in our middle sixties. We had the experience of our lifetime on this trip. Our Ranger Jack(B-Rad) Benter was knowledgeable and personable and really made the experience special. We are still in contact with him and our fellow loopers.

Your alternative plan #4 for the Tuolumne River sounds good to us, but we have not seen the other plans. Our personal feelings are to protect this sanctuary for future generations; and at the same time provide the best experience for visitors of all age groups. We would not like to see any reduction to the High Sierra's permanent Camp sites with provided meals and lodging. At our age, we would not be able to enjoy this High Sierra Loop experience without these conveniences.

The young people who took advantage of this great opportunity through their summer employment were awesome, helpful, and accommodating. Those smiles, hot drinks, delicious meals, campfire talks and warm beds were the most amazing end to an incredible day of hiking and viewing these grand wonders of Yosemite.

Thank you for continuing to make this possible for all of us.

Correspondence ID:	262	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 14:50:47				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	As a 30 year traveler in the Yosemite area(hiking, biking, walking, driving, horsepacking) I would like to make a few comments regarding this plan. First, I don't agree with taking out roadside parking or having only a limited number of parking spaces. This is a hardship on those who cannot walk far, when you have kids, grandparents or handicapped people in the car or people who just want to look at/ hang out at a particular area for a short time. You say there will be parking info on your website but cell phones, etc. don't work in the mountains!! It would be ridiculous to have to check a website while touring to make sure that you'll be able to enter and "get a parking spot"!				

Secondly, I am against limiting livestock, packtrips, rides, etc. The stock are a historical, important and pleasurable addition to the park experience. Hikers have been using a very specific, elitist and exclusive agenda for many years to get the stock out of the Sierras. Some of these groups actually believe that if you can't walk there, you don't belong there, and that is completely unacceptable!! I have hiked, backpacked and ridden in your mountains and I know for a fact that the Packers have complete respect for the land, the trails, their animals, people, trash pickup and maintenance. It's PEOPLE(hikers, backpackers, climbers, campers) not livestock that make a mess. At low and high altitude, there are greasy campsites, trampled vegetation, trash heaps, fishing line, lures, pieces of clothing, tents and equipment, unlawful fires and rude attitudes!!!!

Correspondence ID:	263	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 16:55:56				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I see the increasing push away from group recreation and towards isolationism as a disturbing reflection of the direction society is headed. There is a trend prevalent in society to protect our country from its people. This is an elitist attitude, driven by the vocal few. The perception of overcrowding in Tuolumne is the opinion of a few who feel that to enjoy the park they shouldn't be bothered by the intrusion of other people. The problem with this attitude is that it is selfish. This place was set aside for everyone to enjoy. Those who wish to have solitude should expand their explorations to the millions of acres of practically untouched wilderness both in the park as well as surrounding the park. Tuolumne Meadows is an area of amazing scenery accessible by road and by its very accessibility is going to encourage people to stop and congregate. This will foster the perception of crowding by those who wish solitude, but I repeat to them, there are millions of acres of area to find this solitude. You do not need to regulate a small area of the park enjoyed by many just so these elite few can have a solitary experience by stepping out of their cars. These elitists must make the effort to find that solitude if that is their goal.				

Glen Aulin is already the smallest camp. Reducing it in size makes its limited beds even harder to get. The high camps are all unique in their properties and Glen Aulin is no exception. Its location was chosen for its spectacular beauty and eliminating Glen Aulin eliminates this unique experience for those guests who can't carry a heavy pack or walk into the backcountry. "Glen Aulin allows visitors who are mobility impaired or cannot carry a heavy pack the opportunity to experience and enjoy the river in a remote, wilderness setting." TRP 7-4. The issues with the water could be resolved by composting toilets, which is a great idea. I think all the high camps should have composting toilets just because of their conservative nature. Once the water issues are taken care of it will not be necessary to reduce the size of the camp because the water usage will be significantly reduced by the composters and the intensive water conservation already in place at the camp. Reducing the size of the camp will also not significantly reduce the amount of commercial stock on the trail. The groceries are ordered in large enough quantities that this small reduction is not really significant per trip. The services offered at the high camp are so minimal and this camp is

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

already only supplied 2 days a week, as compared to Sunrise, Merced Lake and Vogelsang which are supplied 3 days a week. The same is true for eliminating wood for the camp. Neither of these alternatives take enough space on a string of mules that eliminating them would eliminate an entire string.

There are many people today who have a bad attitude towards stock. I find this attitude disturbing as well. Many people don't understand the amazing relationship between horses or mules and people. I hear many derisive comments from hikers who feel that my way of experiencing the backcountry is "cheating". Experiencing the backcountry is a personal experience that should not be limited to those who only wish to experience it on foot. Mules allow access to many people who would not be able to experience this without them. My husband and I had a guest on a four day saddle trip this past summer who has a physical disability that requires her to use a wheelchair, yet she was able to travel to Glen Aulin and experience this piece of wilderness because she could ride a mule. Why do elitists want to deny her the experience they can partake of just because she would not be able to get there on her own? The comments of the other guests at the camps we visited who saw her in the camps was amazing. It was such an inspiring experience for those guests to see that the mules had allowed her to experience the camps. Many of the guests in the high camps are the older generation who are excited to see the mule trains on the trail and repeatedly thank us for carrying their dinner and enjoy watching the mules pass by. Many people take photos of the mule strings because they are such a unique and different sight. It is only the vocal minority that is unappreciative of the animals that built the park, and continue to supply those who maintain it. It is these vocal few, the elitists who would take the park away from its people.

Eliminating day rides takes the option to experience Tuolumne from those who are not able to venture very far from paved roads. All of the trails are unpaved making it very difficult for those who rely on wheelchairs or motorized scooters to get very far from the road. Using mules allows those less-abled individuals to experience the beautiful view from the "Tuolumne View", the granite slab where the 2 hour ride goes, which is an easy hike for someone who can walk, but impossible for a wheelchair bound person to go. There are many people who come to the park from areas too far to bring their own animals but still wish to experience the area on a horse or mule and would be disappointed to not be able to experience a day ride. Often day rides are the only option for guests because they have limited time to visit. Day rides also meet the needs of those who wish to ride but were not able to book a saddle trip, or did not know about the option to visit the high camps. Many who book the saddle trips learn about them either from a day ride or talking to a guide in a camp on a saddle trip. I think that restricting commercial operations to either 1 or 2 groups per zone per day is too limiting. I feel that commercial operations, (both the park concessionaire and the outside operations) should be allowed to get permits for those areas they wish to enter without restricting it to the leftovers after noncommercial groups. Leftovers make it very difficult to plan and offer trips far enough in advance that guests know the options are available. With fewer people proficient in the backcountry guided trips are extremely popular and should be encouraged. Both the stables and the mountaineering school offer opportunities for learning a new skill, brushing up on an old one, or just experiencing a passion with someone who knows the area. This is a vital service the concessionaire offers park guests. Removing the mountaineering school/shop also forces those who need that one piece of equipment they forgot (or broke) to travel out of their way to replace it, instead of having climbing and backpacking gear available in the area they are using. Eliminating the gas station would force more people to travel out of their way for gas. I know this is frustrating to all the park service employees who have to drive to Lee Vining to fill their work vehicles instead of filling at the station in Tuolumne. It was very frustrating a couple of years ago when the gas station in Tuolumne closed early and the DNC Stables was still trying to close May Lake and we had to drive to Crane Flat daily for gas, basically wasting a half tank of fuel just to get fuel. Trying to save the environment by creating more pollution seems counterproductive.

I would like to see a bike path along the road from the lodge to the store so that employees and other guests have a safe place to ride bikes as a commuting option. I am also against making all the Tuolumne concessionaire employees live in the same spot since work hours vary so greatly among the employees. Stables employees who have to get up at 5 am are going to be unhappy with lodge employees who get off work at 10:30 pm or so and want to have a little fun before bed and decide to stay up until 3 am. Living where you work makes sense in Tuolumne because of the spread out nature of the community and the potential for unsafe travel conditions for those whose work hours are not traditional. Forcing employees to drive to work due to early or late hours and safety on the road in the dark is not a good option. Working with stock especially it is very desirable to know that someone is waiting for you to get home and who is able to assist with any disasters that happen. Every animal added to a string doubles the potential for disaster. Packers live on the edge every day and taking away their safety net should not be an option. When my mule got loose last summer it took everyone working together to catch her, and she was famous all summer for her escapades in the campground and the meadow. I would not have been able to catch her alone, and moving the stables employees away from the stables would have made it much more difficult to get the help I needed that day. We work as a team because we live as a team. I think employees with RVs or trailers should be able to dry camp at the work units as they do at the park service housing areas. I know that if it was an option I would use the RV we own in the stables parking area instead suffering at night in a tent in a noisy housing area. This is allowed (or a blind eye turned) at the lodge, the store, and at ranger camp, and should be an option for all Tuolumne concessionaire employees.

I love this park and want to see it preserved so future generations are able to experience the things that make it special to me. Horses and mules are the reason I came here and the reason I stay. Taking them away not only eliminates my job, but it takes away my joy. I love the smiles of the kids who come to pet the mules, the ones who's eyes light up the first time they sit on a horse, and the people who want to take their mule home at the end of a saddle trip. None of this would be possible without rides at the stables and the complete High Sierra Camp Loop. Stables jobs are skilled labor jobs that are disappearing all around the country. Jobs are difficult to find in this economy and the seasonal jobs that are offered in Tuolumne are often filled by college students. Fostering a love of the wilderness in the next generation can't happen without getting them in the backcountry and Tuolumne jobs get them excited about the wilderness. I know I would not be writing this if I hadn't been able to get a job at the stables as a college student 13 summers ago. My experiences here in the park have given me a lifelong love of the backcountry and I don't want to see future generations unable to enjoy it as I do, with my mule as my partner.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID:	264	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 18:35:39				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	We won the High Sierra Lottery last year and what a wonderful prize it was! A seven day High Sierra Ranger Guided Loop Hike with meals and lodging.				
<p>Like most people, we had been to several National Parks and did the usual. Drive thru, take some hikes and pictures, maybe camp. But we never really experienced the extended back country. That was too scary. My husband and I are in our mid-sixties. We are athletic and fit, but not experienced wilderness people. The Ranger Guided 50 mile Loop Hike was ideal for us. Our Ranger Jack(B-Rad)Benter made me feel safe. He was very knowledgeable, informative, personable and made the experience special.</p> <p>Your plan #4 for the Tuolumne River sounds reasonable. Would you be able to re- locate rather than eliminate the 12 tents at Glen Aulin? That camp is one of the smaller ones already. It would impact the Loopers negatively.</p> <p>Your High Sierra Loop Hike and the accomodations are unique in the National Park system. Please preserve this jewel for the future. We hope to return to Yosemite in 2014 and hike the glorious Loop again.</p> <p>Thank you for continuing to make this wonderful adventure possible for all of us.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	265	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 21:35:47				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I disagree with reducing # of tent cabins / beds at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. This should remain at current levels to provide opportunity for more people to experience this area. I had the opportunity to hike the High Sierra Camp loop in August 2011, on my 4th visit to the park, staying at all 5 High Sierra Camps. This was one of the most enjoyable, enriching experiences I have had. I would hate to see the opportunity for myself or others to enjoy this experience in the future further limited by reducing the number of tent cabins / beds at Glen Aulin or any other High Sierra Camp.				
Correspondence ID:	266	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 10:00:37				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The effects of the stables operations seem insignificant to the parking situation at Tuolumne Meadows. I believe managing the parking in Tuolumne Meadows would improve the guest experience exponentially greater than eliminating the comparatively few stables rides. Eliminating stables rides seems insignificant to the other aspects of an otherwise good plan to balance use and preservation at Tuolumne Meadows.				
Correspondence ID:	267	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 13:37:09				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Referring to Alternative 4, which I support mostly....				
<p>Glen Aulin HSC - I sure hate to see you reduce the capacity of the camp. That broad area can support the tents that are there now. If the issue is water use, then try harder to reduce water use - more composting toilets, low flow heads on all sinks, etc. And I hate to see the "meals only" stopped - I've hiked down there many times looking forward to enjoying the family style community that occurs in the dining room, even if I retreat to my tent. Paper plates? there must be a way to cut down water use but retain the services!</p> <p>I really worry about removing the gas station!! Folks who come up there from Hwy 395 from the south usually just sail up the road, bypassing the Mobil station and its high prices, knowing they can fill up as necessary in Tuolumne, usually at better prices. The other stations in Lee Vining are even worse - and requires a detour into town. I'm sure the LeeVining gas people love this idea, but for safety and folks who don't know and/or zip past signs without reading them, it's a major inconvenience and danger not having gas up there. What about the people who live there for the summer - they get to go all the way down to LeeVining to get gas? Yikes. That's more pollution and uses up 2 gallons of gas just to get gas! Please reconsider. I know its leaking, but...</p> <p>The mountaineering store sells things that the Lodge store does not - things for climbing and camping. what is to become of this</p>					

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

store??

Capacity and parking - I'm glad this alternative keeps, more or less, the current capacity. Good luck with the parking lot issues - most of the roadside parking is at the Cathedral Lakes trailhead, and moving that parking where you propose makes that hike a lot longer. Folks will grumble. Parking along the road to Parsons Lodge likewise is always heavily used on weekends - can all those cars fit into the Lembert Dome parking?? You can make more parking for the store without removing the gas station....

Correspondence ID:	268	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 13:54:56				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the preferred alternative with two exceptions. First, the 38% reduction in capacity at Glen Aulin HSC seems unwarranted. The impact benefits would seem small compared with the significant cut in access for overnight use, effectively making Glen Aulin a day hike destination. Second, given the level of eroded or changed habitat in Tuolumne Meadows, I wonder if a day use there shouldn't be limited further by reducing the number of designated parking spaces for day users.				

Correspondence ID:	269	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 14:16:05				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Here are some comments on Alternative-4 (Preferred), using Figure 7-11 as a source of information.				

2 - Tioga Road through the Tuolumne Meadows area: Adding roadside curbing to eliminate undesigned roadside parking and associated informal trails into the meadows may sound like a good idea, but it would only work safely for drivers, bikers, cyclists and pedestrians if the road is widened. As it is, Tioga Road is very narrow to accommodate modern vehicles, specially big recreational vehicles (RVs). Curbing this narrow road without changing its width could make it even more dangerous than it currently is for smaller vehicles, bikers and cyclists.

11 - Existing commercial service core. I'm ambivalent about the removal of the mountaineering shop/school and public fuel station to add parking space. Perhaps the products sold at the mountaineering shop could be sold at the main store, eliminating the need for a separate store. The mountaineering school could operate from Yosemite Valley, but eliminate the public gas station seems short sighted. Retaining an above ground diesel tank for official use is necessary, but not adding a tank for gasoline seems an oversight to the fact that most official vehicles (NPS and Concessionaire) are gasoline powered. It could be argued that Crane Flat or Lee Vining Service stations are alternatives, but this argument does not take into account the amount of miles travelled to fuel vehicles to these locations - it seems a waste of time and fuel, not to mention the emissions. I believe the public gas station in Tuolumne is a necessary evil, not only for official use, but primarily for public use for the same reasons stated above. I understand the reasoning behind the elimination of underground tanks that could leak fuel overtime, but California has very strict rules regarding UGT management to prevent such occurrences. It seems to me that eliminating that service is more an invitation to problems than a solution to a parking issue. If cars are to come to the park, then the minimal infrastructure to accommodate them should be made available to visitors. Unfortunately that means gas stations.

12 - Existing Concessionaire stable. I agree that consolidating NPS and concession's stable operations is a good idea from the point of view of the impact such operations have in the environment. I'm just concerned about the number of employee housing provided at that location. Stock needs supervision and two employees seems too small of a staff to oversee a stable.

Comments on Glen Aulin HSC using the overview pamphlet of the TRP as a source of information. It is not clear that the existing composting toilet located in the backpackers' campground would be replaced with a modern model or eliminated. Replacing flushing toilets in the HSC is a great idea, it should have been done eons ago. Flushing toilets make no sense in PAW, such as Glen Aulin HSC. However, each location should have its own composting toilet to prevent overuse and malfunction, such as the ones seen in Vogelsang after the closure of the campground toilet - when the HSC restrooms became the only ones available at that location. Eliminating the "meals-only" service will not result in greater water use reduction. It does not take that much more water to cook a meal for 30 people instead of 20. Eliminating that service takes away a big part of the backcountry experience in Yosemite, specially for those visitors that chose the backpackers camp for its proximity with the HSC for meals and other services.

Correspondence ID:	270	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 15:16:03				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Comments on Proposed Alternatives 1 - 4 in the Tuolumne River Plan:				

The goal of the plan needs to focus on stopping and reversing the consequences of human use and abuse of the land. Along with the historic overuse, there have been added in recent years massive numbers of short term visitors who mostly arrive in personal vehicles, park anywhere, rush about for a brief period without making any real connection to the area, and driving off at the end of the day. Those who stay for multiple days have the time to walk from place to place and/or take the shuttle and return to their

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

lodging at the end of the day. They have the opportunity to learn to appreciate and care about Tuolumne Meadows that too many day visitors do not. Increasing day use is unthinkable. The goal should be to significantly reduce those numbers.

The number of shuttles should be increased to encourage use. If they were running more frequently and reliably, it would be much easier for visitors to leave their cars. The number of cars in Tuolumne Meadows during the summer is a nightmare.

It is noted that day parking could be "managed through a reservation system". This may be an excellent idea, but it is not addressed again. Parking is going to be a thorny issue. _____

My comments are on each alternative separately.

ALTERNATIVE 4: "Preferred"?

**While the preparers give lip service to "opportunities for solitude" on trails, how might this be "managed"? Close to the road these have been largely absent for years now. And, surely, increasing day visitation is an anathema to that concept.

**Increased day use and water use should not even be considered! These need to be reduced.

***Where will concessioner employees be housed??

#2 This hiking trail is needed, and it should be located between Lambert Dome and the Visitor Center on the meadow side very close to the parking barriers. There is a use trail there now, and visitors will build another, if one is not provided.

#9 "Visitor Contact Station" Although I don't know what this means, it sounds limited, utilitarian, sterile, and inadequate. National Park visitors everywhere rely on a Visitor Center as a welcoming resource to mill about, look at displays, maps, books, ask questions, buy items, and get oriented and comfortable. It's important to either maintain the current VC or to provide something comparable.

#10 Certain camping sites can be removed from the campground, thus reducing visitation. There are places where campers are basically one atop the other, especially in the B and C loops. It's unlikely anyone would actually miss these sites. In addition, rules should be strictly enforced in terms of number of vehicles and persons per site. There are currently many infractions resulting in overuse.

#16 To what would the Ranger Station be repurposed?? And what upgrading of NPS housing? It should be in keeping with other standards in Tuolumne Meadows - that is, pretty basic.

#18 Tuolumne Meadows Lodge capacity could likely be reduced some small amount.

ALTERNATIVE 3:

This reduction in use seems like a good start, though more is surely needed. Reducing visitor capacity at Tuolumne Lodge in this way is neither feasible nor desirable. Many who use Tuolumne Lodge have done so for decades, and it doesn't seem to be suffering the amount of increased degradation found in so many other parts of the meadows.

Maintaining either this VC or providing one comparable is important.

ALTERNATIVE 2:

The problems currently being experienced are due primarily to overuse. Increased visitation is out of the question. The need is to decrease visitation and abuse of the land.

ALTERNATIVE 1:

Ideally, returning the entire area to natural conditions is a lovely idea and perhaps possible, but unrealistic. Removing Tuolumne Lodge and the Glen Aulin Camp would not be acceptable to the public. Would park service interpretive staff be eliminated, or would all move the location #6?

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Tuolumne Meadows can be "la crhme de la crhme", not in an exclusive or elitist fashion, but as an example of what a quality park experience can be. In some ways, it still is. However, the direction in which the world seems to be heading in recent years and the focus of some of the points in these alternatives is toward an almost amusement park atmosphere, quick and mindless. The purpose of a park is not to encourage this trend but to provide a wholesome alternative, purposeful and thoughtful.

Correspondence ID:	271	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 15:23:21				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	What will happen to the horses and mules of the discontinued stable highlighted in alternative plan no. 4? Will they be absorbed into the mulit-day trail ride trips? Will they be cared for and kept alive? I would like to know how this will be handled. Thank you.				

Correspondence ID:	272	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 15:35:45				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern. Please accept my brief comments. I urge you to choose the option which best preserves the use of the High Sierra Camps. It is most important to provide as many options as possible for the public to use National Parks so that there continues to be public support for national parks. It is important to seek all opportunities to build a user base of national parks so that they will be fully supported and protected. Additionally, there is something very valuable in these camps, and that is their history, which is woven into the history and value of Yosemite. I recognize the concern about the impact the use of these camps bring to the natural environment and I share those concerns. But I would urge you to seek other ways to mitigate those impacts than to scale back on the camps or close them down.				

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Best regards, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	273	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	[REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 17:12:32				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Yosemite Park Planning Department:				

Though I am a member of the Sierra Club and aware that comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS have been submitted on the Club's behalf, I choose to submit my own personal perspective which may or may not be in concert with theirs.

My family and I have been traveling to Yosemite NP since the mid-1960s and have availed ourselves of many of the camping/lodging, hiking, climbing and swimming opportunities provided by its glorious landscape. In recent years it has been our observation that Yosemite is being loved to death and in high summer season feels more like Disneyland than a spectacular National Park - the scene of John Muir's and Teddy Roosevelt's vision - that needs lasting protection. Last August Tioga Road along Tuolumne Meadows was jammed with automobiles lining the length of the Meadow on both sides of the road. It was a very disturbing scene and destructive to the resource

With the above experience in mind, I would like you to consider adopting parts of Alternative 1. That is the alternative that does the most to restore Tuolumne Meadows and the river corridor. It would remove the Tuolumne Lodge facilities and the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp commercial operation and steer that level of lodging to areas outside the Park such as Lee Vining (20 minute drive away). It also would reduce visitor day use and move some of the throngs of visitors out of the already congested Tuolumne Meadows area by removing most of the undesignated parking spaces and only re-constructing a percentage of those parking spaces that are removed.

Even if either Alternative 3 or 4 are adopted, consider adding significant protections, such as: 1) Removing stock day rides and strictly limit the number of stock day rides and the number of overnight stock trips so as to reduce the SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF STOCK ON TRAILS and of manure, invasive weeds, etc. on the ecosystem; 2) Stop encouraging visitors to be served luxury conveniences at the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp when the area is located in the heart of wilderness. It could still be a commercial operation, but instead of permanent structures (concrete floors, wood stoves for heating, etc.) and a water system that extends into the wilderness and violates the Wilderness Act, the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp would become a less luxurious, more basic camp. And 3) Move the Tuolumne Lodge back from the River or eliminate it in order to not violate the Wild and Scenic River Act. The Tuolumne Lodge is not legally "necessary" for recreational use at Tuolumne Meadows.

There are already thousands of overnight visitors each summer at Tuolumne Meadows within the campgrounds. There is no honest "need" to have the Tuolumne Lodge facility. Or if it is too great a loss for the public, move it a distance from the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Tuolumne River so as not to provide disturbance and degradation of the resource.

The Park should actually remove other "unnecessary" facilities, not just the gas station and the mountaineering shop/school. To reduce stress on Tuolumne Meadows, the Park should commit to a plan to create alternative parking areas, hiking trailheads, and bathrooms strategically located all along the Tioga Pass highway in the Park.

My family and I love Yosemite NP and we support limitations on visitation, such as reduced overnight facilities, outside of the Park parking with day-use bus transportation hubs and other restorative ideas. Yosemite is not an amusement park and must be respected as the significant landscape and natural resource that it is, or was! Your mission is to protect our natural heritage that takes form in Yosemite Park's rugged terrain, high mountain peaks, rivers and meadows.

Correspondence ID:	274	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 17:36:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear National Park Service at Yosemite,				

I've taken a look at your draft Tuolumne Plan/DEIS at your website, and find them to be rather meek "business as usual" proposals in terms of harmful commercial activities. Please do more to limit commercial services at Tuolumne Meadows and within the River corridor.

My primary concern about the Tuolumne River corridor is the continued excessive amount of packtrains used to supply the commercial "High Sierra Camps" at Vogelsang and Glen Aulin. The trails leading to these commercial camps are horribly torn up and dusty, and littered with manure and biting flies. During my last trip there (a couple summers ago) I actually cried my first afternoon when I sat down to rest after hiking for miles and breathing pulverized trail dust mixed with manure and then being attacked by biting flies when I was just trying to sit and rest for a few minutes. The peaceful mountain and river scene I'd come looking for was stolen by the awful results of large packtrains that seem to exist largely (only?) to supply unnecessary luxuries to a small number of people at the commercial camps.

My last trip to Tuolumne was so awful that I don't even want to return unless/until you do something to stop the trail damage and pollution caused by the commercial packtrains.

To be clear, I would much prefer and urge that you close forever the commercial camps at Glen Aulin and Vogelsang, and declare those areas as wilderness. But if you cannot do that, due to the power of money or "political" interferences, then you could at least reduce dramatically the number of animals by prohibiting the camps from providing unnecessary luxuries such as fresh foods, beverages, linens, etc. The customers at these camps could easily eat lightweight, compact, dried foods, and go a few days without showers, like the rest of us, and still enjoy the mountains. They do not need to be so pampered with such comforts and luxuries in the wilderness. (You are actually preventing them from having a wilderness experience under the false pretense of providing a wilderness experience.) AND you could require the pack animals to wear manure-catchers...or at the very least require the commercial outfits to pay one or more of their employees to shovel manure off the trails behind each packtrain.

Why must the vast majority of us suffer so much only for the luxurious living of the privileged few who are able to afford the cost of staying at these camps? It's not fair, and it's not right to allow such a small minority of commercial clients to so harm our precious Yosemite.

Thank you for considering my experiences, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	275	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	[REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 19:22:44				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Protecting the river corridor and its ecosystem should be a higher priority than keeping high levels of use. Prioritize restoration efforts. I have noticed many of the public are people from outside the U.S. and perhaps they don't appreciate our local resource as much as they should. The Park should remove or realign/reduce Loop A campsites and the road segment that squeezes into the river corridor and restricts wildlife movement. Either the Tuolumne Lodge facility should be removed or it should be moved or reconstructed further back from the river. The Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp unfairly causes large amounts of wilderness impacts because of so much stock use transporting gear and supplies to benefit a tiny minority of recreational visitors. It should be phased out or converted to a backpackers camp with less impacts. Keeping the same amount of crowding and congestion at Tuolumne Meadows is not adequately protecting the precious area for future generations. The Park should disperse visitor use elsewhere along the Tioga Road to reduce impacts on the Tuolumne Meadows core area. There is so much more along this route that can be seen and appreciated, not just the meadows.				

Correspondence ID:	276	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 19:31:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I venture to Tuolumne Meadows several times each year. I believe some parking should be maintained along Hwy 120 directly adjacent to the Meadows. I often only have 10 minutes to stop and admire the Meadows, but these are a special 10 minutes.

I don't endorse creation of new parking areas along Hwy 120.

Shuttles should be increased and fully implemented.

The document is incomplete because it doesn't fully address all proposed changes. For example, what is planned for parking between Lambert Dome and the stables? This is one of my favorite quick stops.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 277 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 20:00:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that the High Camps should be maintained at their current capacity. With new composting toilets at Glen Aulin, the demand for water would likely decrease. The use of stock for supplying the camp is well established, and the commercial stock operations for visitor rides is appropriate and, I feel, proper. The high camps were established with a view toward fostering public support for the parks.

Over the years, many park supporters who have been physically incapable of hiking the trails have been able to ride on horse or mule to magnificent places otherwise inaccessible to them. Such possibilities certainly seem to be in keeping with the spirit of the Americans with disabilities act.

The Park Service needs to remember that the park belongs to the public, not just the government. Maintaining the historical flavor of the park should not be ignored just because it is inconvenient or contrary to the wishes of extremists.

Correspondence ID: 278 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 20:42:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against removing road side parking because when you do that you will over burden some areas as you will bring all the people to one place instead of keeping them spread out. My plan would buildup the shoulders of the road to allow for more orderly parking and stripe the parking places. Add a walking path to the south side of the road as you already have on the north side to move people to trail heads or paths. By doing this you will keep the people spread out and not put as much impact on small areas of the meadows. The side of the roads area already impacted so clean it up stabilize the shoulders and make parking all the way from the north end of the meadow to the south end with exception of some small areas that the shoulders are not wide enough .

If you downsize Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp it will be hard to make a profit for DC which you would like to do so they would want out of that part of their contract and take out the camp completely, the mission of getting people out of the sierras would be accomplished. As I hike in and out of May lake I see people that the only way they would or could enjoy this part of the Sierras is this type of camp. Glen Aulin is the same type of an experience don't discriminate against the older people and the ones that can't pack bedding and food in to in joy life that experience, let them enjoy life just like you do every day that your work in the park.

The moving of cabins away from the river can be done as they need replacing over many year and not make a big project out of it. That is move them not take them out.

The same goes for the concessioner housing don't spend a lot of money do it as they get replaced.

So if your going to limit water withdrawals at Tuolumne river you need to start planning to drill a well or wells which ever it takes to supply the water needed.

Eliminating Trail Rides is just another control thing. You as ranger will ride your horses and take pack stock up on those trails justifying it as petrol duties. Just like over the years you have kept some lakes hidden. I know of the perks that park Employees

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

get that the rest of the public don't and that don't bother me, but don't take the fun things away from the rest of us, its not just fun it is a live long experience.

I was born in Mariposa almost seventy one year ago and have spent a part of my life in Yosemite. I bet that there isn't one person working on this plan that was born when my parents started taking me to Yosemite. Back in those day we had a cattle ranch along with a grocery store in Mariposa. We had horse so each summer we would take two or three trips with our horses to the high country. My children will never see Yosemite the way my parent an I did. I am doing my best to take my grand children to the park and do hikes to Half Dome which aren't likely to happen any more with all the new rules. We have done other hikes. I want them to have the experience before you shout the park down totally. You the Park Service have wasted Millions of dollars on bad plans that could have been used to mediate the impact of all the people that are using the high country or the valley. The trails are in terrible shape and your not doing enough to keep them up.

Look at all the money you spent building the Employee Housing in the rock fall zone only to be tore down what a shame. Just think of all the trails and roads you could have worked on with that money. The money that you wasted on the first plan that was thrown out, millions of dollars and the millions that you have spent on this plan. Way more than should be spent again money that could have been used in helping out mother nature.

After attending some of your meeting I feel along with a lot of other people that your plan is flawed, do to your short sightedness from being to close to the picture. The problem is a lot of park personnel feel they own the park, not true it belongs the to the people of The United States Of America to enjoy. The United States Congress set the park aside for the people to enjoy. Your job is to make it accessible to all that come there and midi gate the impact as much as possible by keeping trails repaired roads in good shape camp grounds in good working order. Mother nature need help doing this, one example is not planting fish in lakes that are overburdened as well as streams. Yes I know that this isn't natural but having this many people using them isn't natural ether so help her out. The law doesn't require all the matures that you are doing. You are reading things into the law that aren't there because that is what you want and you couldn't care less what the people want. It is time you get over that attitude and get down to the business of making the park people friendly.

I do understand some limitations are needed but don't go over board.

Correspondence ID:	279	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 21:16:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>As a retired National Park Service Ranger and Chief Ranger (1974 - 2005) as well as working the past 7 seasons as a mounted guide and packer for DNC at Tuolumne. I have followed the development and production of the Tuolumne River Plan with interest. For the past 4 seasons, I have specialized in guiding high sierra loop saddle trips and had the unique opportunity to introduce hundreds of National Park visitors to the wonders Yosemite's incredible backcountry. I have also had the opportunity over the past several years to interact with and make inquiries of numerous current and retired Yosemite employees regarding the direction the Tuolumne planning was being pointed. I am disappointed in and embarrassed (but not surprised)by the National Park Service's selection of Alternative 4. Please consider the following comments and suggestions:</p> <p>1. There have long been concerns the septic sustem at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp operates at or near capacity. BCU and DNC both recognize the issue is the amount of water and sewage overwhelming a delicate septic system. Rather than reduce the number of guests and associated guest services, eliminate the flush toilet system and replace it with a composting system as employed at Sunrise and Vogelsang. since returning to Yosemite in 2006, (I was a Yosemite Ranger from 1974 to 1983) it has been a shocker that this action wasn't exercised years ago. While a separate planning process, the same action should be taken for Merced Lake High Sierra Camp as the complaint there has been the volume of water put through the septic system.</p> <p>2. We need to recognize that the guests staying at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp are National Park visitors too. The experience of staying at Glen Aulin is unique and greatly enjoyed. Tens of thousands of visitors have enjoyed this experience with many coming back again and again. I have had the opportunity to sit and converse with many hundreds of Glen Aulin High Sierra camp guests in the family style breakfast and dinner setting and most love it. Rather than curtail or reduce it, why not look for ways to improve it?</p> <p>3. Housing Tuolumne stable staff on site makes perfect sense. With 65 and more head of stock working out of this facility, unplanned or unforeseen livestock emergencies can and do happen. Having the staff on site virtually guarantees that enough will be there to deal with whatever may happen. Unlike most of the DNC concession staff at Tuolumne, most of the stable staff begin work between 5:30 and 6:00 a.m. Being on-site and having the facility to prepare food make this logistically do-able. Moving the staff to the Lodge area is neither efficient nor practicle.</p> <p>4. During my NPS career I was intimately involved in major GMP and backcountry planning projects. I know how the process works and how pre-conceived ideas and bias can alter what should be an honest and transparent effort. Regretfully, after discussing this project with current and former Yosemite staff members over the past 3 years, I suggest that preconceived bias and pre-determined agenda played a role in the direction this effort has taken.</p>				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.

██████████ National Park Service (1974 - 2005) DNC Guide/Packer (summers 2006 - 2012)

Correspondence ID:	280	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 23:15:51				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I am writing in strong support of the provision within Alternative 2 to open parts of the river for limited recreational whitewater boating.				

Whitewater kayaking is human-powered recreation fully consistent with the letter and spirit of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (as clearly shown by other Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Park units, and wilderness areas that allow or even celebrate boating). Boaters who have previously developed the skill to paddle this stretch will experience the scenic and recreational values of the river (including self-reliance and unconfined recreation) in a way that few others have the opportunity to do.

The proposed level of boating in Alternative 2 is minimal and will result in minimal environmental impacts. Regulating timing, put-in or take-out locations, and other conditions when implementing the permit system can ensure this.

Allowing whitewater boating will allow a category of recreational use that is currently completely - and arbitrarily - banned from the Wild and Scenic River.

Correspondence ID:	281	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:52				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Hello,				

I have been a regular visitor to Yosemite valley throughout my life, only occasionally seeing the high country when I would stop on my drive out the Tioga Pass gate. This past summer for the first time I hiked the loop trail to each of the High Sierra camps as part of a ranger-guided group. It was a great experience, one that opened my eyes to how much Yosemite has to offer beyond the classic valley activities. It was an experience that I will never forget.

I reviewed the proposed preferred option for the Tuolumne River watershed, and it appears to me to be well thought out and thorough. My biggest concern, triggered by the proposal, was the plan to reduce the overnight capacity of Glen Aulin by one third. Glen Aulin was the first of the 5 camps that we stayed at during our loop hike. I would hope that a smaller camp would not result in fewer loop hikes being scheduled for the summer, or in general longer odds for acceptance for those who want to participate in the loop hikes. I can imagine issues such as handling camp waste water when the camp is in a river canyon can be tough. Nevertheless, I hope that all alternatives to simply shrinking the camp size have been explored.

Thank you for including my input. I look forward to visiting Yosemite again, including the high country, soon.

██████████ California

Correspondence ID:	282	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:41:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The Preferred Alternative Should Include More Campsites It is increasingly hard to reserve a campground in the summer months in the meadows and alternatives are both expensive and far away (requiring increased gas usage and driving).				

The Campground Redesign Should Increase Tent Sites and Reduce RV Sites RV traffic and camping is loud (generators) and reduces the feeling that one is camping within a national park. RV camping should be restricted to specific areas and the overall amount reduced. You can fit multiple tents and families into a space for just two RVs.

The Plan Should Propose Action to Manage Motorcycle Noise.

The Plan Should Allow for the use of certain trails by dogs and their owners. The limitations on dogs in Tuolumne meadows is so restrictive that owners can barely let the dogs out of the car on a leash. Allowing dogs on certain trails would give the opportunity for park users to experience nature and exercise themselves and their pets at the same time.

Correspondence ID:	283	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 07:34:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a backpacker and lover of Yosemite I feel tighter controls should be put in place for the High Sierra Camps. It is not necessary that stepping over piles of manure and dealing with polluted water be a part of the Yosemite experience. The pack animals should be kept to the very minimum necessary to supply the camps. Using manure catchers is a viable idea. The camps should offer the minimal amenities to users thereby reducing the need for excessive pack trains. Tighter controls should be put in place for the High Sierra camps.

Correspondence ID: 284 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 08:43:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that we no longer need the HSC in the back country. The degradation of the wilderness land due to high use of a particular spot to both use and maintain the camps is not acceptable.

The year that Vogelsang was closed due to weather we met people on the trail who found other ways to be in the wilderness. They hired packers and got out. This spreads out the use and is better for the land.

The back country use equipment has improved over the years so that packs are not as heavy as they were in the past. The HSC are from another time and are not appropriate for this one.

Correspondence ID: 285 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 09:33:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly believe the two High Sierra Camps in the Tuolumne River Area (Glen Aulin and Tuolumne) should be PERMANENTLY CLOSED.

It is well established that the camps are a source of pollution to the waters of the area. Also, the pack trains foul the trails of the area, requiring other users to deal with manure piles, dust, flies, etc., which is most unpleasant. Please do the right thing - CLOSE THESE CAMPS!

Correspondence ID: 286 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 09:57:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Last summer I hiked from Tuolumne Meadows past Vogelsang High Sierra Camp on a backpacking trip. The trail was covered with horse shit. It was disgusting. Several times we had to get off the trail to make way for long pack trains carrying supplies into or out of (stinky latrine waste) from the HSC. The Camp itself is an eyesore: ugly buildings on a flat plain under beautiful mountains. I understand that some older people cannot backpack and thus there is a purpose for the camp. However, the impact on the rest of us should be minimized. 1) Move the camp into the woods so it is less visible. 2) Minimize the transport of goods to the camp by only serving food which is compact and light weight, like freeze dried. 3) Minimize use of fuel (no hot water except for cooking). 4) People bring their own sheet sack.

Probably the same should occur at the Glen Aulin HSC, but I am less familiar with this one. (I think it is already in the woods).



Correspondence ID: 287 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 09:57:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been visiting Tuolumne Meadows and the river all my life.

I support Alt 4 but with no increase in overall visitor use and no increase in overall day parking. I support the removal of roadside parking and the fueling station and mountaineering shop.

The Tuolumne Lodge dining hall should be moved away from the River.

I support more increase in transit both within and from without the Park.

Correspondence ID: 288 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Outside Organization: retired firefighter & backpacker Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 10:00:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The HS camps were my first backcountry experience. I love the thought that they are there to introduce people to the backcountry. But they are not worth the pollution they introduce into the backcountry, constant pack trains, leaking septic systems. The Park Service, the organization charged with protecting the backcountry, should upgrade the camps and supply them in a less destructive manner. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 289 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 10:34:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please be mindful of all Native American remains below the soil and obey proper repatriation procedures, if said remains are found.

Correspondence ID: 290 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 10:49:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While the Tuolumne area is a wonder the presence of high bacterial counts in water sources is not good and should be reduced and closely monitored. The Wilderness should remain a wilderness and the effects of human and pack animals minimized. If the High Sierra camps at Vogelsang and Glen Aulin are to remain open their impact needs to be reduced, i.e., fewer people, fewer amenities, closer monitoring of waste products.

Correspondence ID: 291 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 10:50:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: High Sierra camps seem out of place and unnecessary. Trail users are treated poorly and third rate when visiting. Profit becomes more important than protecting nature at all, especially with pack train damage and problems. The stench on trails is overwhelming. We expect dust and dirt while in the backcountry, and it won't make you sick. But the bacteria, viruses and residue of pack animal manure, urine, or the same dried stuff everywhere along all the trails can not be cleaned off clothes or hands before eating a day snack or meal or preparing for sleep. My kids / students are ready for dirt but not fecal material everywhere and even being part of breathing. Our group being forced off the trail by ramrodding pack animals with so much "stuff" left on the trail is at best disgusting. How do you explain park service trail damage to children? I mean we've taught them to respect and treasure nature, and then they see park officials that treat both them and nature poorly. And how much money is unnecessarily spent reinforcing bridges and trails just for great weight of many stock animals?

High Sierra Camps including Glen Aulin and Vogelsang should be removed. They have done and continue to do irreparable damage including permanent structural cement, water treatment, buried plastic sheeting and pipes, and nearby widespread contamination. Camp personnel do not protect nature and show a disregard, even disrespect, for other trail users. Plus these folks are kept out of favored natural areas and some park restrooms.

During the remaining time packtrains are used, "manure catchers" should be universal on all animals including those used by rangers and park employees so they can be seen as good people, or an accompanying employee goes behind each packtrain to shovel manure off of trails. NPS should not allow HSCs to provide unnecessary luxuries & comforts in nature's backcountry (such as showers, linens, and fresh/heavy foods & beverages) out of simple respect for our children and their children.

Trail users must not suffer while a privileged few are pampered with unnecessary luxuries and comforts. The HSCs should keep the number of pack animals to the absolute minimum by serving only the minimum necessary food and lodging services.

Correspondence ID: 292 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 11:01:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please: 1) Glen Aulin and Vogelsang High Sierra Camps should be removed . 2) Comercial packtrains out of the high sierra. 3) Add "manure catchers" on all commercial packtrains, have an employee along trails behind each packtrain to shovel manure off of trails.

Correspondence ID: 293 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 11:06:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of: "Alternative 1 would improve opportunities for self-reliant experiences by closing the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge, reducing use levels, and eliminating all commercial services. I don't believe corporations for profit belong in the national park.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

I don't see where this alternative reflects upon the future of the High Sierra Camps. These I believe are one of the biggest issues effecting the backcountry. These for rent dining suites are not even mentioned as far as I saw in the 72 page .pdf "Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement"

Having large facilities maintained in the back country by packhorse to provide the finest of living for those who have the money to pay for it is not "protecting the wilderness for future generations." It's more a circus in our wilderness. There are multiple studies that show the damage inflicted upon the environment by packhorses: "12 of 15 sites with heavy pack-animal traffic yielded coliforms. Differences between backpacker and cattle or pack-animal areas were significant" -Wilderness and Environmental Medicine, (2006) To list just one study, there are more...

The environment takes a big hit when these types of activities are allowed.

The High Sierra Camp listing names hot showers, and laundry facilities. Really? Folks need to do laundry when out in the wilderness? Also from the web listing: "The pristine subalpine environment where the camps are nested is more susceptible to the impacts of visitation than the developed Yosemite Valley floor."

So what is it your missing there. The camp listing even admits the problem.

I don't have a problem with the idea of "?" Reflect a collaborative approach with all stakeholders." But I do have a problem with this premise when it involves organizations and corporations that will make a profit off use of the wilderness. Corporations who take from the park and degrade the natural features in order to line the pockets of shareholders. They give little back and degradation continues a downward spiral. I don't believe companies who stand to profit should be included. This should also include individuals who are behind such corporations.

Why should backpackers be subject to the massive volumes of horse manure, dust, flies, crumbling broken trails, chewed plants, and everything else that pack animals contribute to a lousy backcountry experience? Do the pack companies pay to build and maintain the trails? What do they give to the backpacker who seeks the wilderness experience and has to stand aside while massive pack-trains lay claim to the foot trails.

Please chose to preserve our wilderness and our national park. The more people clamor to use it, the faster it crumbles to the history of what it used to be...

Correspondence ID:	294	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 11:36:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I find it hard to think about Tuolumne River Environmental Impact when none of the four alternative plans even begin to discuss the removal of the dam and restoration of the valley. Do you really believe removing horses and campers is the solution when you allow a dam to destroy an entire mountain habitat INSIDE A NATIONAL PARK? Please at least develop a plan (even a long term plan) for the removal of O'Shaughnessy Dam.				
Correspondence ID:	295	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 15, 2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

I grew up in California and first visited Yosemite in 1973 and over the years I have rock climbed and skied all over Yosemite Valley, Tuolumne Meadows and the back country. However, one of my greatest experiences in Yosemite National Park is kayaking down the South Fork of the Merced from Wawona to the Highway 140 Bridge. The whitewater of the South Fork of the Merced is world class and it makes me wonder what other possibilities are within Yosemite National Park in the Merced and Tuolumne watersheds.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

In the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statement, Volume One, Chapter 7, Alternatives Dismissed from Further Consideration, I understand the issue of bank erosion and that certain areas may need to be closed to protect sensitive habitats. However, the stretch of water in the Tuolumne Meadows area is Class I and the possibility that boaters may need to be rescued in that stretch indicates that they are inexperienced whitewater boaters. Every year, numerous inexperienced rock climbers need to be rescued in Yosemite, but there are no restrictions on where they climb. The argument that "more boaters would need to be rescued" to ban whitewater boaters is simplistic and not consistent with the management of other recreational activities. There are many sections of the Tuolumne River that offer outstanding whitewater and they should be open for boaters to explore just as a rock climber can explore any peak.

In the Merced Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statement, Alternatives 1-5 continues the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach is class III, suitable for intermediate whitewater boaters and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley.

In addition the Merced River Gorge is closed to boating in Alternatives 5 and 6. This section has been successfully kayaked by expert boaters. In case a rescue is necessary, safety concerns are the same as other high risk rescue operations in Yosemite such as rescuing climbers from the face of El Capitan. Even hikers supposedly in a low risk activity have fallen down a steep canyon or have been swept away in a river resulting in a high risk rescue operation. Closing a section of the Merced River to boating because a rescue operation might be high risk is inconsistent with the management of other recreational activities in Yosemite.

In Alternatives 2, 3 and 4, boating would be allowed in the Merced Gorge, but a permit system would be utilized to limit the number of boaters per day. This section is an expert run and few boaters are capable of attempting it and the window when necessary conditions are perfect for running this section will automatically limit the number of boaters. A permit system is an unnecessary bureaucratic regulation.

I have been whitewater kayaking for over 20 years and have always tried to practice a "leave no trace" wilderness ethic. I think that whitewater boating in an outstanding way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. The important values of Yosemite and these rivers can be protected through appropriate management. Whitewater boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park and not be singled out for requiring high risk rescues. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	296	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 11:53:16				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	The Glen Aulin and Vogelsang High Sierra Camps -- and the stock use that supplies them with backcountry luxuries -- are anachronistically unacceptable in the 21st century and incompatible with Wilderness law/regulation, wheter in designated Wilderness or not.				

Please remove and rehabilitate the Glen Aulin and Vogelsang High Sierra Camps.

Please reduce stock limis to four animals maximum per party.

Correspondence ID:	297	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 11:55:12				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support Alternative 3.				

Yosemite is a treasure that we cannot take for granted. Yet if people do not have access they will not be able to appreciate it. It would be wonderful if we were all self reliant but the fact is many are not and so facilities such as Tuolumne Meadows and Glen Aulin provide the services needed and I think they should remain but I support cutting back to lessen the impact on the environment. Personally, I have used the "meals only" option at the HS camps, after initially staying in the tent cabins. Having ventured into this area of Yosemite I am encouraged to be more self reliant and I hope this will be the same for other users.

I support measures that encourage less single family vehicles and decreased commercialization.

Correspondence ID:	298	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 12:15:55				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Reading the summary of the Draft Tuolumne River Plan, I found it to be arbitrary and lack justification for some of its most				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

controversial actions. Outstanding Values: Regarding historic values, why is only Parson's Lodge mentioned as historic and not its neighbors, Glen Aulin HSC and Tuolumne Lodge? Is its Sierra Club origins more important than NPS's reasons for starting the tent cabin lodging facilities? Tuolumne Lodge was built the year after Parson's and Glen Aulin was started within the first decade of NPS's history. These two camps are part of the original mission of NPS and provide a service that is unique and historic to this day. Why is this no longer valued? Why is the only recreation values recognized in the summary the Tioga Road and wilderness experience and not stables, rockclimbing, camping, and fishing, some of the most popular and traditional activities along the river? The Tioga Road seems more like a physical feature than a recreational value. By omitting certain cultural and recreational values, the plan cherry-picks values to support its decisions rather than accurately reflecting traditional use in the area. I don't like to find political maneuvers and bias disguised as science and history in a document designed to educate the public. Actions: I applaud the plan to establish parking areas in an attempt to prevent roadside parking. The current system is dangerous and unsightly. I do not think this will limit day use visitors as stated in the summary. People do not stop coming just because parking is more limited, it just causes more congestion. The plan seems to expect people to come, park and sightsee only. This is not the reality of Tuolumne Meadows and the way people enjoy the area. Activities such as climbing, stable rides and camping are great ways to get people out of the car and interacting with the area. The TRP ignores these activities' values and does away with them without explanation. Why remove day rides? Mule rides in the Sierra are a traditional, historic activity. It would be very sad if this activity was denied to visitors. Why keep Glen Aulin, but limit the number of beds? This action is more designed to cripple the high sierra camp system rather than provide any true restoration. Why remove rather than relocate the mountaineering school? If you want to do away with the gas station, that could be understandable. But the rock climbing classes teach a unique way to enjoy the Sierra. This is more modern activity, but still important to Yosemite's history. Plus climbing on granite doesn't have an ecological downside compared to backpacking and camping.

These are some of the gaps in logic and lack of explanation found in the TRP summary. The specifics mentioned - improving the water system, establishing a composting toilet at Glen Aulin, removing roadside parking, moving facilities away from wet/riparian areas - are well thought out and explained. They're good actions. But ignoring any activity except for driving and hiking is a weakness in the plan and suggests a strong bias. Traditional activities are important to the public and shouldn't be discontinued.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and the time spent reading my thoughts.

Correspondence ID:	299	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 12:26:49				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Thank you for the opportunity you are giving the public to comment on such an important topic for an area that is so valuable and treasured by so many people. I was at a couple of the initial public meetings at the beginning of this process and understand the importance of protecting this delicate and irreplaceable area of Yosemite National Park. I did participate in the recent webinars that you held and did submit several questions, but did not really get any sufficient answers to those questions.				

After reviewing the Draft Comprehensive Management Plan (Full Plan and Summary Guide), I have the following questions and comments. I did try to find my questions in the guide, but due to the volume of information, it was difficult to be sure that I hadn't missed something.

General Comments/Questions:

First, I have to say that I wasn't really satisfied with any of the alternatives that are being presented. I feel that there are still some questions that weren't answered for the public that may affect which alternative they would like the best. For instance, what kind of fencing is being suggested for use along the trails in the meadows. How tall would the fencing be? Would it be chain link, wood pasture fencing or something else? It makes a difference. Or would boardwalks be used instead of fencing? These types of things are important in helping people know which alternative they would prefer. Also, how many of Loop A campsites in the campground would be removed? And where would the Loop A road be aligned to?

In general...no matter which alternative... I think that the Tuolumne Meadows campground does not need showers installed in the bathrooms. I think that people should still be able to pay for showers at the T.M. Lodge (provided you pick the alternative which keeps the Lodge). This would continue to control the use of water but still offer the alternative of a shower for those who really want one. This is a "rustic" area and I think that people in general accept this rustic atmosphere and also I think that most visitors don't stay long enough in the meadows area to warrant the additional use of water that would happen if the showers were so easily accessible. If bathrooms are not remodeled to include showers...could we increase campground capacity in another alternative (other than Alternative 2) and not use as much water? Also, Ref. table 715 (pg. 7-106) doesn't show a reflection of the adjustment in water usage between the current fixtures and low flow fixtures in showers, faucets and toilets that may be installed.

Also, I think that no matter which alternative you pick, you should include the additional trail from the area #11 referenced on the alternative maps (store/grill/visitor center or picnic area depending on the alternative plan) to the Parson's Lodge bridge area. This is suggested in Alternative #2 and I like it! I think that having only one formal trail through the main meadows (from area #7/#9 on the alternative maps to the Parson's Lodge bridge area) will become overly crowded on a busy summer day. Adding

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

this additional formal trail, would alleviate congestion and allow visitors to feel a little more of the peace and solitude that they should feel when they get there! This second formal trail will hopefully give people some more time to view and appreciate the meadows and river that is so important.

I think another thing that the public should know is how any of these alternatives would even be funded. At a time when you are also working on the Merced Wild and Scenic River Management Plan, it is important to know what kind of fiscal impact these would have on the National Park Service, Department of the Interior and Yosemite National Park...especially when the budgets necessary for both plans could be so close in time to each other.

Also, I am wondering if you could address and consider making a formal trail from the Pothole Dome parking lot area, along the side of Pothole Dome to the cascades on the river. There is currently a very pronounced social trail there and I think that it would be nice to have it be a formal trail. It could give the public the opportunity to see one of the stair step river morphology features that this incredible river has! Encourage people to experience, fairly easily, one of the ORVs that make this area so unique! As far as I can think, it is one of the only spots to witness this ORV without a lengthy hike on the Glen Aulin trail or along the much more remote areas of the Merced River that also shares this stair step morphology.

I do appreciate that you have left the overnight trailhead quota system in place as it currently is. I have used this system for decades and feel that it works. Thank you for not reducing the quota numbers on the trailheads!

I know that one goal is to manage day use and overnight use by managing the parking areas and removing the possibility of informal, roadside parking. I do wonder how effective would additional buses be? Is there any possibility of additional remote parking areas being put in further along the road in either direction from the Meadows to use in conjunction with the additional bus service?

Alternative 1:

I felt that 2 of the alternatives really aren't viable (alt. 1 & alt. 2) because Alternative 1, in my opinion, is too restrictive in a growing population. I think it is ridiculous to think that visitor day use could realistically be reduced by 41% and visitor overnight use could be reduced by 25% in our growing population. To reduce use by this much, along with completely removing the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge and Glen Aulin restricts use of this area too much! I believe that a better balance of protecting this area and allowing the public to enjoy this area can be achieved. It is vital to Yosemite, and other natural areas as well, that people be able to really connect with the nature and beauty of this area so that they can see how important it is to protect areas like this in the future. I also very much dislike the complete removal of Loop A in the campground in this alternative.

Alternative 2:

As for Alternative 2, I think that expanding the recreational opportunities to the degree mentioned in this alternative are too much. Although, I liked the aspect of increasing the formal parking and expanding the campground (it is currently so difficult to get a reservation at T.M. Campground...sells out in the first couple of minutes of availability!), I do have concerns of the huge increase of water usage per day in this alternative. I also do not particularly like the whitewater boating that would allowed in this alternative. I have a hard time seeing that as an addition to the park. I am also not clear how an "outfitter camp" would work for the public in the Glen Aulin area. I do not like the idea of completely removing the solid structures in Glen Aulin. I think that it is part of the charm of that area. I think, overall, that this alternative really isn't viable because of the increased water demand put on the water supply and also because of it being the most expensive alternative to implement.

Alternative 3:

When reviewing Alternative 3, I find that there are some things that I like and some I dislike. I again find the reduction visitor day use and overnight use not very feasible in a growing population, especially when it is so obvious how many people WANT to be in the Tuolumne Meadows area. I do like the the concessioner stock day rides would be maintained at some level in this alternative. I know that the stock is hard on the trails , etc. but it does still offer an option for people to see other areas of the park that they may not be able to see by foot. As for the campground, I like that the current configuration of the campground would be maintained, although I would like to see the capacity be increased slightly as is suggested in Alternative 2.

This alternative mentions that people would not be discouraged from dispersing into the meadow or along the riverbank. I am conflicted by this. I wasn't sure if this meant that it would be completely "free reign" for the public, or if there would still be some fencing or boardwalks and some limited access to directly enjoy the river. Because of this lack of a clear view, I have a hard time knowing if I would approve of this aspect of Alternative 3 or not. I do think it is important for people to access some parts of the river directly. There is a lot to be said for being able to sit by the river or wade in the river. I know it is an important part of my visitor experience! I do like that Glen Aulin H.S.C. would be maintained at a reduced capacity. I think this is a fair balance between river protection and visitor enjoyment. As for the reduction in NPS employees in this alternative...I am not sure that an increase of employee to visitor ratio (1 to 33) compared to the current ratio (1:28) is a good idea for visitor safety and

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

support.

Alternative 4:

There is no doubt that this Alternative is the best attempt of the 4 at a balanced option. Some of the things that I like about this alternative are that there is at least a minimal increase in visitor day use and only a minimal decrease in the visitor overnight use. I also like that there isn't a decrease in the campground use; however, I would have liked to have a more clear picture of where the A loop road would be moved to, where the entrance road would be moved to, and how many Loop A sites would be relocated? I would like to see, if at all possible, the concessioner stock rides still be available at a small amount (as in Alt. 2 & Alt. #3). As I mentioned before in the general comments section, I would love to see the addition of a second formal trail through the meadows between area #11 on the map and the footbridge by Parson's Lodge (like was proposed in Alternative #2). I think this would help reduce congestion on the only available trail through the main meadows that the alternative is already incorporating.

This Alternative mentions that NPS staff would increase by 13 people. I do wonder if the total day and overnight use is only increasing by an estimate of 53 people why would there be a need of 13 more NPS employees? I love having NPS employees available, but can the NPS budget withstand a ratio of 1 NPS employee to 28 visitors versus the current ratio of 1 NPS employee to 30 visitors (at least from my calculations from Table 7-14 on pg. 7-105)? I do like that Glen Aulin H.S.C. will be maintained even if it is at a reduced capacity. Again, a fair balance.

I do not agree with the mentioned possibility of using a trailhead quota system for wilderness day use. I have used the mixed first-come/first served and advanced reservation system for backpacking for decades and believe it works great in that capacity. When it comes to an overnight wilderness trip, there is more pre-planning involved and this system works. However, I think that it will be too rigid of a system for those people who just want to take a day hike in this area. It is too likely to make it impossible for people to take an unexpected day hike to a spot that they may never return to if they are just passing through (which a lot of visitor's do). I really hope that you will reconsider this aspect of the Alternative. It would be very disappointing to see people be pushed out of the possibility of taking a day hike to the major trail segments (mentioned pg. 7-87) just because they hadn't made a reservation for a DAY hike or hadn't gotten to a wilderness center early enough in the day to get a first come/first served permit for the trail. I STRONGLY disagree with this quota system for day hikes!

In summary, I again really want to convey how appreciative I am for you encouraging the public to comment on these alternatives. I can only imagine how tedious and time consuming it will be to review all of the submissions you will receive. Tuolumne Meadows is an important part of my life and my children's lives as it is for many others I am sure. I wish that nothing would change in the meadows, but I know that in order to protect it there will have to be some changes. Hopefully, this will be achievable with as little changes needing to be made as possible.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	300	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 12:28:12				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Alternate 4 - Concessioner stock day rides into wilderness should be allowed in either Yosemite Valley or the Tuolumne River area. The preference would be the Tuolumne River area, rather than the Valley since it would be better to get people out of Yosemite Valley and experience horseback riding in the high country. Please reconsider the elimination of concessioner stock day rides in the Tuolumne River area.				

My husband and I have a vacation rental in Mariposa and many of our guests from around the world want the option of these stock day rides, which I understand will only be available in the Wawona area if the TRP and MRP are approved.

Correspondence ID:	301	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 12:31:04				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please let's get rid of the pack animals and tent camps at places like Vogelsong. The desire to bring the luxuries of urban living into the wilderness is an absurdity and travesty. There are numerous RV parks, car camping sites, and paved state parks already available, so to situate similar facilities in national park wilderness is plainly unacceptable.				

For disabled persons only, trips supported by pack animals could be allowed provided there are no shelter or bathroom facilities

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

left in place and manure catchers be required for each pack animal. The polluting effects of stock animals negatively impact water, trails, natural silence, and foul the air. How many times have I had to stand aside while a virtual cavalry traps me in choking dust? This is the antithesis of a wilderness experience for me and for the detergent stinking people on horseback who invariably seem bored and grouchy. We must help them help themselves to quit their vehicles and move in the natural world we all inhabit.

For all the paved parts of the planet, let's recognize and prize our national park wilderness without apology.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	302	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	[REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 12:31:55				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	In the above recap of the plan most seems reasonable and acceptable. However the reduction of overnight camping at Glen Aulin is a huge disappointment. It is already a small camp and if implemented it will be even harder to access. Given that it is the beginning of the circuit for most of the high camps, it seems unacceptable to cut the number of overnight campers at GA but still allow the larger number at May Lake and beyond. Campers would need to either hike the entire 14 miles (unlikely) all the way from TM to May Lake or start their circuit at May Lake, cutting off some of the most gorgeous meadow hiking in the park. Accessing the area on a day hike would be a round trip of 11-12 mile, a major stretch for most of us and still not getting to see/hike the area between the two camps. Getting a permit thru the lottery system is already very difficult. Please continue to allow the current # of visitors to this beautiful high camp.				

Correspondence ID:	303	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 13:10:14				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support Alternative 4, "Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences" but without any increase in maximum day visitor use. I support the Actions Common to all Alternatives which make needed changes to protect the River and the meadows, including removal of roadside parking and the addition of offroad parking. I support Alternative 4's removal of the unneeded fueling station and mountaineering store.				

Correspondence ID:	304	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Tuolumne River Trust, member Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 13:11:13				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	YNP Staff: These 11 identical pages of comments are being submitted by two different routes to be sure they arrive. T W&S R CMP, EIS and Appendices in YNP, issues of concern to [REDACTED] P.E. & retired canoeist. Please consider these issues, both the praise and requested changes. March 18, 2013				

Overall comment: I favor Alternate 4, with additions and requests detailed below, because it limits the number of overnight visitors to the present water supply source, limits day visitors by parking limits, makes many important restorations, all backed up by a real prospect to receive \$66 million to pay for it all. Yet, many other changes and additions are needed (e.g. adding whitewater boating and parking reduction) to make Alternate 4 produce a sustainable ecosystem, equal for and fair to all people.

Fourteen issues that interest me are listed in no particular order followed by text corrections and lesser important suggestions:

Table of Contents: Source of Dana Fork is Well Corrected. Corral consolidation, drainage control, manure removal and reduction in stock are applauded. Poopenaut Valley biological and wildlife revival are applauded. Whitewater boating should be allowed in preferred alternative. Domestic flow diversion at Dana Fork dam is not favored. Waste water ponds removal requested. User capacity in wild designated river zones is unclear. Correcting all Hwy 120 culverts and those on Great Sierra Wagon Road is useful. Are Highway 120 and/or the footbridge near Parson's Lodge/Soda Springs impacting hydrology? Raised walkways not favored. How will NYP enforce day use limit? Scenic turnout suggested. Mountaineering School and Climbing Store continuation is suggested. Text revision is requested on page 8-21. Other text revisions and comments of lesser importance.

? Source of Dana Fork is Well Corrected by moving it from Tioga Pass to 11,000-foot on Mt Dana, reference law, p 1-4 & 5, "Eligible portions" p 2-11. Chapter 3 p 3-1 through -5 with corrected map p 3-1. I am partly responsible for this error 34 year ago by not paying closer attention to the W&S map in YNP.

? Corral consolidation, drainage control, manure removal and reduction in stock are applauded as useful improvements to river water quality and reduce trail impacts. Text p 5-79, p 5-81 and 7-15. However, there is no mention of pack trains to Vogelsang High Sierra Camp or whether firewood is packed in there or could be reduced to lower impact on trails in the Tuolumne W&S

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

River zone.

1, RWH This line below and any others are an artifact of my Vista Operating System, or an indication of my inability to use it. ? Poopenaut Valley biological and wildlife revival are applauded as very good with SFPUC providing money, pulse flows in spring and with YNP and SFPUC staff and consultants counting, interoperating and publishing the benefits.

? Whitewater boating should be allowed in preferred alternative with permit and party size restrictions that is now only allowed in Alt 2, ES-12, and explored more fully at p 7-57, allowing annual limits, but limiting putin to the downstream end of Tuolumne Meadows (long portage) to Pate Valley, p 8-56 and 7, p 8-16, and 8-54; and from below O'S Dam to Poopenaut Valley, but not beyond, p 7-57, and 8-16 and p 7-54 which is puzzling. A separate comment was sent to NPS prior to this one supporting the run from Poopenaut Valley to Early Intake There are multiple confusing and conflicting issues about ww boating. I believe planners have assembled this new proposal by violating the method used for a multitude of other issues where YNP asked scientific and behavioral scientists to study situations, present a paper that considers the conflicting issues addressed, then chose the course that balances public use with environmental protection. For ww boating, it appears you have done the reverse, making multiple guesses as to what it takes for a safe run that also protects environmental values. My suggestion is: ask the experts, declare amnesty for those who have run these segments in the park, request (require) them to attend a conference along with other kayakers qualified to make these runs, along with professional raft outfitters and others who have knowledge of group size needed for safe and efficient runs. Also, invite local American Indians with concerns about their ancestral sites, p 8-337 and 8, and any academic scholars with knowledge of boater group dynamic, ww sport user trends and those knowledgeable about environmental values along the routes. I suggest you discuss with the group of experts assigning a putin on a bar near Soda Springs and assigned campsite at Pate Valley, p 8-351, which might reduce inadvertent intrusion into sacred sites as well as using an assigned camping places below O'S Dam, Poopenaut Valley and near Early Intake. Perhaps allowing no kayak trips at times when tribal ceremonies are scheduled along the river would prevent inadvertent intrusion. Also, discuss logistics for vehicles since there needs to be overnight parking near the takeout too. In short, call in those knowledgeable for advice from those who have a stake in aspects of travel on this silver thread of river. Following are some of the problems you have thus far not addressed well about ww boating: Why is the section below Poopenaut forbidden, since I know the reach from Poopenaut Valley to near Early Intake has been run? A separate comment was sent on the run from Poopenaut to Early Intake that included permission from the Forest Service. Recreation values are discussed on p ES-4, ES -7 and 8, ES-11, and history and photo 2-9 including boating on Merced W&S River, but no accounts of (illegal) runs on the TR, even though staff know those runs are posted on YouTube. There is confusion on number of trips and group size that must be corrected. Perhaps the number of trips and group size should be different for the upper vs the two lower segments. The executive Summary gives group and people limits of 8 trips per year with maximum 6 persons/boats, p 7-57. Likewise, 8 trips per year of 6 persons are discussed on p 8-186, again at p 8-206 and again on p 8-321. However, the opposite language occurs for 6 trips per year of 8 persons maximum, p 8-3 to 7. Limited ww boating seems in tune with NEPA requirement in Section 101 at item (3) p 7-113 that indicates 6 float trips per year would have no impact on water quality p 8-38, without discussing the 8 trip option. Six trips per year are discussed in the Vegetation section of the EIS p 8-76. Surely these yearly limits on party size would apply separately to each of the three sections of river: Grand Canyon, O'Shaughnessy Dam to Poopenaut, and below Poopenaut. There is no discussion in the EIS for boating in the section from Poopenaut downstream that I have yet found on p 8-56 through 8-95, but there should have been.

2, RWH All boating would be forbidden in TM Scenic zone, p 7-117 and 8, p 8-76 and 8-168 and 9. All boating and floating are now forbidden anywhere on the Tuolumne within the park, p 8-176. That restriction in TM Scenic section makes no sense by forcing ww putin as proposed at the north end of TM, e.g. a long portage. Instead, a putin could be at a bar near Soda Springs bridge, as illustrated in Summary Guide page 9. Could there be overnight parking spaces assigned at the corral or along the corral road for wilderness boater vehicles that have a wilderness permit as guaranteed elsewhere on p 8-185? Gradient in the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne is 190 feet per mile, calculated from data on p-8-31 to 33, that will persuade the less skilled boater to not apply to go there. Impact of kayakers on archeological sites is discussed on p 8-321 and 22 that suggests "Impacts would be avoided through consultation?" also, by "the location of kayaking put-in?" ww boating fits in with Alternative 4, for example, via that Alternative purpose "to further connect visitors to the river while protecting its resources", p 6-20. Rather, the ww boaters are given a bad rap by saying "Allow Boating on the Tuolumne River in the Meadows Area" i.e. Scenic zone on p 7-117 by suggesting that boaters, and by implication ww boaters, would "inevitably land on the banks?thus trampling the ground adjacent to the river." A permit restriction on ww boaters putin would take care of this because these boaters want to land and leave from bars, not unstable banks or wetlands where willows should be growing. WW boaters, once underway will not be stopping until they are into Wilderness. Be specific in this paragraph to limit forbidding tubers and open canoes whose day use numbers you could not control. If necessary put up a sign at the bridge near Soda Springs saying only whitewater boat launch there.

? Domestic flow diversion at Dana Fork dam is not favored: I see little progress on finding an alternate or supplemental supply for this dam, photo p 5-86, p 5-87. Demand is listed in Alternate 4, p 7-99, 6-22 and Table 7-12. Percent diverted is discussed on p ES-6. Demand reduction is a good goal p 7-13. P 7-103, p 8-24. Flow of roughly "5 to 6 million gal" per season, p 8-24 and "average water withdrawal [from Dana Fork] of 60,000 to 70,000 gal; per day" currently during August, p 8-25 & 26, also p 6-21 and 22 Table 6-9 possibly peaking when Dana Fork flow is near annual low, taking "approximately 10% of the Dana Fork discharge" of 1 cubic feet per second and "continuous [Dana Fork] flow monitoring is warranted", p 8-25, but no flow monitoring is proposed, but should be. Diversion of 66,778 gal per day listed for Alternate 4 converts to 46.4 gpm assuming there are tanks large enough to store that amount around the clock and have enough retention time to meet state standards. The cost of replacing leaking domestic water lines and installing low flow fixtures throughout Tuolumne Meadows is not shown in Appendix L, but should be. I found nowhere in these documents a goal mentioned for these replacements, but that would be reassuring that there is commitment as to when this proposed work will be done. These changes will reduce diversion from Dana Fork. Say when this important water saving work will be done. "[A]additional storage capacity might be needed during

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

periods of low flow in Dana Fork to stay within the standard of withdrawing no more than 10% of follow flow (see Chapter 5)", p 3-50. I did not see a size or plan for additional storage mentioned in Chapter 5. To supplement water supply late in the season, I suggestion you investigate installing a long subsurface perforated collector that could be tapped to supplement low surface flow in Dana Fork. Possibly such a collector could be located on the uphill shoulder of Tioga Road from Pothole Dome to the present visitor center, with flow pumped to the present treatment site, if that aquifer has sufficient ground water supply and quality, p 8-28, to supplement low Dana Fork diversion when stream flow is less than 1 cfs. Another option that could be considered would be to pump raw water from the main stem near or from under the highway bridge when Dana Fork flow is low. If this source could be used permanently, then Dana Ford diversion

3, RWH

structure could be removed. Dana Fork diversion was placed there long before electrical power came to these meadows, but could be now. Consideration of options for supplementing Dana Fork flow is important because "reduction in visitor services" could result at times of low flow in Dana Fork, p 8-35, and preferred Alternate 4, p 8-33 and 8-43. In the best case, the goal I urge is to remove the present diversion and diversion dam which would allow Parker Pass Creek basin to be reopened to overnight wilderness camping, p 2-16, with a group potentially allowed at each of the seven lakes there every day. I ask that this idea of increasing wilderness camping in this basin be addressed in a subsequent park study. I have hiked through this area four times to camp sites beyond. I was always impressed by the size and grandeur of this basin. None of the foregoing section on water supply should be taken as my endorsement of increasing the number of overnight visitors beyond the number listed in Alternate 4, with or without the Dana Fork dam. My remarks are directed solely at supplementing supply in time of critically low flow in Dana Fork.

? Waste water ponds removal. I choose to call them sewer ponds because the domestic waste water appears to have had only scant primary treatment and little progress is seen on improvement. Text p 5-80, map p 7-31. Text p 8-27 saying "remove waste water ponds", Table 7-13 p 7-103, should apply to all alternatives as a goal. The two sewer ponds are shown in Figure 5-12, p 5-65 as low visibility locations whereas from the shore and from distant Medlicott Dome on p 5-2 and in Summary Guide p 5 where the shorelines look bright, artificially white in contrast to the nearby river gravel and exposed granite. Sewer ponds are stated to be in "high-or moderate visibility zones", p 8-164. My photograph of one of these sewer ponds is available to illustrate this bad visual impact, but Figure I-29 and 30 on page H-31 show a sewer pond and pump station, but lack Cathedral Peak in mine. USGS topo maps Falls Ridge and Tioga Pass each show a pond labeled "Sewage Disposal Pond" which I take as two black eyes for the park. The warnings about the potential impact on river water quality, p 8-32, should be headed by applying better technology as suggested in the text. Is this sewage disposal field in Yosemite Wilderness or not? The preferred Alternate 4, in Figure 7-11 p 7-97, and all three other alternate figures show the spray field outside of Wilderness. Likewise in Appendix A, p A-6, in the table under Spray field I read "No. No suitable [location for the spray field] occur outside the [wild and scenic] corridor due to wilderness boundaries and other resource constraints?" This hints that the spray field is outside Wilderness On the other hand, Figure 8-1 p 8-29, Figure 8-3 p 8-49, Figure 8-5 p 8-69, and Figure 8-11 p 8-273 all show the spray field inside Wilderness. Likewise Falls Ridge and Vogelsang USGS topo maps show the spray field in Yosemite Wilderness. It seems to me a stretch to use Wilderness designated land, p 8-194, for disposal of partly treated sewage, even for a few days a year. If spraying sewage onto Wilderness land is allowed, explain that anomalous action. "Need for comprehensive upgrade" of sewer system is discussed on p 8-32. What is the target date for such "upgrade and redesign", p 8-43, that would remove the ponds altogether from the Preferred Alternative? Treatment of waste water in future by tertiary methods was not noted as being considered on p 5-81, but could allow disposal by many means, even by injection into the aquifer, say on the down slope side of the highway shoulder between Pothole Dome and the treatment plant if that aquifer were porous enough and the meadow beyond would not be harmed. Alternately, storage of tertiary treated waste water in large tanks all season at the treatment facility (e.g. 2 tanks 130-foot diameter and 40 feet high) and spraying over portions of porous land in October would not threaten water quality in the river. Neither would pumping this water continuously into aquifers harm water quality and could do away with big tanks. I ask that the dates of spraying waste water in 2013 be announced so those interested could see how this activity looks, if there is runoff and visitors could be shown where Wilderness boundary is in that area. 4, RWH

? User capacity in wild designated river zones is unclear. I am confused as to overnight carrying capacity stated as 400 persons per night for Alternate 4, Table 7-14 p 7-105, but that limit is clearly divided between the segments above and below O'S Reservoir in Table 6-8 p 6-20, into 50 below and 350 above. My confusion is, does this limit apply to the 320 acre per mile in wild river zone, as discussed in 6.2 of Step 3 on p 6-3, or do these limits apply to the park wilderness generally at the permit issuing stations for Hetch Hetchy entry (issued at Hodgdon Meadow station) and at Tuolumne Meadows wilderness permit station? The Pate Valley to Mt Lyell stretch of 35 miles wild, permits 350 users, which is equal to just over 10 persons per mile per night. For the 6.4 total miles below O'S Dam to park boundary a limit of 50 is equal to a little less than 8 persons per mile. These seem very limiting, but perhaps reasonable considering the lack of trails in the lower section. Tell how you set these limits. A second issue, will overnight camping be allowed in the one mile zoned scenic below O'S? I don't exactly remember the text location saying the horse camp limit in the Lyell Fork wild zone is up to 25 persons and 25 stock overnight at one place. How does this fit into the permit system? Is the horse permit numbers subtracted from the hiker limit that day or is horse permits separate? Please make these questions clear in a response to this draft.

? Correcting all Hwy 120 culverts and those on Great Sierra Wagon Road (GSWRd) will help hydrology and visual goals. I'm satisfied with the provisions that drainage will be corrected in all alternatives, Table 7-13 p 7-103 and Table 7-16 and p 7-110. Some tributary damage photos illustrate park interest in making corrections, p ES-6, 2-7, and Appendix H, p 5-24 & 29 & 30, Photos 5-25, restoration 5-27, good map of problem areas; immediate shoreline provision, p 5-2, Culvert damage to meadows is acknowledged p 5-17 & 8, 8-22 and 23. "Nondegradation and enhancement mandate" "both past and ongoing", discussed p 5-11, i.e. scenic values and more broadly p 5-11 through 15 and Table 7-16 p 7-110. I support returning the GSWRd leading

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

across the meadow to the pedestrian bridge near Soda Springs to a condition similar to that in width in or before 1915 including swales in that road for good hydraulic passage in flood, as long as the resulting path retains a mineral surface, a boardwalk is not favored, but would be tolerable. I support crushing or removal of the abandoned sewer line under GSWRd, p 7-103.

? Are Highway 120 and/or the footbridge near Parson's Lodge/Soda Springs impacting hydrology? If so, I support a study and making changes at these two bridges, page 5-67. Also, Figure and Table 7-11 p 7-97, Table 7-13 p 7-103, p 8-24 for both bridges. Improvements are suggested, for both bridges, but no specific date set for study to be completed, p 7-11, 7-97 and Table 7-13 p 7-103, and p 8-24, but the park should assure these potential problems are examined by a date certain so they are not forgotten.

? Raised walkways not favored across meadows, p 5-30, because they may be more a visual blight than limited damage from social trails are. Stoneman Meadow in Y Valley at 4000-foot elevation is given as a positive example in Figure 5-10 and text, p 5-34. More text and references are needed before I can accept this restoration method at this 8,600-foot elevation. But, I see the wisdom of a boardwalk going out into the meadow across from the Store because of heavy traffic that cross the road to walk in the meadow. I too walked that path in the 1980's after buying ice cream at the end of a weeklong backpack trip. But, I hope that fencing, p 8-77, will not have to be used to protect meadows from heavily used social trails. There is not enough specificity in the statement "boardwalk or other surface types", p 5-30. Other types should be explained as to what material and location. Asphalt is appropriate only for a trail beside the 5, RWH

highway from the river to the store and possibly on to the new contact station, including a wooden bridge over Unicorn Creek. Would a pedestrian bridge over the TR help visitor movement? Although I have reservations on how visitors can be controlled by fences, etc, Appendix H, p H-132, in the section Monitoring and long Term Maintenance well sums up the work intended by W&S designation.

? How will YNP enforce day use limits? These documents are not convincing about how YNP will control day use numbers when the maximum environmental limit of 562 parked user vehicles is exceeded. Although we are assured that "visitor capacity will be enforced to protect the quality of visitor experience from increasing congestion", etc, p 5-71, we read in the errata for p 5-70 that adverse impacts for vegetation indicators caused by day use visitors will be tolerated until degradation by informally parked vehicles exceed the parking space supply by 20% of the time at peak hours for three years including visitors arriving by regional busses that serve the Tuolumne River corridor. A limit of formal parking places are set at 562 in Table 7-11a, p 7-93 for Alternate 4 as the amount that will not bring more day users than the environment can withstand after \$66 million in restorations and improvements are made as shown in Appendix L. 20% more than the limit is 112 informally parked cars. Parked where, along the highway shoulder as now, obstructing views and presenting a real safety hazard, or on internal roads now, e.g. photo p 2-9? Just as bad, will velvet ropes or hog-wire fences and keep out signs be placed around the big meadows to protect resources from excessive visitor trampling after several million dollars of restoration is made on 171 acres, Summary Guide, p 17? Cost of meadow restoration is not broken out separately in Appendix L. There are two broad choices, as I see it: Reduce formal parking spaces by 112 spots and let peak period informal parking happen and give the informal parkers large, brightly colored, friendly warning to control the number. Also, increase the frequency of shuttle bus service on peak days to mitigate parking problems. Another parking help on peak and near-peak days would be to station parking staff at congested places and at remote parking areas, listed on p 7-93, to direct those waiting at congested areas to the more remote, but uncongested parking places. Alternately a poor choice, would have park ranger/traffic cops in bright traffic control jackets, circulating through the internal roads and along Hwy 120 from Tioga Pass to past Pothole Dome on Harleys giving citations carrying federal fines or imprisonment to those parking in illegal places. I dread the thought of tow trucks hauling illegally parked cars to Lee Vining! I suggest the first three friendly steps be used as the solution to protect park resources because it would be doubly distasteful to be cited in paradise. Tickets are no simple matter in Yosemite. I have an attorney friend who got such a citation while living in YV years ago, who stopped briefly beside Tioga Road in Tuolumne Meadows in an informal shoulder parking area in the off-season with no no-parking sign posted in sight. He spent a lot of time to resolve that citation. The shuttle bus service was barely mentioned in the three volumes, but could help visitor and employee circulation to reduce parking problems near the store/grill. More frequent scheduling should be investigated to better move visitors between parking lots and view sites as well as hardening the stops to avoid trampling nearby. I have added to the present traffic problem by circulating from highway through the grill parking time after time until a spot opened. 6, RWH

? Scenic turnout is suggested for viewing iconic peaks, e.g. those on the cover of this CMP. I don't think there are enough opportunities to see these peaks clearly as outlined on p 2-16 for "an unobstructed view of the craggy Sierra Nevada", p 5-60, and "vista management", p 5-61. I am spoiled for my first view of these peaks was awaking near Soda Springs after a dark night arrival 55 years ago. I have long wondered if those travelling in closed vehicles can well see the iconic craggy Sierra Nevada in Tuolumne Meadows. Last June I saw a number of busses entering the park at Tioga Pass and I wondered what views of Cathedral Range they would have from the bus. However, I see the hint of a possible scenic turnout location just for busses at "little blue slide" shown in a photo, p 5-80, where road embankment work is proposed, p 5-80 & 81. This spot might give those travelling west, especially those traveling through in visually confining busses. I want them to have a chance to stand at roadside (with bus motors off) to see these iconic craggy peaks in the Cathedral Range that are only briefly viewed from a moving a vehicle. This location, if widened for a scenic turnout, may have a "contrast analysis rating sheet" score of only 1 for "other structures" e.g. road signs and widened pavement since this location seems scheduled for embankment work for visual improvement and sediment control if that also might include the barren slope above the road. However, by closing the comment period in March precludes park staff and my opportunity to go to this location and judge its possible usefulness as a view point. Thus I can only propose it be investigated in conjunction with other already planned remedial slope work that might be done above the road. The goal would be to give these folks on a bus a grand view for the money they are paying since they can't walk to Soda Springs to see this range. Other useful references on this topic are photo p ES 3, p 1-1, p 5-3, p 5-6, p 1-16, p

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

8-54 and 5, p 5-60 mentioning "undisturbed views of the craggy Sierra Nevada". P 5-61 includes, but does not improve possible views of Cathedral and Unicorn peaks from little blue slide. Busses probably should turn off their engine while parked at any view point. Can this CMP and EIS require tour busses to turn off their motors when stopped at view spots? Diesel engine exhaust is discussed on p 8-140. Scenic Vista Management and vista clearing are discussed on p 8-151 and 8-154. In Appendix J, Figure J-9 shows that Unicorn Peak is in view from this location. Possibly more of the Cathedral Range peaks would be visible from Little Blue Slide itself.

? Mountaineering School and Climbing Store Continuation is suggested: The preferred Alternative 4 would "[r]emove mountaineering shop", Table 7-16 p 7-109 and p 8-164, p 8-177, 8-192, 8-193. Appendix A, p A-9 gives a weak argument for eliminating the mountaineering shop and school by saying such a store is located in Lee Vining, but does not say where a mountaineering school or guide service is to be found. In the 1980 GMP, p B-5 says Tuolumne Meadows should "continue to provide staging for high mountain experiences", but should relocate mountaineering shop (reference NPS 1980b 63-66) which was done. Cathedral Range is outside the TW&SR zone that is being discussed in this CMP. In another appendix is discussed consolidation of trails on Cathedral Peak will reduce damage to the slopes of that peak caused by presumably guided climbs. Relocation seems a wiser choice since mountaineering or climbing school in TM is discussed as a meeting place for climbers, p 8-169 and 70, and on p 8-172, 8-169 and 70, 8-172. I advocate for relocation to, say, the Wilderness Center, location 15 on the plan map shown in Table 7-11 page 7-97, or near the Cathedral Lakes trailhead, map location number 6, if the concessionaire wishes to continue the service in or near the W&S zone because it has little environmental impact while promoting dispersed recreation. Climbing is an

7, RWH important recreation in the park, as noted in Appendix G, p G-5, which notes 1.3% of visitors to YNP have climbing as their primary activity compared to 4.0% listing camping in developed campgrounds in Tuolumne Meadows as their primary activity. I'm biased because I did a little climbing in Yosemite Valley many years ago and earlier hired a guide on Thunder Bolt peak.

? Text correction footnote: A footnote on p 1-5 or 1-4 in the law section is needed to say the Tuolumne River was codified as number 53 because by the time the California Wilderness Bill was enactment on September 28, 1984 number 52 had been taken, reference: 16 U.S.C. 1274 Chapter 28.

? Fencing is discussed for Alternative 4 on p 8-77, as necessary to stop social trails or to keep deer from eating young willow. I would prefer cedar rail fencing such as that used along paved trails in YV rather than hog-wire on steel posts that would be an ugly way of steering folks away from social trail areas. For me, cedar fence would be more acceptable along designated paths rather than boardwalks in dry areas. The need for planting willow and fencing them to reduce deer damage is well explained in Appendix H, p H-10, figure 1.1 showing bank erosion that I have seen myself on a walking tour years ago to problem areas led by Kristina Rylands, p 2-5. Appendix H well explains the need and methods for restoration of many damaged area of TM, but don't use orange fencing. Could loss of some willows be a result of the 1997 New Year flood?

? Text revision requested on page 8-21 in the EIS Hydrology section. In the second sentence, instead of beginning with "The Dana Fork?" I request reversing the order of the source peaks to read: Mount Lyell at 13,114 ft-foot elevation (reference: Merced Peak USGS 15' topo 1953, a later map is available) is the highest peak in Yosemite (Wikipedia) with Lyell Glacier on its north face. Lyell Fork flow appears from under the glacier at about 11,500 -foot elevation. Lyell Fork contributes the larger runoff of the two sources tributaries, contributing 60% while Dana Fork 40%. Dana Fork draining the west-facing slopes of 13,057-foot high Mount Dana (reference: Mt Dana USGS 7.5' topo 1994) is the other source tributary. The confluence of these two forks form the main stem just upstream from the highway bridge in the center of the Tuolumne Meadows complex of meadows. The Tuolumne River continues? I make this request since text falsely gives the impression that Mt Dana is the primary source of T W&S R. However, Mt Lyell, the higher peak, and because I have seen a stream flowing across the glacier at ca 12,200-foot elevation before disappearing beneath the ice, and Lyell Fork contributes the larger annual flow of the two source watersheds, p 8-21 and 22. Also, when I initially drafted these first 22 words of what later was enacted into the Wild and Scenic Act, I only included Lyell Fork as the source, but a few days later I added Dana Fork because it is an important source of runoff, also comes from a high peak and watershed, and the massive mountain is visible from the central part of Tuolumne Meadows visited by most folks, as illustrated in the photos on page 2-5 and 3-2 and Appendix J, p J-5 and J-8. I had hiked through Parker Pass meadow and climbed both peaks 12 years or more before drafting the initial study act language in 1973 so I had a memory of their beauty, streams and size. The alphabetical order in which the two names appear in the act, page 1-4, is not the most important thing about these two forks. Those words in the Act relating to Mt Lyell and Mt Dana are there because I felt these source tributaries and main stem in the park were not getting the attention from park managers that they deserve, as this thick text now indicates.

8, RWH ? Other text revisions and comments of lesser importance, because repetition is not complete, if needed at all, because the reader is left wondering which goal is going to be the legal rule. Among historic buildings listed in Figure 8-11 p 8-273, I do not see reference to the stone ranger station on the south side of Tioga Road between the present store and river. I believe it now serves as the campsite registration office noted in Appendix K, p K-11 and in photo 13, p K-18. It is significant to me because it was my first contact with a Tuolumne Meadows park ranger ca 1958. I also faintly remember phoning a ranger there and being patched through to Tuolumne Meadows number 9. Perhaps you are listing this building as "Contact station (3005)", p 8-278, or as "campground office", p 7-92, but is not evident the building I'm referring to will be honored or retained.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Photo numbering is confusing to me in appendix K, p K-19. Could those four photos be corrected?

"[R]ecreational use would be retained", p 8-3, which has a useful discussion, but it could be expanded for the Wilderness area of Parker Pass Creek basin and Dana Meadow by relocating the domestic water intake away from Dana Fork which could lead to adding wilderness permit capacity at up to seven lakes there.

Relocation of diesel fuel tank is discussed in Alternate 4 on p 7-108 and a number of other places. Are all NPS and concessionaire vehicles diesel powered or will some need gasoline storage too? Diesel tank only was referenced on p 7-94. Fuel tank is to be removed, p 8-43. I suggest relocated since NPS vehicles will need fuel of whatever kind.

Adding a potable water tank at Gaylor Pit is proposed on p 7-97. If so, also add that for Alternate 4 on p 7-94.

Add overnight parking for NPS employees at Gaylor Pit in Alternate 4 on p 7-94 if there is to be housing there.

Removal of riprap from the campground and relocation of campsites away from Lyell Fork is good, p 5-89.

Please repair a typo on p 3-3 which says "the headwaters of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir for this segment" because to me a "headwaters" means all the way to Mt Lyell and Mt Dana. I suggest changing "headwaters" to "head of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir".

I'm disappointed that flush toilets are not included at Lembert Dome parking/picnic and about to become a shuttle bus stop as was discussed at length in earlier interactions of this plan.

Figures in Chapter 5 are excellent.

Stock is discussed p 5-31. I rented a burro for packing in during August 1988. I suggest that the concessionaire give green horns a short course on burro management at the rental corral. That animal I rented acted as if he had never before seen the small at Ireland Creek or a wooden bridge. Or, he was smarter than we greenhorns.

A day use limit of "12 people at one time" below O'Shaughnessy Dam, p 7-91, i.e. at Poopenaut trailhead, seems too restrictive for that area since a kayak trip of 8 people might move through that valley quickly and would leave a severely limited knapsack group wanting to use that area. Don't limit your thinking to the small parking area for Poopenaut Valley because kayakers stage shuttle car(s) at different locations to fit parking space and need. I was assured at the Yosemite Valley meeting by Mike Yochim that many cars can now park overnight at the "day use" parking area close by the O'S Dam. I request a limit be increased to 16 people per 9, RWH day for backpackers with Wilderness permits in the area downstream from the dam.

Concerning the negative aspects of wood smoke, p 8-43; at low concentrations and for a short time, many people treasure the smell of a campfire. I am one.

Wildflowers are mentioned at p 8-152. I remember them and also seeing a poisonous, red amanita mushroom beside the John Muir Trail in Lyell Canyon in August 1988, the only time I have seen this species in the wild.

In River values, p 5-48 forward, discussing Cultural ORV "The rich archeological landscape" is all good, but doesn't recognize the historical miners for whom the Great Sierra Wagon Road was constructed. Some of the miner and road builder's broken tools may have been left as evidence of their presence. If so, recognize that those artifacts are part of our recent human heritage. Likewise do so for the Buffalo Soldiers who repeatedly pushed herdsman out of Tuolumne Meadows after establishment of the park. As I remember they had a camp in Tuolumne Meadows.

This line below and any others are an artifact of my Vista Operating System, or an indication of my inability to use it.

An error is found in Appendix G, p G-7, which should say Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River designation was, as you know, in 1984 instead of the printed date of 1979, which was the date of the Final Study Report and EIS.

Correction of text in Appendix M at page M-16 that says SFPUC Water System Improvement Program states diversion of 265 mgd from the TR at Hetch Hetchy by 2018. Actually, after heavy pressure from the Tuolumne River Trust and other groups, the final revised plan released ca October 15 and revised slightly upward in late Oct 2008 was approved by the Planning Commission and the SFPUC has a goal of 223 mgd from the TR as a five year running average by 2018. The number 265 mgd includes the average of 15% of total supply coming from Bay Area watersheds. I have documentation and personal notes from the two agency meetings that adopted that goal of 223 mgd, should you wish to see them. Please make this correction.

In Appendix I, page 1, a view SW from Soda Springs and GSWR with several peaks in view. Why is Cathedral Peak and the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

bridge not included? Is it that I am biased toward these features by my own use of that area? Why is the Soda Springs enclosure never shown since it is such an important place to American Indians as well as to conservationists?

The text in Appendix J beside Figure J-3 indicates the pond in the foreground is "the meandering Tuolumne River". Is this true, or is this Dana Fork? Also, in Appendix J, p J-4, after some of the trees are removed, would it be appropriate to add a interpretive sign saying, high up between the two peaks is the source of the Dana Fork of T W&S R that flows through the pond at your feet, etc? Likewise, at p. J-5, the same sign could be placed for explaining that Dana Fork is one source of T W&S R. Would the signs alone raise the VRA score?

In Appendix J, p J-8, Little Blue Slide, I suggest an interpretative sign calling attention to Mt Lyell and/or Lyell Fork as a source of the TW&SR. I have never been certain I could see Mt Lyell from this spot.

Again my bias may keep me from seeing the scene shown in Appendix J Figure J-12 because from that location I see through the trees (some to soon be removed) to the GSWR, bridge and Soda Springs beyond.

Appendix M, Tioga Road Rehab project is wasteful to repave the road in TM before the culvert replacement work is done which likely will require surface paving patching thereafter. 10, RWH

There is a date error in Appendix O, p O-5 paragraph 1, and many other places in the entire three volumes that state public review of these documents began in 2012, whereas, as you know, it began in 2013. The correct year on the front and back covers and at the end of the appendices partly corrects the error.

Pate Valley is not mentioned in Chapter 5 and elsewhere only in the Archeology Appendix. I ask that this glacially created valley about three miles long at 4300-foot elevation may have interesting biological for it is in between the lower, wetter Poopenaut Valley and the higher subalpine Tuolumne Meadows. It is not a destination for hikers, but a resting place before climbs to higher places. I ask that subsequent studies be done to make the comparison between its two neighboring valleys to see the impact of elevation difference.

In any supplement to this CMP and EIS, could staff please include a brief explanation of the level, equipment and chemicals used in treating sewage at the present waste treatment plant in TM at location 7 on figure 7-97? Also tell the technical details of the expected improvement in the waste treatment processes and equipment to be added.

I'm disappointed the reception/dining hall/kitchen at the lodge are not considered for relocation, say, 50 feet farther north from the Dana Fork.

Sound of (noise to me) from Harley motorcycles is disturbing because they are loud and their sound carries far across the meadows as they pass along Tioga Road. I wish they could be offered quiet passage through the park, say in an open bus that accommodated their bikes, complete with narration on all the points of interest they pass so they can see without the necessity of driving. This suggestion needs park-wide study and consultation with all motorcycle riders. I ask that you add this to a priority study list.

I know that this plan can do nothing about high altitude aircraft noise, p 8-128, but I recommend the Superintendent, Regional Director or national director of the Park Service write the FAA, say every five years, asking that if and when airline routes heading toward the Bay Area are changed, that consideration be given to avoiding passing over YNP. I see and hear those flights passing fairly near my home at a frequency of roughly one every four minutes in the evening. They are no problem to me at home because I do not sleep under the stars nor or expect solitude here. Also, photographers in YNP often grumble about the condensation trails intruding on photographic scenes. I understand that DOD, to their credit, no longer sends low level practice flights over the park.

It has been a pleasure to work with YNP staff and thank you for considering my comments.

11, RWH

Correspondence ID:	305	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 13:15:35				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please let's get rid of the pack animals and tent camps at places like Vogel song. If this sort of thing is causing pollution it should just be banned. There is no need to have domesticated animals, "modern civilization", pollution and garbage in places where wild animals have their last refuge. For disabled persons, trips supported by pack animals could be allowed provided there are no shelter or bathroom facilities left in place and manure catchers be required for each pack animal. Thanks for your hard work,				

[REDACTED]

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 306 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 13:26:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir,

I sent the following letter on Sept. 27, 2012 to Mr. Don Neubacher, Superintendent, Yosemite National Park. The letter speaks for itself. My wife and I understand the need to protect our national parks from overuse. At the same time, we believe that there is a need to provide for reasonable access: Of what use is Eden if no one can go there. Accordingly, we oppose the reduction in capacity of the Glen Aulin Camp.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Mr. Don Neubacher, Superintendent Sept. 27, 2012 Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

cc ? Mr. Jay Vincent

Dear Mr. Neubacher,

We have learned that plans are under consideration to "reduce the human footprint" in the Yosemite back country. These plans could lead to the closure or reduction in capacity of one or more of the High Sierra Camps. We are opposed to such closures and reductions. We support reasonable efforts to protect the environment. But those efforts must be balanced against equally reasonable provision for continued human access, particularly for those who are no longer young.

We are a case in point. Last August, we hiked the forty-nine miles of the High Sierra Loop, visiting all five camps. It was the adventure of a lifetime. Our day packs, including liquids, weighed about 20 pounds, modest in size for someone under fifty, as once we were. But today we range in age from 64 to 70. Packs of this size are near our limit. Were it not for the camps, we could not have made the trip.

We support reasonable efforts to minimize the camps' impact on the environment. Composting toilets should replace flush toilets. Shower facilities should be reserved for staff use only. Laundry facilities should also be set aside for staff use, or they could be eliminated entirely, with dirty laundry packed out for washing.

The camps are unique. Their like does not exist elsewhere in the Sierra or in the National Park System. A vast region-from Tioga Road to Whitney Portal-is available for traditional backpackers, the young and fit. We ask that this one small region, the High Sierra Loop and the five High Sierra Camps, remain open and accessible for the rest of us.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 307 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 13:29:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Your extensive efforts in preparing this three-volume Draft Comprehensive Management Plan for the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River is impressive. Thank-you for making it available for public comment.

1. With so large a document, I feel that 90-day public comment period would be more appropriate than a 60-day public comment period. Please consider extending the comment period by 30 days or re-opening the comment period for an additional 30 days.

2. I am pleased that the issue of appropriate level of permissible stock use that was raised during scoping was mentioned on page 2-8 and was taken into consideration. In particular, I support the elimination of commercial stock use in the subject areas,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

or at a minimum, its substantial reduction.

3. Alternatives 3 and 4 provide for a reduction in the use level of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (HSC), but there does not appear to be a commensurate reduction in Concessionaire Administrative Capacity. Please explain why Concessionaire Administrative Capacity is not effected or take the reduction of the needed staffing into account.

4. An encounter (with other parties) rate per hour is used as a metric for achieving certain goals such as along the Wild Segments of the subject river. My experience hiking in Tuolumne Meadows dozens of times is that an encounter with a party which includes stock has a much, much greater impact on my recreational and wilderness experience than a party without stock. I strongly recommend that an encounter with a party with stock be counted as five times the impact and effect as an encounter with a party without stock.

5. Further, parties with stock have further degraded my recreational and wilderness experiences in Tuolumne Meadows along Tuolumne River to a much greater degree than parties without stock by what parties with stock leave behind: horse manure, the ensuing flies, the stench of horse urine on the trails, the pulverization of trail beds far beyond non-stock parties, the greater trampling of meadows, and the greater contamination of the Tuolumne River. Please use greater weighting of parties with stock in the impact to the subject area.

6. On page 5-81, Water Quality Management Indicators and Monitoring Program, implies that people are more likely the greater impact on water quality when it states, "Nutrient levels ..., Escherichia coli (E. coli), and hydrocarbons are appropriate indicators for monitoring water quality because their levels can be tied to human activities and human contact with water." At the top of the page, you consider a microbial water quality study by Atwill et al. in 2008 on the Tuolumne River watershed that considered the potential risk of surface water contamination by pack stock. Please also incorporate into the document the fact that scientists from the UC Davis Medical School published studies in 2006 and 2008 that document high concentrations of bacteria in (among other waters) the Tuolumne River, and concluded that "pack animals are most likely the source of coliform pollution." Other sections of your report also allude to water quality degradation by stock such as new requirements on handling their fecal matter. Please incorporate into your report a more balanced identification that stock is a major cause of water quality issues.

7. Further improvement to both the recreational and the wilderness experience can be obtained by requiring manure catchers for all stock animals in the subject area. This would be particularly helpful on the trail to Glen Aulin HSC. At a minimum, start with requiring manure catchers on stock animals of the pack trains supplying Glen Aulin HSC. Please add manure catcher requirements.

8. Of the alternatives proposed, I assess that Action Alternative 4 has the most to recommend it, including concessionaire stock day rides into wilderness would be discontinued, commercial use would be restricted, and capacity at Glen Aulin HSC would be reduced. I recommend it over the other alternatives.

9. The updates to Glen Aulin HSC outlined in Alternative 4 are good: removal of flush toilets, secession of wood stove firewood burning, and discontinuation of meals-only service.

10. Increased day use that is being experienced in teh subject area was discussed in the document. I would recommend building (where possible) additional trails that provide and invite loop hiking, particularly for the proposed interpretive and educational programs. If numbered stations are indicated to hikers, and they generally proceed along the loop hike in the same direction, encounters with other parties is substantially reduced for a given level of parties on the trails.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	308	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 13:46:16				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Last summer I took my son (who was 9) on a 7 day hike in Yosemite. It was a very special event, as we left his little brother and Dad behind. We used the High Sierra Camps as our tents.				

Coming from Washington State, this vacation was an enormous undertaking. There is no way we could have accomplished this hike without the High Sierra Camps. When I heard that this kind of experience was being reconsidered, it was so shocking.

My son, [REDACTED] was transformed by his accomplishment. He wrote a book about it and he uses his hike as a touchstone this year. A bench mark for any challenge he is facing in school. "Well, if I can hike 35 miles, then I can do ..." We should be offering this experience to as many people as want to have it! Not limiting it.

It is very natural for people who live and work in the Park to see what could be better or different. Especially if you study it and think real hard, and follow an environmentally friendly life. But the rest of us don't live like that. We get to have peak

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

experiences on shortened time frames. If you close those opportunities off for us, we will all have to go to Disneyland. Kids won't know what silence is, because they will have never gone to park and been outside at night.

It feels very elitist to me that you would consider limiting what is already there. Taking away what already feels like a very finite amount. Tuolumne Meadows Lodge is such an amazing adventure, and it is an opportunity for people to see nature in a way they can manage. You don't have to be fit, or shop at REI - you can just go and feel nature without having to change your whole way of being. This is the best way to get people motivated. If they never see the park, if they never experience the park, why would they protect the park? Why would they want to pay taxes to the park? As our government argues over resources, it would be a shame if people started to question the notion of the Park Service. Maybe they think, "I have never seen nature, or used nature, why do I care if we pay for nature". It is important to provide as many ways and places for people to get out into nature as they possibly can.

A long time ago, I worked for YCSC / DNC. For 8 years (off and on) I worked in the Valley. During this time, it was such a pleasure to see families getting out of their comfort zone. They would marvel over a squirrel (which I considered a pest). To see them take pictures of wildflowers. And it occurred to me on my weekends how few people I saw. Only about 6% of the park is paved? Is that about right? That seems a small sacrifice to me. Let's just give the masses 6% of the park. Let them see the Valley, Tuolumne Meadows, Tenaya Lake - all these beautiful, life affirming things. Encourage them to love the park and therefore become tax paying stewards of the park. It is only good sense to let the people who pay for the park to see the park.

I don't think the High Sierra Camps are a hardship on the environment. In reality, it is a very small group of humans. They turned Aidan into an environmentally conscious kid. He now advocates and helps with the composting in his classroom. In my opinion, that is a long term benefit for the planet. A net win for human impact.

Please consider not changing any of the available campsites, lodging, day use permits and wilderness permits. Please don't limit this experience to an elite few. Please make as much space as useable as possible for as many people. This is how we spread the word about our beautiful planet. This is how we create citizens who will make small changes in their lives to help us all. This is how we gain voter support for longer term gains.

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	309	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 14:05:59				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	18 March 2013				

Dear Tuolumne Planning Team:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan DEIS. The Tuolumne River is the heart of Yosemite's high country, with a rich history and a vibrant present. The effort you have put into protecting it is clear.

The actions common to Alternatives 1-4 include thoughtful, workable means of restoring the river environment and the river's free-flowing condition; enhancing water quality; protecting viewsheds; reducing negative impacts from stock (also mentioned in Alternative 4); and protecting archeological sites. These actions demonstrate a strong intent to protect the river and make it accessible to visitors in current and future generations.

Given this strong intent, some parts of the preferred alternative are of concern. In support of your work to protect the Tuolumne and enhance visitor experiences, I offer comments for your consideration.

Alternative 4 concept: The concept seeks to balance traditional Tuolumne experiences with reduced development and with sustainability, while introducing short-term visitors to the river in a meaningful way. Several actions in Alternative 4 seem in opposition to these worthy goals. For example, Alternative 4 calls for new development and increased visitor and employee use, which could conflict with these goals and with the overarching aim of protecting the river. Some of Alternative 4's actions seem strongly supportive of park operations, with less clear focus on visitor connection and other goals. For example, visitor contact is central to Alternative 4's goals. But VC functions will be shifted to a small contact station, while the large, historic visitor center will be used for office space, though the need for that space is not explicitly linked to plan goals. In addition, 59 new employee beds are called for, while the number of overnight visitor slots remains the same. The reasons for these kinds of choices are not clearly explained.

User and Employee Capacity: Given the goals of the TRP and this alternative, day-use capacity for visitors and overnight capacity for employees seem higher than warranted. Day-use visitor numbers are based on 2011, a high visitation year. In addition, day use is increased (pg. 7-91), and designated parking spaces are added to the Tuolumne area, without explanation for

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

the reasoning behind these decisions.

To support the aims of river protection, visitor enjoyment, reduced development and sustainability, setting the visitor-capacity baseline at some percentage of 2011 numbers (85%, for example) might be more effective. Holding parking spaces at current numbers, rather than increasing them, would also support these goals.

If visitor numbers are held steady or reduced, employee housing numbers could also remain steady. This would enhance sustainability, reduce the need for the employee bunkhouse and other new housing, and reduce other impacts on the river. These impacts include increased water consumption for employee use; on page 7-90, this increased use is linked to enhanced free flow of the river, an apparent contradiction.

Managing Visitor Use: Managing visitor flow through Tuolumne poses real challenges. The plan accepts and addresses these directly, a useful step.

Other factors may need to be taken into account for visitor capacity. For example, Tuolumne campground (CG) capacity is set at 304 sites with six people each; however, Yosemite campsites are often used by extended families with many more than six members. Enforcing site limits is extremely difficult, so actual use exceeds predicted capacity at busy times. How can these numbers be aligned? One possibility: the number of CG sites could be decreased slightly, and some sites could be given a higher visitor limit (e.g. 10, rather than six). A related note on sustainability: water use for the Tuolumne CG is set at 100 gallons/site. What is the reason for such high use? Would education or repairs help resolve this?

Alternative 4 suggests that limiting parking will limit visitor capacity. But visitors and employees in Tuolumne have historically found creative ways to park in order to be in the area, so this approach seems unlikely to work. Are there other options? Also, enforcing "no parking" in the new roadside pullouts could be very difficult, especially on days when parking is scarce.

Putting fencing along trails (e.g. from Tioga Road to Parsons Lodge) would aid meadow recovery; it would also change the character of the meadow. Are there other effective options?

Visitor Contact/Interpretation: Deciding where to place a contact station or visitor center is a difficult trade-off in Tuolumne. If placed at the store, the station would fit with natural visitor flow, but encourage use of a social trail through the fragile meadow (to Soda Springs), sending the wrong message about river and meadow protection. This siting would also require a larger, more obtrusive parking area. If the station is placed at the proposed site, it allows interpreters to educate visitors at the meadow's edge, but it may not reach as many people. The proposed site seems very small to accommodate a contact station, parking, a picnic area, and presumably, a restroom.

Another possibility to consider: create a visitor center at the site of the gas station. Parking could be positioned behind the center (and out of the wetlands). Interpretive exhibits near the use trail, and at the proposed contact station site, could focus on meadow restoration in support of river protection goals.

A related note: There is already a campground connector in the B loop. Is there a need for another one?

Site east of Pothole Dome: Because people are naturally drawn onto the open meadow, placing a picnic area along the meadow east of Pothole Dome (or anywhere on the meadow's edge) would encourage people to walk, take their dogs, or bike on the meadow. This undermines the goal of protecting the river and its environment, and of long-term visitor enjoyment.

Hiking trail along the road: A trail along the road would likely have similar effects on meadow health as the picnic area mentioned above. In addition, it would create a safety hazard as people crossed the road at random points. Such a trail would likely not be heavily used (because many visitors would rather use their hiking time in Wilderness). Omitting it would be more in line with Alternative 4's stated goals.

Sustainability: Since sustainability is called out as a key feature of Alternative 4, explicitly including it in alternative actions would support this goal. Adding public transportation, as mentioned, moves in this direction. In addition, new buildings and facilities of all kinds ought to be designed with sustainability in mind, as a model to the public and other NPS sites. Along these lines, adding hard-sided buildings in a seasonal-use area does not seem in line with the goals of sustainability and reduced development.

Glen Aulin: Some of the Glen Aulin passages are unclear. For example, why aren't employee toilets also composting, rather than flush? Day-use increases in Alternative 4, so why would it decrease at Glen Aulin (as mentioned on page 7-88)?

Once again, thank you for all your efforts to care for the Tuolumne River and Tuolumne Meadows, and to create this plan. I

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

hope that these comments are useful to you. Feel free to contact me with any questions about them.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	310	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	[REDACTED]	Unaffiliated Individual			
Received:	Mar,18,2013 14:15:52				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear Sir/Madam				

I am writing to comment on the NPS's draft plan for the Tuolumne River that proposes to retain both of the Tuolumne-area backcountry "High Sierra Camps" (at Glen Aulin & Vogelsang).

In 1984 Congress passed the California Wilderness Act which designated the commercial High Sierra Camps (HSCs) as "potential wilderness additions." Congress directed NPS to closely monitor conditions at the camps, and to remove them if impacts at the camps (or surrounding areas) became apparent. The NPS and its concessioner, who is determined to retain these lucrative commercial ventures---never conducted the monitoring requested by Congress and have continually covered up the problems (such as sewage leaks, water pollution, trail damage, etc.).

In reviewing this plan it appears to do little to address the damage and pollution caused by these commercial camps and the numerous pack trains that supply them. Basically, business as usual.

I am writing to request that would like to see these commercial camps removed, the sites restored, and the areas designated as wilderness.

My request is motivated by water quality testing conducted by Mr. Tom Suk, a back country ranger working in conjunction with the USGS found high concentrations of giardia in the waters downstream of the HSCs. These findings were confirmed by scientists from the UC Davis Medical School published studies in 2006 and 2008 that document high concentrations of bacteria and other pollution in Yosemite's waters, including the Tuolumne River, and concluded that "pack animals are most likely the source of coliform pollution." Many if not most of the pack animals in the Tuolumne area are used for the constant pack trains which supply the HSCs with luxury foods and other unnecessary suburban comforts to the wilderness.

My personal hiking experience has been negatively affected by the numerous pack trains that supply unnecessary comforts & luxuries to the commercial High Sierra Camps. What hiker anticipating a wilderness experience would want to breathe pulverized dust mixed with manure particles, while side-stepping manure every ten feet along the trail, whilst enduring biting flies, knowing that the water we drink in the Yosemite back country is polluted by the manure of stock animals? The HSC operation and governance fly in the face of the entire intent of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Elimination of the HSCs, and restoration of the sites would significantly reduce number of commercial pack trains. Requiring manure catchers on all commercial pack trains, such has been standard practice at Grand Canyon National Park, and has been successful in keeping manure off of trails. It is time to start treating wilderness, as wilderness.

The HSCs should keep the number of pack animals to the absolute minimum by serving only the minimum necessary food and lodging services required by removal and restoration crews.

The NPS's governance changed after the Wilderness Act of 1964, when the famed "Fire Falls" pushed off of Glacier Point were discontinued, although the rock remains discolored. Forty nine years later it is time to retire the HSCs, reduce the fecal pollution on wilderness trails, and restore the site to pre-project conditions.

Thank you for your time and attention to my humble request.

Sincerely Yours,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	311	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	individual hiker Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 14:37:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence: The plan looks ok except for the reduced capacity at Glen Aulin. People like to do guided or unguided loop hikes through all of the High Sierra Camps. Having such low capacity at one camp would create a bottleneck, allowing fewer people to do the whole 7 day loop.

There is already a lottery for this marvelous trip. Please don't reduce access to this wonderful experience. It was probably my favorite Yosemite trip of my life (of many, many, various trips to the park). The whole seven day loop would be affected by this one bottleneck.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	312	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	The Access Fund Recreational Groups				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	18 March 2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Planning PO Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Re: Access Fund Comments to Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management TRP/Tuolumne Meadows TRP and EIS

Yosemite Planning Team

The Access Fund welcomes the opportunity to submit these comments to the National Park Service's (NPS) Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan/Tuolumne Meadows Plan and EIS (Draft TRP). We provide these comments to help Yosemite National Park (YNP) to refine planning alternatives for the Draft Tuolumne River TRP. These comments are provided in addition to the scoping comments we submitted in 2006.[1]

The Access Fund

The Access Fund is the only national advocacy organization whose mission is to keep climbing areas open and conserve the climbing environment. We are a 501(c)(3) non-profit supporting and representing over 2.3 million climbers nationwide in all forms of climbing-rock climbing, ice climbing, mountaineering, and bouldering. The Access Fund is the largest US climbing organization, with over 15,000 members and affiliates. California is our largest member state, and Access Fund members across the country regularly travel to Yosemite's Tuolumne Meadows to climb at this world-class destination. The Access Fund has a long history of participation in Yosemite National Park management initiatives, and we welcome this additional opportunity to participate in the development of TRP alternatives.

COMMENTS

The Access Fund supports the Preferred Alternative[2] in the Draft TRP with the following modifications.

I. The Preferred Alternative Should Include More Campsites

We support the proposal in Alternative 2 to add 41 walk-in sites to the main Tuolumne Meadows Campground, and we ask you to incorporate this into the final TRP.[3] We also recommend the area west of Unicorn Creek (and immediately west of the campground) as the location for these sites or further walk-in sites, with parking in the level area near the road and campsites in the higher area above. The Preferred Alternative calls for locating the visitor contact station, a picnic area, and 80 parking spaces in this area.[4] But as noted in Alternative 2, the visitor center function could be located in the commercial core area, and the parking could be located at the current concession stables, which in turn could be moved to the area east of Budd Creek. The picnic area could be sited on the north side of the highway, similar to the picnic area proposed for the north side of the road east of Pothole Dome. These changes would make it possible to use the area west of the campground for more campsites.

Increasing the number of campsites is consistent with the 1980 Yosemite Park General Management Plan ("the GMP"). The GMP proposed to maintain 400 sites in the Tuolumne Meadows Campground and add 50 new walk-in sites there, for a total of 450 sites.[5] By contrast there are only 311 sites in the campground now, and the Draft TRP's proposed Alternative 4 would not add any. Given that there is a shortfall from GMP numbers of about 1000 campsites in the park overall including nearly 340 fewer campsites in the Highway 120 corridor above Crane Flat,[6] adding 41 walk-ins at the Tuolumne Meadows Campground

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

is an appropriate and long overdue development.

Currently, the summer demand for campsites far exceeds supply in both the Tuolumne Meadows area and the park as a whole.[7] Obtaining camping reservations is very difficult, and the first come, first-served approach is ineffective visitors, especially families, hoping to find a campsite on a summer weekend. Preferred Alternative 4 accommodates peak season day use while doing nothing to increase the number of campsites in the Tuolumne Meadows corridor. We think this is unbalanced and the TRP should do more to accommodate overnight use by increasing the number of campsites.

We strongly support the development of walk-in sites, which can be smaller and more space efficient than drive-in sites, since parking is clustered, and would allow the replacement of sites eliminated by the removal of sites in Loop A and the additional 41 sites in Alternative 2 into a relatively small area. Walk-in sites reduce the influence of automobiles on the camping experience. Walk-in campsites also allow some self-segregation of campers because they are likely to be more attractive to active and experienced campers, and less desirable for families and less experienced campers.

National Park Service Policies Support an Emphasis on Providing Camping Opportunities

Providing camping opportunities furthers important park management policies[8] and enhances the role of the parks as a unifying element in American society in a variety of ways. Camping is also an activity that brings visitors into a direct association with park resources. First, camping is a form of recreation, in which the camper has to carry and manage his own shelter, food, warmth and protection from wildlife, insects, and the elements. Camping brings the visitor into a direct relationship with park resources, and distances the visitor from the commercial values of comfort, convenience and consumption. Camping brings the visitor closer to nature, the simple necessities of daily life, and the way people lived in the past. Staying in developed accommodations, by contrast, where these services are provided to the visitor, is a form of leisure that distances the visitor from park resources.

Second, camping is democratic. In campgrounds, social distinctions account for little, and camping has the potential to bring people together in shared appreciation of their natural surroundings in a manner that reduces social barriers. The nation's great parks present an opportunity to be a force for social equality, much like our public schools and the military. Third, camping is inherently communal. Campers live in the open in close proximity to others and have to adapt their behavior to accommodate others' needs. Campers thus have an enhanced opportunity to associate with other people, develop new relationships, and broaden their social horizons through the camping experience. Camping also fosters the development of relationships within existing groups by bringing people together in simple and informal surroundings free of the consumer competition and hierarchical relationships of the greater society. This aspect of camping is recognized in YNP's Campground Study, which calls for more group sites and more closely-related "buddy" campsites.

National Park Service management policies that support visitor experiences with a "direct relation" to park resources suggests a natural hierarchy of overnight opportunities. Visitors' overnight experiences that foster the most direct relationship with park resources should be accorded the highest priority in park TRP planning, while those that foster the least direct relationship with park resources should be accorded the lowest priority. In considering visitors' overnight experiences, the TRP should prioritize backcountry camping first, including adequate backpacker campsites in the main campground, followed in order by walk-to and walk-in campsites,[9] drive-in campsites, rustic lodging like Tuolumne Lodge, and finally RV camping, which can offer the amenities of a small house.

Camping and Water Conservation

The Draft TRP explains that adding 41 campsites may impact water supply in low water periods, resulting in reduction of visitor services.[10] We understand this and believe that even if these sites only operate in good water periods, they are still worth adding. Also, most walk-in campers are comfortable with simply a drinking water spigot and vault or portable toilets, and the design of these campsites should consider these options for use in low water periods. Implementing the water conservation measures mentioned in the Draft TRP could also address much of the water supply concern. Consequently, the TRP should retain the flexibility to include additional campsites, even if only in conjunction with the redesign of the campground in such a way as to incorporate the water conservation measures necessary to ensure the viability of these additional campsites.

The Campground Redesign Should Increase Tent Sites and Reduce RV Sites

Recognizing that tent camping brings visitors into closer contact with park resources than RV use, park planners should increase the number of tent sites at the Tuolumne Meadows Campground and reduce RV sites while also concentrating them as much as possible.[11] This reconfiguration would reduce impacts on tent campers from RV generators and electric lights. Increasing this ratio towards more tent sites would also recognize that there are 255 campsites immediately east of the park in the Inyo National Forest, which are managed under a multiple use policy more suited to use by RVs.

Provide Two Lanes at the Campground Entrance

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Included in the direction for the redesigned campground entrance should be two entering lanes of traffic; one for those who have been assigned their sites and can drive directly in, and one for those who need to talk with kiosk staff. We also support the proposal in Alternatives 1 and 2 to reopen the western exit to the campground, which would reduce the number of vehicles having to traverse the entire campground to exit.

II. The Tuolumne River Plan Should Propose Actions to Manage Motorcycle Noise

The Draft TRP identifies aircraft and vehicle noise as the top two noise sources and the top two priorities for management action.[12] However, no management action is proposed which is a problem particularly regarding highly disruptive vehicle noise from motorcycles with altered mufflers. During the summer, motorcycles roar up from Yosemite Valley and through Tuolumne Meadows daily, with groups of up to 36 cyclists on holiday weekends that fill the road corridor with an inescapable ear-shattering noise that can be heard for miles into the wilderness. This noise not only exceeds NPS soundscape management standards and the requirements of the Wilderness Act and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, it also violates NPS regulations and the California Vehicle Code. Unfortunately, Yosemite National Park has made no effort to enforce the noise standards of any of these authorities against motorcycles with altered mufflers.

The Draft TRP measures noise impacts through inadequate metrics which are limited to geographic scope, intensity, duration, and type (i.e., beneficial or adverse).[13] Glaringly absent is any consideration of human nature and human noise sensibilities, which should be included in any noise impact analysis of the visitor experience. If YNP expanded their analysis to include the visitor experience perhaps planners would be more inclined to include at least one proposed action to address disruptive and illegal motorcycle noise in the park.

Research shows that noise is more disturbing (i.e., has a detrimental impact on performance and enjoyment and is rated as irritating) if it is loud, occurs in bursts at irregular intervals (is unpredictable), and is perceived as not being under the control of the listener. Moreover, annoyance over the noise is higher if it interferes with tasks (such as listening for natural sounds), if the perpetrator is perceived as unconcerned about the welfare of the listener, and if it [the noise] is perceived as unnecessary.[14] All six of these criteria apply to noise from motorcycles with altered mufflers.

Access Fund members know from personal experience that motorcycle noise interferes with climbing activity, including safety tasks. Many climbing routes in Tuolumne Meadows are close to the highway, and climbers routinely find it impossible to hear each other's climbing calls above the noise of vehicles, especially motorcycles with altered mufflers. For climbers, being able to hear and immediately respond to their partner's calls is critical to their safety. We have discussed the management of motorcycle noise with Yosemite's upper management and law enforcement staff, and it became clear to us that the park will not take any action to manage these noise sources without the authority provided by a management plan such as this TRP. By contrast, the park has not hesitated to cite climbers for using power drills in wilderness and for disturbing raptor nests during the breeding season. Nor does park enforcement staff have any hesitation to issue citations to people for violating dog, food storage, driving or any number of other regulations. In fact, the TRP contemplates enforcing parking regulations in Tuolumne Meadows against motorists who park outside designated spaces.

To correct this unacceptable situation, the TRP should propose the following management actions in the river corridor from Puppy Dome to the Tioga Pass entrance station. Most of these actions have already been adopted in parks elsewhere who are faced with a similar problem.[15] ? Encourage quiet and courteous motorcycle riding through education. ? Discourage use of modified exhausts on motorcycles that increase noise levels. ? Require groups of organized motorcycle riders to acquire a special use permit, and an application system for organized motorcycle riders should go through the appropriate NEPA analysis. ? Enforce 36 CFR 2.12(i) limiting vehicle noise to 60 decibels at 50 feet. ? Enforce 36 CFR 2.12(ii) prohibiting "unreasonable" noise, judged from the totality of circumstances. ? Issue "fix-it" tickets for modified mufflers, requiring documentation that a modified muffler has been replaced with a compliant one, as some CHP officers do.

III. The Commercial Core at Tuolumne Meadows Should Have Better Facilities for Socializing and Eating

Missing from the proposal for the commercial core in the Proposed Alternative is any mention of the important social functions this area serves. The store parking lot and adjacent tables and benches are favorite places for climbers, hikers and others to relax and socialize, exchange information, and check the bulletin board for information. The seating areas are crowded and heavily impacted, however, and confined by the bathroom building, causing some people to sit and eat in their cars and others to sit on the boulders across the road. The toilets occupy an area needed for seating. Reconfiguring the area around the store and grill to make it more inviting and more suited to the informal socializing that occurs there while reducing impacts on soils and plants should be a stated goal of the TRP, along with the actions that are proposed, including relocating the employee housing, expanding day parking, and upgrading the restroom. Please note we are not talking about building a new picnic area here, as proposed in Alternative 2, which presumably would be intended to attract visitors driving along the road and looking for a place to picnic and would require additional parking specific to picnicking. We realize there will be a subsequent project plan to address the physical changes here, but the TRP could include explicit guidance regarding improvement of the visitor experience for socializing in this area.

IV. The Lambert Dome Picnic Area Configuration Should be Improved

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Lembert Dome offers expansive views of Tuolumne Meadows and is a popular destination for climbers. The picnic area there is often used in the evening by climbers who enjoy cooking at the tables and watching the setting sun. The Access Fund supports the Proposed Alternative's proposals for expanding the picnic area,[16] as well as adding 21 parking spaces,[17] but we are concerned that the present facilities are too crowded together and the visitor experience here is not equal to the high quality surroundings. TRP planners should consider improving the location and spacing of facilities, particularly the additional parking spaces. The TRP should also provide explicit direction to subsequent site-specific plans to move the picnic facilities some distance away from the parking lot, toilets and trash bins.

V. The Tuolumne River Plan Needs a Better Discussion of Gaylor Pit and the Helipad

All the alternatives in the Draft TRP would retain the existing helipad at Gaylor Pit, and the Preferred Alternative calls for campsites accommodating 30 NPS employees at this location.[18] Gaylor Pit was considered as a possible location for visitor camping in the Yosemite Campground Study, which found that there was space for 22 walk-in campsites in addition to the helipad. However, that study recommended that emergency vehicle use of the road to the helipad precluded the use of the remainder of the site for visitor camping.[19] However, we believe that the TRP presents an opportunity to consider possible use of Gaylor Pit for visitor camping and alternative locations for the helipad.

In Yosemite Valley, the Park Service uses the Ahwahnee Meadows across from Church Bowl as a helipad; similarly, TRP planners should consider the meadow across the road from the Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Station, portions of the meadows alongside Highway 120, or perhaps some portion of the concessionaire stables site as an alternative helipad location in order to free up visitor camping at the Gaylor Pit area. The TRP should provide a meaningful discussion of the helipad use patterns, alternative helipad sites, and alternative uses of Gaylor Pit including camping.

VI. The Climbing School Should Be Retained

The Preferred Alternative calls for removing the mountaineering shop, climbing school, and gas station.[20] The Draft TRP notes that Lee Vining has alternative places to shop and purchase gas, but it fails to mention alternative locations to obtain climbing instruction or places to relocate the climbing school. We believe the climbing school should be retained in Tuolumne Meadows, though it could certainly be re-housed in a different building (perhaps in a tent cabin at the Tuolumne Lodge).

Yosemite is the nation's premier national park for climbing and is the consummate place to be introduced to the sport. The Draft TRP notes that the climbing school had about 350 students and 187 guiding clients in 2008, and presumably this has grown, like visitation, by about 15% in the intervening five years. Teaching climbing and guiding cannot simply be relegated to Yosemite Valley. Tuolumne Meadows has more rock formations suitable for teaching novices and training beginners, and is much less hot and crowded in the summer than Yosemite Valley. And three of the best formations for teaching climbing in the park are in the Tuolumne River management corridor: Pothole Dome, Puppy Dome, and Lembert Dome. Moreover, the Valley's primary teaching crag, Swan Slab, is crowded and the routes have become polished from heavy use, making them difficult for beginners. We oppose the removal of the climbing school from Tuolumne Meadows, and the TRP should more clearly state that the building that houses the mountaineering school will be removed but the school will be retained in a different location.

VII. Park Planners Should Consider Use of Porters to Supply the High Sierra Camps

The Appalachian Mountain Club supplies all their backcountry facilities using human porters, with occasional use of off-season helicopter flights. Yosemite should consider doing the same, with some use of stock for items too large or heavy for people to carry.[21] Using human porters in lieu of horses would have a number of benefits: it would greatly reduce the tremendous damage the stock use causes to the trails and the heavy maintenance burden it imposes on the park. It would eliminate the manure, dust and urine on the trails now caused by stock use. And it would bring more young people into the park to work and start a life-long relationship with Yosemite. We are confident that the concessionaire would have no trouble finding young people, including climbers, eager to do this work. The TRP should reflect some consideration of this concept, and at the very least, the next concession contract should evidence some discussion of the AMC porter model and how it might be applied in Yosemite.

VIII. The Tuolumne River Plan Should Encourage Transit Use by Overnight Visitors

The Draft TRP assumes that all transit use will be by day visitors,[22] and mentions a number of ways to encourage and increase transit use, including increasing the number and frequency of shuttle buses and the number of stops.[23] Another way to address transportation concerns involving the Tuolumne Meadows area would be to guarantee a campsite in the main campground, or provide a discount, to campers who arrive by transit and who provide the campsite office several days' advance notice of their expected arrival. This would show that the park was serious about accommodating people willing to rely entirely on transit in the park. It would also recognize that most campers can get reservations, and that these campers don't have the means to drive around to other campsites inside and outside the park looking for a place to camp when the main campground is full. This suggestion also ties in nicely with our proposal for more walk-in sites, which would be perfect for campers arriving by transit.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

* * *

The Access Fund hopes these comments assist Yosemite planners to identify planning solutions that are important to the climbing community. The Tuolumne River Plan provides an opportunity to appropriately protect and enhance the historic camping opportunities in the park, mitigate disruptive motorcycle noise, and improve both facilities and the visitor experience. The TRP should also consider ways to protect and enhance access to the scores of climbing areas that lie immediately outside of the planning area boundary. Thank you for considering the importance of Yosemite to climbers worldwide and for your hard work on this extensive planning process. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at pminault@earthlink.net.

Sincerely,

Access Fund Northern California Regional Coordinator

Cc: Yosemite Roundtable Group Outdoor Alliance Access Fund Regional Coordinator

[1] See http://www.accessfund.org/atf/cf/%7B1F5726D5-6646-4050-AA6EC275DF6CA8E3%7D/CA__Tuolumne_26_9.6.2006.pdf

[2] All references are to the TRP unless otherwise noted.

[3] See Draft TRP at 7-55, 7-62.

[4] See Draft TRP, map of Alternative 4 at 7-97, Table 7-16 at 7-109, Table 7-17 at 7-112.

[5] See 1980 Yosemite Park General Management Plan at 62-63.

[6] GMP at 1. The GMP calls for retaining 50 campsites at Tenaya Lake, expanding the Tamarack Flat and Porcupine Flat campgrounds from 50 to 75 sites each, the Yosemite Creek campground from 30 to 75 sites, and the White Wolf campground from 86 to 150 sites, for a total of 900 campsites along Highway 120 above Crane Flat. See GMP at 62-63. Today, the Tenaya Lake campground is gone, and instead of 900 campsites along the road, there are only 564, a shortfall of 336 sites. Yosemite National Park, Parkwide Campground Planning Study, A Study of the Potential for Expanded Opportunities for Camping in Yosemite National Park ("the Campground Study") A-24 (2002).

[7] Park plans often state that over the past several decades, day use visitation has increased relative to overnight visitation. See, e.g. P. 2-9. But park plans typically fail to acknowledge that the reason may simply be that facilities have existed to accommodate growing day use (notably undesignated parking), while overnight visitation is limited by the number of campsites and lodging units. This line of thinking has led, and will continue to lead, to reduced numbers of campsites in the park and a growing imbalance in the ability of the park to accommodate both day use and overnight visitors. Visitors like climbers, whose activities are poorly served by day use access exclusively, will continue to suffer under these policies.

[8] NPS management policy is to "encourage visitor activities that . . . promote enjoyment through a direct association with, interaction with, or relation to park resources." NPS Management Policies, 8.2 Visitor Use (2006).

[9] A walk-in campsite has been defined as one within 50 feet of parking, while a walk-to site is more than 50 feet from parking. See the Yosemite Campground Study at B-11.

[10] Id., at 5-87 - 5-91, 7-59.

[11] At present, the Tuolumne Meadows campground has 302 individual sites. The campground map shows that of these, 161 or more than half are RV sites, and 25 are walk-ins (for backpackers).

[12] See Draft TRP at 8-128.

[13] See Draft TRP at 8-130.

[14] Bell, Paul A, et. al, Aircraft Overflights at National Parks: Conflict and Its Potential Resolution, Park Science, 66, 67, Vol. 26(3) (Winter 2009-2010).

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

[15] See Zion National Park, Finding of No Significant Impact, Soundscape Management Plan 3-4 (2010).

[16] See Draft TRP at 7-93.

[17] See Draft TRP, Table 7-17 at 7-112.

[18] See Draft TRP at 7-94, Table 7-16 at 7-111.

[19] See Yosemite Campground Study at B-52.

[20] See Draft TRP, map of Alternative 4 at 7-97, Table 7-16 at 7-109.

[21] A mule can carry about 150 pounds; a human porter about 60 pounds.

[22] See Draft TRP 7-86.

[23] See Draft TRP at 7-91.

Correspondence ID:	313	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 15:05:41				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Comments on the draft environmental impact statement for the Tuolumne River Plan. March 18, 2013. Overall, the DEIS is an outstanding work by your staff. My number one requirement is not to mess things up. The preferred alternative appears precisely does that. I have been using Tuolumne Meadows for the last 65 years. Therefore, to me, the idea is fix what needs to be fixed, replace what needs to be replaced, and leave the rest alone.				

The no action alternative is not my first choice. There are things that need to be fixed such as the tunnel of cars along the highway by the Cathedral trailhead, the multiple stables, employee housing mixed with camping sites, and the water treatment plant to name a few. Meadow restoration is important as well.

In my opinion, the user levels currently at Tuolumne Meadows are about right. It would be very easy for Tuolumne Meadows to be completely overrun by visitors if there were more services and more facilities. However, I do not believe that the land, the roads, or the water supply could support this and it would further degrade the meadows.

The Preferred Alternative seems to be a good blend of the things that need to happen. The river values will be protected; there will be restoration of areas of the meadow that desperately need it and have for many years; stables will be combined; housing units for employees moved away from camping areas.

The idea of replacing the current visitor center is the right choice. The present building is difficult to access for people with disabilities and it is quite small. Replacing it with a larger, better-designed facility makes a great deal of sense.

The only item I would add to the Preferred Alternative plan is to provide a trail that has been hardened to allow children to ride bicycles. Presently, they only can ride in the campground or the highway.

I am delighted with the direction this plan is taking and with the overall Park Service conclusions as to what needs to be done for Tuolumne Meadows and the Tuolumne River preservation and user experience. Good work YNP planners.

Signed, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	314	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 15:29:08				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the National Park Service's preferred alternative, Alternative 4. I particular, I agree with retaining the existing (69) units at the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge, where my family I have stayed numerous times over the last 20+ years. I also agree with discontinuing stable (horse/mule) day rides at Tuolumne Meadows. I strongly support the restoration of 171 acres of meadow and riparian habitat and 2 acres of upland habitat, with 27 acres of disturbance for new construction or relocation of facilities. Finally, given how dangerous it is to run or walk along Tioga Road through the Tuolumne Meadows area, I strongly support the elimination of roadside parking and expansion of designated parking.				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 315 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Californians for Western Wilderness (CalUWild) Conservation/Preservation
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: March 18, 2013

Mr. Don Neubacher Superintendent Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577, Yosemite, CA 95389

via web: <http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=49369>

Comments by Californians for Western Wilderness on the Tuolumne River Plan Draft EIS

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

I am writing on behalf of the more than 800 members and supporters of Californians for Western Wilderness (CalUWild), an unincorporated citizens organization dedicated to encouraging and facilitating citizen participation in legislative and administrative actions affecting wilderness and other public lands in the West. Our members use and enjoy the public lands in California and all over the West.

We are pleased that the Park Service is undertaking a plan to protect the Tuolumne River Yosemite National Park in appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan Draft EIS.

We support the Park Service's choice of Alternative 4 as the "preferred" alternative.

We fully support discontinuing stock daytrips into wilderness areas. We recommend limiting their use in non-wilderness areas as well because of adverse impacts (manure, smell, flies) to trail conditions and potential water pollution. Concessionaires, the Park Service, and private pack stock users should be required to remove manure from trails by whatever feasible means. It's simply disgusting to hike the trails around Tuolumne Meadows and have to encounter those adverse impacts.

We support the removal of the gas station, both to cut down on commercial operations in Tuolumne Meadows and to reduce the potential for water pollution. Gas can be found just over Tioga Pass.

We strongly support relocation of wastewater treatment ponds (Item 4 on the maps) so as to help return the Meadows to as natural a condition as possible, and to concentrate the area in which development and operations are located.

With respect to the Campground, we support leaving a portion available as first-come-first-served rather than by reservation. We support keeping Loop A open, making it tent camping only (if it isn't already). But we support the realignment of the road and relocation of sensitive sites.

We support the reduction in overnight commercial use at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp.

The one drawback to Alt. 4 is the plan to increase user capacity, even if it is only a small increase over present use levels. The relative remoteness of Tuolumne Meadows and the River are among their most important values. The area has been becoming more and more crowded over the years. Though not a formal part of the Plan, the Park should take no steps to encourage visitation, and particularly should not promote Tuolumne as a "less-crowded" alternative to visiting Yosemite Valley. Visitors should be allowed to discover the Meadows and its surrounding areas on their own.

In the User Capacity Table on p. 6-20, the number of buses is listed as "2," but then in the calculation is listed as "8." Is this a typographical error?

In summary, except for the user capacity exception noted, we support the overall aim of the Park Service with respect to planning for the wild and scenic values of the Tuolumne River in the Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please inform us of your decision in this matter and please also inform us of further opportunities to be involved in your public decision-making processes.

Sincerely, [REDACTED] Coordinator

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 316 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 15:47:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The amount of stock use and waste on the Yosemite trails really detracts from enjoying the wilderness experience. There need to be limits and controls adopted to reduce the impact of commercial packtrains, such as requiring "manure catchers" on all commercial packtrains, or requiring commercial packstock outfits to send an employee along trails behind each packtrain to shovel manure off of trails. NPS should also require that the number of pack animals supplying the High Sierra Camps be reduced by prohibiting HSCs from providing unnecessary luxuries and comforts such as eliminating linens and heavy foods & beverage items.

Correspondence ID: 317 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 16:19:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Sirs,

The High Sierra camps at Glen Aulin and Vogelsang are not consistent with the intent of the Wilderness Act, with protecting the Yosemite high Sierra, and with the enjoyment of the majority of people who hike there.

For the pleasure of the few who can afford luxury trips to these camps, the area and I and the rest of visitors have to suffer the animal dust, the manure, and as the UC Davis studies have shown, the high concentrations of coliform bacteria in the water.

To allow these camps to continue to operate and to operate without the minimum of restrictions, such as limiting the need for numerous re-supply pack trips by requiring the use of freeze dried foods and normal camping with sleeping bags instead of bed linens, would make a fraud of the Tuolumne River Management Plan and of this process.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 318 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 16:21:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Tuolumne River is an iconic river in California and the west. I have hiked, backpacked, camped, picnicked, bird watched, bear watched, photographed, and otherwise hung out in Tuolumne Meadows, down the River past Reverse Creek, and attempted some peak-bagging as well.

The Tuolumne is a magical place that is in desperate need of restoration followed by much better protection than it has received in the past or even today. I found the trails to Glen Aulin and Voglesang to be in horrible shape, due to excessive use by horses and pack animals. Ugly, ugly , ugly. From damaged stream crossings to eroded banks, the impacts of animals and hoofs were prevalent throughout the trail system. The animal's fecal matter was completely disgusting, and the extensive amount of horse poop everywhere was shocking.

We filtered water everywhere, but what an awful idea to have to filter water when enjoying a beautiful national park! Even the rivers in the east are cleaning up, and the National Parks should be able to do better. We have reached a new era in our sharing of the West with the nation's huge population - its time to get rid of the horses. They represent a bygone era, and even cowboy movies aren't as prevalent as in the days of Randolph Scott.

And further, as to water pollution, recent studies have tied to many cases of dysentery and worse to fecal coliform deposited in our western rivers to ignore public health any longer. It is the duty of the National Park staff to take EVERY MEANS AVAILABLE to eliminate obvious public health hazards.

This EIS must provide accurate public health information regarding the daily quality of the water in the summer, and must recommend an alternative that requires removal of all sources managed by the Park Service through permits of fecal coliform in the Tuolumne River watershed in the Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Correspondence ID: 319 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: not affiliated Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 16:28:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The High Camps should remain open for generations to come. Stop taking away opportunities for discovering the challenge and

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

beauty fo the High Sierras. The stewardship and enjoyment of all can be managed by a private public partnership that benefits all of us. Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	320	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Rock Creek Pack Station, Inc. Business				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent of Yosemite National Park,				

Comment on the Tuolomne River Plan/Draft EIS:

The DEIS does not adequately describe the historical use of livestock and commercial pack stock in the Tuolumne River drainage. A proper environmental document would look at use levels and the resource condition over a sufficient period time. This document is flawed in that it does not present data from the 1960's through the present last few years.

Looking at data and use figures for 2010 or even a five year recent period is inadequate for an environmental document. If the preparers of this document presented the historical use data and grazing information, decision makers and the public could make an informed decision.

The Tuolomne River Plan/DEIS is inconsistent with the Wilderness Act in curtailing the historic pack stock use while at the same time increasing the amount of day and commercial hiking use. The proposals for allocating commercial use reflect a bias against commercial pack stock.

The Wilderness Act was designed so that the public could travel throughout the Sierra and enjoy wild and primitive backcountry experiences. Those that don't own their own livestock or choose to utilize a commercial packer will be denied the opportunity to enjoy their National Park.

Much of the DEIS addresses social issues. People complaining of horses, horse manure on the trail or seeing packers is not an environmental issue. This DEIS makes decisions based on social biases and concerns. It is using the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act language to do social engineering.

The alternatives listed in this document promote large amounts of day use, car traffic and new forms of wilderness recreation. Those that travel on a horse and mule and have their gear carried by pack mule should have equal rights to use this Tuolomne River Cooridor.

When Congress enacted the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act it was not their intent to use this legislation to enable an elitist anti-livestock group within the National Park Service to impose their will over appropriate wilderness use. The Wilderness Act was very clear on permitting existing wilderness use. The Wilderness Act proponents sat around a campfire with their gear packed by commercial packers to organize its passage in Congress.

The DEIS prepares a complicated system to allocate commercial use. Today, there are lots of limitations that prevent us from getting a pack trip on the trail. Why impose more restrictions?

This document attempts to judge and evaluate commercial use. Imposing restrictions on the number of mules per person, giving priority to a member of the public that is on a so called educational trip, assuming a group with less livestock per person should have greater access than a riding group, etc. are not necessary to protect the Tuolomne River.

The commercial pack stock business is about finished. The proposals outlined in the DEIS essentially eliminate the opportunity for the public to travel the John Muir Trail by horse or mule. The planners state the plan "reflects a collaborative approach with all stakeholders".

I have conducted pack trips in Yosemite National Park since the 1970's. No one from Yosemite National Park contacted me to ask my opinion or the consequences of the various remedies proposed in this DEIS. Staff from Yosemite have indicated that it is very important to be involved in the Tuolomne Wild and Scenic Management Plan.

I would hope that the Park will prepare a plan that enables the public to continue to use the Pacific Crest Trail with commercial livestock. Much of the action items in this document should be addressed in a Wilderness Management Plan.

Sincerely,



2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 321 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 16:56:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and friends spend considerable time in the Sierra backcountry and we have encountered the negative impacts of High Sierra Camps and pack trains. Though I am eager to allow and create an assortment of opportunities to greater access for all to our beautiful public lands, these camps and particularly the pack animal infrastructure are far too impactful.

The notion of Wilderness is severely compromised by the resource intensive nature of these camps. Though I would prefer they be removed completely for a return to true wilderness character and experience, at the very least I believe the following could and should happen to reduce impact and improve our backcountry experience:

1. pack animal numbers and frequency must be reduced significantly! Simplifying and lightening food and resources available at High Camps would be a start. Cut out luxury food items, linens, optional comforts, etc. that necessarily add to pack animal bulk and resource usage.

2. pack animals should be required to wear manure catchers to protect precious and diminishing water quality, while also vastly improving the hikers/backpackers experience by not forcing us to walk and breath thru endless fly swarmed piles of manure.

3. It seems there is a great, but mostly missed, opportunity in the High Sierra Camp experience, for it to be used as an optimal teaching tool for first time or infrequent wilderness visitors. If the ease and accessibility of typical urban/suburban comforts and luxuries are simply imported into a wilderness area, it becomes too easy to dismiss the inherent uniqueness, remoteness and fragility of our Wilderness areas. Why is the goal to recreate an overly common experience (showers, clean linens, luxury foods, etc.) when the rest of our lives and experiences are just that? I believe that being 'closer to' and working within the natural framework of the Wilderness and it's ecology will garner a far greater understanding and respect, by all visitors.

4. I do want many more people to engage our remarkable parks, for with that comes greater understanding, appreciation and respect. But we must be very careful about how that is accomplished. There are plenty of spectacular view car parks, campgrounds, accessible swimming holes and experiences within our NP system, so please be conscious and protective of the unique Wilderness experience which is rapidly diminishing and yet, is like no other.

I respect the hard work and challenges of managing our most exceptional lands and offer my thoughts for your consideration.

Respectfully, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 322 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 17:01:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This Tuolumne Plan is the best opportunity in decades (since passage of the CA Wilderness Act) to REMOVE the commercial High Sierra Camps at Vogelsang and Glen Aulin. The only question is whether the Nat'l Park Service has the courage and foresight to do the right thing.

You know that the existence of both these commercial camps is harming the Tuolumne River. And you know that the existence of both these camps is harming the experience of the majority of visitors to these areas. The time has come to REMOVE these scars and abominations from the precious Yosemite landscape.

The High Sierra Camps at Vogelsang and Glen Aulin completely RUIN my own Tuolumne River experience from all of the noise and intrusion in the backcountry (i.e., crowding, helicopters, ugly slum camps, etc.) and the destruction and pollution caused by the numerous recurring frequent repeated persistent regular ongoing never-ending ceaseless PACKTRAINS needed to supply tons of unnecessary comforts & luxuries to the privileged few who visit these commercial camps. The trails are torn up, littered with manure, covered with dust & flies, and you know it all runs off into the water.

During my last hike on the trail from Tuolumne Meadows toward Vogelsang, the mixture of fine dust & pulverized manure was so choking and awful that I'm not sure I even want to come back. Such dust would not be allowed by OSHA at any factory in the land. Visitors to our national parks should not be displaced by such awful impacts.

If people want showers and linens and fancy fresh food, they can get it in town. And if they want to enjoy the Tuolumne River and Yosemite backcountry, they don't need packtrains full of such comforts and luxuries.

Please stop denying the obvious, stop pandering to commercial interests, and stop pampering the small number of visitors who

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

desire unnecessary comforts and luxuries in the backcountry at the expense of us all. Please REMOVE these ugly harmful noisy polluting camps once-and-for-all, and restore the sites & move to have them designated as wilderness. The Tuolumne River and the vast majority of us who visit Yosemite's backcountry looking for peace, quiet, clean air, and clean water deserve no less.

Correspondence ID: 323 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 17:08:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Park Service,

I'm writing to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan Draft. I believe your plan does not adress multiple concerns resulting from pack stock into the high Sierra and particularly the camps at Glen Aulin & Vogelsang which I believe should be closed. While their dept of Watershed Sciences is undoubtably the foremost authority on streams and rivers in California it was actually their own Medical Dept which said that the coliform pollution in Yosemite's waters were most likely caused by pack animals. It is also simply not fair that a few individuals using pack stock can so diminish the wilderness experience for so many. Rapid trail degradation, manure, flies, dust are tangible and very unpleasant. Not so concrete is the experience which is changed dramatically for the worse by trains in an area which should be kept wild. That is the whole purpose of the Park system, to preserve the wilderness, not preserve special interests. Please close the High Sierra Camps and please place limits on pack use and please make them clean up their own mess. Many of us hikers practice "leave no trace" camping. I rarely make fires now, leaving that for newbies to enhance their first backcountry experiences. For me being there is enough now but the impact from pack stock is like being punched in the face. Please adress these issues, it's been going on too long now.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 324 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 17:13:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Although I support Alternative 1 as the most likely to mitigate adverse impacts to the Tuolumne River Plan area, if Alternative 4 is chosen, the following changes should be made:

1. Reduce the increase in daily use by restricting the increase in the number of parking spaces to no more than 200 in the Tuolumne Meadow area to offset the elimination of roadside parking along Tuolumne Meadow;
2. Eliminate the use of horses for all but park personnel and the use of pack animals to service the Sierra Camps; the use of stock has identified adverse impacts on hoof punching in meadows, soil compaction, trampling of vegetation, and stream bank erosion, in addition to water contamination from manure;
3. Trails should be available for hikers without the erosion, dust, and manure created by the use of private and contractor horses, although recognizing that some dust and manure will still be created by horses for park personnel and animals servicing the High Sierra Camps. The budget constraints on the Park Service now in effect, which may continue into the foreseeable future, will impair the Park's ability to monitor and take corrective action to mitigate the impact of stock on the Tuolumne River Plan area if private horses and contractor horse stables continue.

Correspondence ID: 325 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 17:30:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Park Officials, I am submitting a brief letter supporting alternative 4 as outlined in the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. I have a CD copy of the DEIS and have reviewed the various alternatives. I am a member (chair) of the Range of Light Group (Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club). Although the area concerned is not in the area covered by our group (Inyo and Mono Counties), many of our members recreate in the Tuolumne River corridor and I have shared communications regarding the DEIS with some of our more active members. However, this comments in this letter are my own and do not represent an official position of our Range of Light Group or the Sierra Club as the Sierra Club will have submitted its own letter outlining its position on the DEIS. I do support the most important points made by the Sierra Club in their comments. 1) Support of the Actions Common to all Alternatives designed to protect the meadows and the river. 2) Removal and reduction of unnecessary commercial activities such as the fueling station and the mountaineering store. 3) Increase in public transit within and into the Park. 4) Contrary to Alternative 4, not increasing the maximum visitor day use. On behalf of our Range of Light Group, I did submit in the name of our Group comments on the Tioga Road Environmental Rehabilitation EA about 18 months ago. I am happy to see that this DEIS continues the effort to eliminate off road/along the road parking which creates hazardous conditions for visitors and contributes to environmental degradation (erosion, run-off, etc.). Additionally random off-road parking is conducive to visitors directly accessing sensitive meadow areas rather than using planned trails designed to keep visitors from trampling through the most sensitive areas. At the same time, I hope the increased official parking will be implemented in such a manner as not to affect negatively the scenic values of the area. Regarding increased public transportation, I believe it is important to use modern technology (including appropriate apts for smart phones, information signs with scanable bar codes for smart phones, etc.) that can inform visitors

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

before and upon arrival of the status of designated parking areas and suggest use of inter-area public transportation with indication of things such as time to next "bus" at specific public transportation stops. Such information could also direct visitors to appropriate secondary comparable destinations within the area when one of the more popular areas has reached maximum desirable usage ? in terms of parking and trail usage.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	326	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	SUWA Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	------------------------------

Received:	Mar,18,2013 17:31:38
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	I think that the High Sierra Camps, though a lovely way for a certain subset of sierra enthusiasts to engage the outdoors, are too impacting on the landscape of the Yosemite backcountry.
------------------------	--

I would prefer that they be removed entirely, but failing that, a stronger effort to limit their overall impact would be a wonderful change.

The damage that the pack animals do to the surrounding landscape with their excrement is the main problem. The water quality in this ostensibly pristine landscapes has always been problematic and this is the likely source of the contamination.

If the number of stock needed to supply the High Sierra Camp could be cut down by limiting the amount of creature comforts that the camps offer, that would seem an obvious step to take.

Thanks for the chance to express my opinion.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	327	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Received:	Mar,18,2013 17:58:15
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	While mostly in favor of alternative 4, I would hope you will consider the reduction in size of the Glen Aulin camp. Last year I had the chance to hike the high camps loop. Since I am now in my 60s, backpacking the entire loop would have been extremely hard. Cutting the capacity of Glen Aulin will make it much more difficult for others who are older to have the same experience.
------------------------	--

There must be some alternatives such as relocating the camp that would satisfy your requirements while preserving a virtually unique hut-to-hut hike. Please reconsider this item.

thanks

Correspondence ID:	328	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Mono County Tourims & Film Commission County Government
------------------------------	---

Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	Mono County Tourism & Film Commission P.O. Box 603 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760-924-1743
------------------------	---

March 15, 2013

Superintendent Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the Mono County Tourism & Film Commission, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on both the draft Tuolumne River Plan (TRP) and draft Merced River Plan (MRP). The Commission appreciates the time, effort and energy that have gone into the extensive details of these management plans.

Yosemite National Park and Mono County share the same visitor base in that Yosemite is one of the primary attractions for our destination. A significant portion of our spring/summer/fall visitors travel to and from the park via the East entrance on Tioga

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Pass Road and the visitor's experience in Yosemite is of critical concern to our tourism partners and county stakeholders as the quality of the park experience impacts both new and repeat visitation and thus the health of tourism in the Eastern Sierra.


The Commission supports certain elements of the preferred Alternative 4 for the Tuolumne River Plan, particularly the improvements to the campground and the changes to the current roadside parking situation adjacent to the Tuolumne Meadows. However, the removal of the gas station is a concern given the significant distance between this essential service at Crane Flat and Lee Vining. The Commission understands the fueling stations will still be available for park staff vehicles. To have the existing tanks operational, but not available for guests, appears to negate any environmental concerns as well as to deprive our visitors of a basic need while driving.

In addition, the elimination of horseback day rides also greatly reduces the ability of a specific segment of the visitor population to access the beautiful, unique and rugged back country of Yosemite. Older individuals and families as well as people with mobility issues, are unable otherwise to explore the park land without guided tours by horseback. Activities such as these also create reasons for visitors to stay an extra day in the region or to return at another time to participate in this activity. There is also a potential negative impact on "generational" travel to the park in which families return year after year to participate in an activity that has become a tradition for generations. With respect to the Merced River Plan, the Commission is in full support of all the improvements to meadow restoration, traffic circulation, parking, pedestrian mobility and the increased lodging opportunities that are proposed in preferred Alternative 5. Once again, the Commission does not support the elimination of visitor amenities and services in the Valley such as bike rentals, raft rentals, horseback riding day trips, and the removal of existing swimming pools at the Yosemite Lodge and the Ahwahnee hotels. These amenities enhance the enjoyment and access of the park for the public, and increase visitor motivation to return or to stay longer.

In conclusion, the Mono County Tourism and Film Commission would like to express support for the proposals in both plans which are designed to improve traffic flow and circulation and to ease congestion. However, the Commission does not support the removal of the existing guest activities, amenities and services that enhance the visitor experience in the park and therefore in the Eastern Sierra. Elimination of experiential visitor services and attractions reduces the motivation for people to stay longer in the region and/or to return at another time to take part in these activities. The Commission respectfully requests that the Tuolumne River Plan preferred alternative be modified to reinstate horseback riding day trips and the important fueling station service in Tuolumne Meadows. The Commission also respectfully requests that the Merced River Plan preferred alternative be modified to relocate or reinstate experiential visitor services and activities such as environmentally-friendly bike rentals, raft rentals, horseback rides, and to allow the existing swimming pools to remain at both the Ahwahnee and Yosemite Lodge properties.

Again, on behalf of the Mono County Tourism & Film Commission, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on both the draft Tuolumne River Plan (TRP) and draft Merced River Plan (MRP).

Sincerely,

 Chair, Mono County Tourism & Film Commission

Correspondence ID:	329	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 18:08:29				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I wish to comment on the high sierra camps in Yosemite. I think these should be maintained, as they are a historic use of the park and there are some people who use them who would otherwise not be able to experience these backcountry areas. But I do think every effort needs to be made to keep the impact to a minimum, and I am not sure this is the case now. "experience" doesn't have to mean "with similar amenities one would find outside the backcountry". I think every effort needs to be made to reduce the stock needed to supply these camps, because the stock needed to bring in supplies for the few people who stay at the camps ends up impacting all the other hikers who don't stay at the camps. it's a simple matter of equity. I'm willing to put up with some degradation of the trail due to erosion and stock manure in order to maintain the camps for use by certain people who would not otherwise visit (and vote to protect) the backcountry, but not as much trail degradation as is currently occurring. So - keep the camps, but find some way to decrease the stock use substantially over what the current status quo is.				
Correspondence ID:	330	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 18:12:39				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I am commenting on the campground design. The document is in appendix K and titled Tuolumne Meadows Design Guidelines.				

The document states "Provide an Appropriate Range of Rustic Campground Experiences" and discusses three different kinds of campsites: * RV only, * tents only with car parking at the site, * walk-in tent camping with parking close by. Diagrams 1 to 3 show a proposed layout for each kind of site.

I really like this idea and believe its implementation would provide a nicer campground experience for everybody. * RV sites

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

would have better access, larger parking spots and there would be the possibility to add more services to these designated RV sites in the future * traditional car campers would have a dedicated parking at their camp site but would not be bothered by the hum of generators * walk-in tent campers could park their car nearby, yet would have the opportunity for a more rustic nature experience.

An improvement for everyone all the way around!

Correspondence ID: 331 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 18:15:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I hope you leave all the Sierra High Camps open. There are so many ways to make less of an environmental impact and still stay open. You can use something to collect the pack animals waste like they use in Central Park for the horses that hangs under the tail, you can select food that weighs less and requires fewer animals to carry and fewer trips. You could probably cut out showers altogether. The times I stayed at the high camps, they served large bone in, skin on chicken breasts making a lot of garbage to pack out. I think boneless skinless chicken and dried beans, dried falafel patties and other foods that generate less waste would make a huge difference. We entrust our parks to you and cutting out access for backpackers who would go along with any sensitive ecological program while allowing mobs to invade the valley floor is completely inconsistent and just wrong.

Correspondence ID: 332 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 18:25:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the efforts to limit the packtrains. I have hiked to the High Camps and have enjoyed the experience immensely; the inconvenience of sharing the trail with pack animals is minimal. I am glad to know the trails are accessible to pack animals; in the case of an unfortunate hiking accident, I would want one to help evacuate me out of the area. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 333 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 18:29:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of preserving Glen Aulin at its existing capacity with existing camp lodging and infrastructure. As the smallest HSC, cutting the amount of beds by 12, to 20, will substantially choke ability of people to complete the High Sierra Loop, and the capacity for the Park to support human enjoyment, as a ranger-led loop trip, which is required by some people for safety to access the loop, already has 15 people in it.

The High Sierra Camps exemplify the best of what the National Parks have to offer. Compared to other parts of the world, we have a great scarcity of camp-to-camp hiking trails available, and only the wealthy can afford to leave the country to hike within a camp infrastructure. The camps support the dual missions of the National Parks: to preserve scenic beauty, and to provide access for the public's enjoyment. The interpretive education provided by the naturalist ranger on a guided hike is unparalleled, preserving an important cultural wilderness tradition that is not replaceable by plans which value a total self-sufficiency available to only a narrow range of the completely able-bodied public.

I am interested in preserving access to the wilderness via the Loop Trail and to all High Sierra Camps, as a tradition in support of the National Park Service mission and as a place of cultural association, education, recreation, reflection and inspiration. As the EIR characterizes human presence as a disturbance, and the disturbances caused by people using Glen Aulin Camp as minor, I would rather see some minor disturbance which is being successfully managed and which preserves access.

I am confused by the alternative which proposes a "seasonal outfitters camp;" Glen Aulin is already seasonal. I prefer an alternative which allows continuity in the Loop and availability provided through the Park concessionaire.

I have a deep regard for the dual missions of the National Park Service of preservation and enjoyable access. Yosemite's High Sierra Camps have provided access to many who could never access the wilderness experience without some assistance. Hiking the Loop trail was one of the most transformative experiences of my life. I therefore do not support of the series of alternative concepts which propose the elimination of camping infrastructure at Glen Aulin Camp, which would foreclose the possibility of completing the Loop. Glen Aulin Camp has provided an important way station for people accessing the wilderness for many years with relatively low impact, especially compared to what is available in the Valley. For me, and the folks I've met on those hikes, the High Sierra Camps exemplify the best of what the National Parks have to offer. The camps support the dual missions of the National Parks: to preserve scenic beauty, and to provide access for the public's enjoyment. The interpretive education provided by the naturalist ranger on a guided hike is unparalleled, preserving an important cultural wilderness tradition that is not replaceable by plans which value a total self-sufficiency available to only a narrow range of the completely able-bodied public.

Other than the changes to Glen Aulin, I do not have a problem with Alternative IV. I do, however, prefer NO ACTION on Glen

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Aulin Camp.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 334 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: NPCA Conservation/Preservation
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Neubacher, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Tuolumne River Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. We fully appreciate the significant work that has been done to develop this draft, which we find to be well thought out and useful as a planning document. The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) was established more than 90 years ago and now consists of more than 750,000 members and supporters who support our mission to protect and enhance America's national parks for present and future generations. NPCA supports the Preferred Alternative (4), Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experience and commends the park service for selecting an alternative that addresses a range of public concerns by balancing desires to retain a traditional Tuolumne experience with desires to reduce development and make visitor use more sustainable, while addressing the need to provide a meaningful introduction to the Tuolumne River for the growing number of short-term visitors. NPCA also supports the preferred alternative site planning for Tuolumne Meadows, which allows for day visitors to be encouraged to get out of their cars and take walks or short hikes to sites of natural and cultural interest, where they could enjoy activities such as sightseeing and participation in interpretive and educational programs, fishing, swimming, and picnicking. NPCA appreciates proposing formally maintained trails and specific destinations to protect and enhance recovering meadow and riparian habitats while accommodating existing levels of day use. In addition to actions common to all alternatives, the National Parks Conservation Association supports the following proposals in Alternative 4:

Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp

? Reduce guest capacity to 20, continuing to offer the opportunity for visitors with a broader range of physical abilities to connect with the river in a remote setting, while decreasing the risk to water quality. ? Elimination of flush toilets to reduce demands for water use and waste disposal ? New composting toilets for visitors. ? Reduction of water use at Glen Aulin to 500 gallons per day. ? Retain flush toilets for employees living at Glen Aulin. ? Discontinuation of wood for heat stoves in visitor tent cabins. ? Discontinuation of "meals-only" service for people who are not lodge guests. ? Continue overnight saddle trips but discontinue concessioner day rides to the camp. ? Additionally, NPCA recommends NPS consider using human porters for concessionaire trips when appropriate and feasible. Tuolumne Meadows and Tioga Road Corridor

? Discontinue concessioner stock day rides in order to reduce conflict on wilderness trails ? Remove the public fuel station and restore area to natural conditions. ? Maintain views from eight scenic vistas by controlling the encroachment of vegetation in a manner that is protective of ecological conditions and archeological values at each vista point based on individual work plans. ? Increase the amount of designated parking available from 533 to 914 spaces and remove all undesignated parking opportunities. ? Manage day use levels along wilderness trails within reach of day hikes from Tioga Road to achieve a standard of no more than 10 encounters with other parties per hour (80% of the time). ? Allow commercial use in wilderness, with restrictions on types and levels of use based on a determination of extent necessary that gives priority to noncommercial use and restricts commercial use to no more than 2 overnight groups per zone per night and no more than 2 day groups per trail per day.

Tuolumne Meadows Site Plan ? Provide a new visitor contact station south of Tioga Road, across from the Parsons Memorial Lodge trailhead. ? Retain the store and grill, post office, wilderness center, and ranger station in their current locations. ? Retain the campground at its current capacity. ? Retain the Tuolumne Meadows Lodge at its current capacity, while relocating the three guest tent cabins nearest the river to protect adjacent riparian habitat. Upgrade the shower house at the lodge. ? Increase the capacity of regional transit as an option for arriving at Tuolumne Meadows. ? Increase the frequency of shuttle bus service among destinations within the Tuolumne Meadows area, and add stops at visitor service areas. ? Formalize John Muir Trail connection. ? Retain Elizabeth Lakes trailhead and day parking. ? Remove riprap from riverbank. ? Co-locate NPS and concessioner stable (for administrative use only). ? Retain one hard-sided cabin for two stable employees (relocate most concessioner employee housing to location #18). ? In addition NPCA recommends that regional transportation be expanded even beyond the proposal.

Gaylor Pit

? Add NPS employee campsites, vault toilets, and potable water tank. ? Retain helipad.

The National Parks Conservation Association appreciates the opportunity to comment on this crucial plan and to support Alternative 4, the preferred alternative. Thank you for engaging us in this important process.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 335 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 18:39:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to comment on the NPS plans. I have been backpacking in the Upper Yosemite area for over twenty-five years. I have backpacked and camped near Vogelsang and also Glen Aulen. I have hiked the Rafferty Creek Trail in summer and fall, as well as the Glen Aulen trail down to Waterwheel Falls and beyond several times.

I would like to see the High Sierra Camps closed, especially because of the amount of mule traffic required to keep them offering fresh sheets, fresh food, and showers, etc. I don't think that people who are taken in to a wilderness place on horseback (i.e., don't have to work hard for the goal) are as apt to be conscious of preserving and taking care of the wilderness areas.

I think that the pack animal issue in the Sierra and Yosemite has always been a bone of contention. So often I see a mule straddling a creek and taking a pee or even defecating. This is really insulting and disgusting given the rules that backpackers have to follow regarding camping away from "fresh" water and always taking care to have a big distance between water and one's "latrine". No matter that the mules sometimes pee and defecate away from water, it ultimately becomes mixed with rain run-off and enters the water system. I remember when I visited Quebec City and the horses all had "baskets" under their tails to catch manure. This was years ago and I thought it was a great idea to keep the city streets clean. Maybe something like that could be required and enforced.

Other issue regarding mules and horses (when in large and frequent pack trains) are the amount of dust, flies, erosion and degradation of trails, and their night-time grazing habits.

There just has to be a stop to the number of pack trains going in and out and the lack of controls on the amount of manure being left behind. We need to stop catering to the Horse Pack lobby.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 336 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in order to comment on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. I am a seasonal Ranger Naturalist who has worked in the Tuolumne watershed for 8 out of the 9 seasons that I've been employed in the park (Tuolumne Meadows, White Wolf and Hetch Hetchy). Naturally, as is the case for so many other people, I care deeply about the future of the Tuolumne River and its environs. I wish that I could comment more thoroughly on this draft of an important document, but as I lead a busy life doing other work in Upstate New York during the off-season, I unfortunately didn't notice that this document was in a public comment period until today (which happens to be the last day of the comment period). I'm actually quite surprised that such an important document that will affect the future fate of an area that many people care about but can only visit seasonally was put out for public comment during a time when no one is there. In any case, I will try to quickly prioritize and summarize some of my concerns here. I apologize upfront for my lack of time to thoroughly read through the entire document.

My three biggest priorities in considering the developments described in Alternative 4 (the Preferred Alternative), or any development that will take place in the Tuolumne area, relate to minimizing impact to the meadow, river, and "wilder" qualities of experience by modifications to visitor access in heavily-travelled areas, maintaining full, but conscientious use of Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp and ranger-led loop trips there, and maintaining use of tent cabins in the NPS employee housing area for Interpretive Rangers who choose to live there.

Minimizing the impact to the meadow, river and "wilder" qualities of experience in the Tuolumne area by modifications to visitor access in heavily-travelled areas: I am happy to see that the Preferred Alternative addresses parking issues at the current Cathedral Lakes trailhead by designating a parking area and relocating the trailhead. Parking is admittedly a very difficult issue to imagine solutions to, but I do hope that in the process of moving, expanding and creating new parking areas, significant and serious attention is being given to the potential of creating new impacts where there wasn't necessarily one before. One example I can think of off-hand is the proposal to create a new parking/viewing area east of Pothole Dome. As an interpretive ranger, I have led guided interpretive hikes up the back side of Pothole Dome and hiked there many times on my own after work. One of the great appeals of this hike is the feeling that it is a wilder way of accessing the exhilarating top of Pothole Dome. It is really a unique experience that visitors have commented on (after participating in the guided hike, they talk about how it was like their own little mountain climbing expedition ? and these are people who would not likely have thought to embark on a mountain climbing expedition). I feel that this experience should be protected. Having another heavily-visited visitor area on the east side of pothole dome pretty much eliminates this possibility. With the main parking area for the east side of the dome being currently located at the present Dog Lake Parking area, by the time you've climbed up the hill and crossed Tioga Road, it feels like you

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

are entering a new space that is a little wilder and much further from your car than it actually is. Bringing the parking area up closer to the top of the dome will also likely increase the number of hikers reaching the top of the dome which could certainly be a safety issue.

Maintaining full, but conscientious use of Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp and ranger-led loop trips there: I am happy to see that the Preferred Alternative would eliminate flush toilets and create composting toilets for guests at Glen Aulin. I am also happy to see that it discontinues use of wood stoves for the camp. It makes perfect sense that such a concentrated use so close to the river needs to be carried out in a very conscientious fashion. And if Glen Aulin didn't exist, I would probably not be in favor of creating it in that particular location right on the river. But it does exist as part of an extremely unique and historic system and I believe strongly in the influence that the experience of hiking the High Sierra loop has had on countless visitors to the park ? some of whom have gone on to help the park and contribute to other conservation efforts after having "life-changing" experiences at the High Sierra Camps. I have led High Sierra Camp loop trips for 5 seasons and experienced this change firsthand. There are visitors from previous trips who update me occasionally on what they are doing. One couple from a trip that I led back in 2007, both of whom are developers, decided to only build LEED Certified buildings after having such a "life-changing" experience on their 7-day loop trip. Most of the "deeper" experiences that I've noticed in participants have happened on 7-day loop trips, which spend one night at Glen Aulin. The loop functions really well as a 7-day trip and eases hikers into some of the more challenging hikes making the whole 7-day experience somehow really perfect. While reducing the number of people to be able to stay at Glen Aulin might be one way to reduce some impact on the river, I fear the effect that it might have on the ability to have 7-day loop trips, since cabin space would be limited. I also wonder if a similar reduction of impact on the river couldn't be had by taking further efforts to reduce water use at the camp and increasing education of visitors as to the sensitivity of the location. This particular approach could also allow the camp to serve as even more of a model for low-impact existence in a place.

Maintaining use of tent cabins in the NPS employee housing area for Interpretive Rangers who choose to live there: Lastly I would like to comment on the value of an experience that I am no longer lucky enough to have when I work seasonally in the park. As a loop trip leader, I was based out of Tuolumne Meadows from 2006-2010 and lived in a tent cabin. Prior to living there myself, I had heard stories about how cups of tea left by the bedside would sometimes freeze at night and had a sense that Interpreters in that part of the park somehow lived a rougher life than I did in an apartment in Wawona and then a hard-sided cabin at White Wolf. Actually living in a tent cabin myself proved to be a most amazing experience that was not always without challenges but in the end was essential to my time in Tuolumne. Living in the Tuolumne tent cabins, Interpretive Rangers have a greater sense of the immediate environment. For example, they hear what birds are singing at different times and are therefore better able to answer visitor questions about such things. Living in a tent cabin, Interpreters also experience the extremes of temperature in a more direct way that helps them to relate to visitors who are staying in the campground and tent cabins at Tuolumne Lodge. In general, living in a tent cabin facilitates a relationship to the place that is essential to our jobs. Last year and this year I am/will be based out of White Wolf due to having a young child and only being able to work out the logistics of my work and family by being there instead of Tuolumne, and we will again be living in a hard-sided cabin. While it is certainly a luxury to live in a building that stays warm at night and to have hot running water in the sink, I feel that I am less effective at the part of my job that requires me to know the place really well so that I can help develop connections for others. There is always a level of disconnect that might be comparable to staying in a hotel on a camping trip, rather than a tent. Additionally, the tent cabins are a historic part of Ranger Naturalist culture in the Tuolumne area. Stories of Carl Sharsmith, Bob Fry and other inspirational role models for our profession pervade the canvas roofs and wooden walls. Tuolumne has a strong reputation for high quality interpretation in the spirit of amazing naturalists who helped to build the profession of Environmental Interpretation in the Park Service throughout the country. While so far as I can tell in my very quick read of the draft the Preferred Alternative does not address removing these structures, I would like to emphasize how strongly I (and other naturalists) feel about keeping this part of our culture as a living part of the experience of working out of Tuolumne.

Thank you for your time in reading and considering my comments. I think we all want only what is best for the Tuolumne area. I hope you will take my comments (and those of others) seriously.

Kind Regards, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	337	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 19:16:25				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I have backpacked and climbed throughout the Sierra Nevada, including the Yosemite High Country, for 65 years (I climbed Lyell 8 times since 1948). I am a combat veteran of World War II [B-17 pilot, Army Air Corps, Europe] and I led 81 backpacking trips in the Sierra Nevada, including Yosemite, from 1955 to 2001.				

I have been particularly offended by the degradation of the pristine beauty of the Sierra Nevada wilderness caused by horse parties which intrude on meadows, drop manure all along the trails, which in turn attracts flies and creates dust. Worst of all the manure finds its way sooner or later into the water systems, which has been documented by scientists at the UC Medical Center.

I consider that horse parties, being generally pampered because they ride and thus don't walk through the wilderness, and enjoy luxuries such as fresh food, fresh sheets, warm showers, alcohol, don't fully appreciate the need to preserve the natural beauty of

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Yosemite and the rest of the Sierra Nevada.

I think that the NPS should close the Vogelsang and Glen Aulin High Camps and possibly all High Camps or at the very least restrict the number of horse trains and especially require and enforce the clean up of the manure in some manner. [Several times I have personally witnessed a horse defecating in a creek in the Yosemite High Country.] It is really up to the NPS to forcefully address the horse packing issue. I respectfully urge you to do so.

Correspondence ID: 338 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am generally supportive of the actions common to all action alternatives and believe that alternative 4 is a reasonable choice, for the most part. I have some concerns, however.

First, Yosemite National Park does not have a legally-required General Management Plan. While the 1980 GMP is supposedly in effect, it has not been "revised in a timely manner," as required by law (considering it's a 20-year plan and it's been over 30 years since it has been revised in any comprehensive manner and is largely irrelevant to today's circumstances). Despite NPS' wish to move away from general management planning, NPS is still required by the National Parks and Recreation Act to have a valid GMP for each park. The TRP and MRP aim to revise the GMP, but they fail to do so in such a way as to avoid fragmented planning, thereby defeating the purpose of NEPA. Both plans have impacts upon each other that are not analyzed at all (e.g., proposed implementation of user limits in each plan that affect the other plan). Additionally, the law requiring GMPs requires parks to identify and implement carrying capacities for "all areas" of each park, something these two plans fail to do because they're beyond the scope of each plan. However, fragmented implementation of visitor use/carrying capacity in some areas of the park fails to achieve legal requirements, and prevents NPS from holistic approach to user capacity/carrying capacity. Thus, both the TRP and MRP fail to adequately revise the GMP to bring it in compliance with the law.

GLEN AULIN HIGH SIERRA CAMP It is with extremely conflicted feelings that I must argue strongly in favor of removal of the permanent structures of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (GAHSC), as proposed in either alternative 1 or 2. GAHSC is extremely valuable as a way to get visitors who otherwise might not experience a wilderness-like overnight experience such an experience, but it is not necessary. Additionally, GAHSC, as "the only developed structure" in the wild segments of the Tuolumne River, is a blight on the landscape and spoils the wilderness experience, which should be devoid of structures.

The TRP describes GAHSC as necessary "to allow visitors with a broader range of physical abilities to enjoy a wilderness experience along the river" (p. 7-27). This determination is false for the following reasons:

1. Anyone capable getting to GAHSC is capable of having a wilderness experience along the river by walking or riding a short distance from Tuolumne Meadows; the GAHSC is not necessary for such an experience and, as stated elsewhere in the TRP, detracts from it. (If, in the context of the TRP, "wilderness experience" means "overnight wilderness experience," the TRP should state this explicitly. However, staying at GAHSC isn't a wilderness experience because the portion of the trip spent overnight is spent in an area excluded from wilderness.) 2. The argument that a permanent camp is required for people to have a wilderness experience explicitly contradicts the Wilderness Act, which prohibits permanent installations in wilderness. Arguing that a structure inconsistent with the Wilderness Act is required in order for visitors to enjoy the benefits of the Wilderness Act is nonsensical. 3. Whether GAHSC is necessary under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is irrelevant because it was Congress' intent in the California Wilderness Act that GAHSC be removed as soon as practicable. Additionally, potential wilderness areas must be managed as wilderness insofar as practicable. When a conflict arises between the WSRA and the Wilderness Act, the more restrictive (protective) prevails. Unlike in the similar case of Drakes Bay at Point Reyes, in which removal of the non-conforming use within potential wilderness was delayed by a contract, there is no such complication in the case of GAHSC. Since it is immediately practicable for GAHSC to be removed and that area provided wilderness designation by the secretary of the Interior, this must be what happens, as provided by law.

Even if GAHSC is necessary (a point that I don't concede), since it is infeasible to move but negatively impacts river values, it should still be removed.

Alternative 2's approach of removing all of GAHSC (except the vault toilet) and replacing it with a smaller, temporary outfitter-style tent camp may be a reasonable compromise that would seem to meet legal requirements under both WSRA and the Wilderness Act while still fulfilling the role the High Sierra Camps have traditionally played. Additionally, implementing this proposal has the same cost as implementing the more impactful proposal contained in alternative 4.

If GAHSC is retained, all structures and objects within designated wilderness must be removed, in compliance with the law. If the water line within the potential wilderness addition is sometimes inadequate, GAHSC should cease operation until adequate water is available from within the potential wilderness addition. Additionally, I'm supportive of removing flush toilets, wood stoves, and meals-only plans (unless the meals are cold and/or have minimal effect on water usage and waste disposal).

TUOLUMNE MEADOWS STABLE The TRP states that, even if GAHSC is removed, the DNC stable is still necessary because of the role it plays in supporting other High Sierra Camps. This is irrelevant--the stable is not necessary for protecting

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

river values within the river corridor. So, if GAHSC is completely removed (alternative 1), the stable is no longer necessary and must be removed as well.

KAYAKING I support alternative 2's proposal for very limited kayaking. Given the very minimal impact this would have, there's no need for an unnecessary regulation absolutely prohibiting it. I support a strict permit system and allowing NPS explicit discretion in the TRP to further reduce or eliminate this activity if impacts or other problems are greater than expected.

VISITOR CENTER/CONTACT STATION Alternative 4's proposal for a "small contact station" is inappropriate and contradictory to the statement that a full range of interpretive/orientation services will be available. A regular visitor center (vs. a contact station) is an integral (and perhaps most important) part of a full range of interpretive/orientation services. It's also impossible to have "increased emphasis...[on] protect[ing] river values" while reducing the size and interpretive content of the visitor center.

The TRP repeatedly calls out the importance of interpretation in protecting river values and states that visitor centers "are the primary place/means for NPS to educate visitors on resource protection." While additional formal interpretive programming is an essential and valuable way to achieve this, a visitor center (including exhibits, something a "small contact station" lacks) will be far more effective, and this is made plainly obvious by the fact that the most common activity in Tuolumne Meadows (beyond simply driving through) is stopping at the visitor center (58% of visitors) while only 9% of visitors attend an interpretive program. If anything, the Tuolumne Meadows Visitor Center should be expanded. Why wouldn't the most popular activity and best way of educating visitors about how to protect river values be made smaller?

Additionally, if the visitor center is replaced with a small contact station, with a smaller and more crowded Yosemite Conservancy bookstore, YC's revenue would be significantly reduced. Reduced YC revenue means less staffing (to provide resource protection messages) and less funding available for resource protection projects funded by Yosemite Conservancy. The TRP fails to analyze these resource protection and economic impacts.

The visitor center/contact station can be larger with a very slight reduction in parking spaces and/or reduction in size or elimination of the proposed picnic area at the visitor center. Surely, the positive impacts of a true visitor center far outweigh the loss of a few parking spaces or less space for picnicking.

Combining the wilderness center with the visitor center would be more convenient for visitors, be more efficient to operate, and would reduce energy and water use.

If the visitor center/contact station is located as proposed in alternative 4, a more direct trail to the Cathedral Lakes trailhead should be constructed. This would reduce the potential for the creation of an informal trail, walking along the road, and unnecessary driving or shuttle bus usage.

POTHOLE DOME PICNIC AREA For the most part, I'm in favor of adding well designed picnic areas to reduce the many impacts that informal picnicking often has. However, there's not enough information in the TRP to evaluate the impacts of the Pothole Dome picnic area. For instance, it's not clear where exactly this would be, other than somewhere east of Pothole Dome. Would its parking lot be a draw for Cathedral Lakes hikers looking to shorten their hike?

(Speaking of poorly-described locations, the location of Gaylor Pit isn't described anywhere in the TRP, except in an inset map with no geographical context.)

HOUSING The TRP calls either for any new housing to be hard-sided or actually proposes replacing NPS tent cabins with hard-sided structures (depending on where you look--it's not consistent). Yet, there is already a project scheduled to replace NPS tent cabins with hard-sided cabins. This seems to be predecisional. This project is also not listed as a current or reasonably foreseeable project. (Interestingly, even where the TRP calls for replacement of NPS tent cabins with hard-sided cabins, concession tent cabins are excluded. Last I checked, OSHA regulations apply to both.) There is almost no analysis of the impacts of replacing tent cabins with hard-sided cabins, including the four contributing tent cabins in NPS housing.

COMMENT PERIOD No public comment would be complete without a request for an extension of the comment period. Therefore, I request an extension of the public comment period for at least a few weeks beyond the opening date of the Tioga Road for two reasons. First, NPS repeatedly promised that the TRP would be open for public comment during the summer. Second, the public (not counting a handful of skiers) is unable to evaluate the accuracy of the EIS (which, after all, is one of the purposes of a public comment period) and see for itself what proposed actions might look like on the ground. Further, even if the Tioga Road were open, the public can't fully evaluate some proposals because the EIS fails to indicate their locations (e.g., Pothole Dome picnic area, Gaylor Pit).

Correspondence ID:	339	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 19:40:39				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It has been a couple of years since I've been to the high camps. However, I think it would be a shame to close the camps completely. I do think that environmentally sensitive measures can be better applied for their maintenance, but I would be sad if the camps were completely removed. They are not only historical but provide a unique form of high country touring. In my lifetime I've done a fair amount of backpacking. However, the fact that certain creature comforts are provided for the high camps makes the high mountains accessible for many who might not otherwise reach these more remote regions. If we had to, I would carry a sleeping bag and food for an overnight stay. But I don't want the camps to go away.

Correspondence ID: 340 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 19:48:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comments to Yosemite National Park on the Tuolumne River Plan

My husband and I are horse owners, and our main form of recreation is horseback riding and camping in the back country. In past years I rode to all of the high sierra camps on my own horse, and brought back memories that I will cherish for the rest of my life. We are seriously concerned that the preferred alternative will be discontinuing the concessionaire stock day rides. This will preclude a variety of visitors, such as the disabled, and the general public that are not hikers or backpackers, from experiencing the backcountry.

We are also concerned that the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is slated for possible removal and the area returned to wilderness. All of the High Sierra Camps are historical, and are not part of designated wilderness, and they all retain a buffer around them that is not wilderness. They are havens in Yosemite National Park that enhance visitor comfort and enjoyment, and they should remain for present and future generations to enjoy. Stock use is historical and is allowed by law in the Wilderness Act. Please rework your preferred alternative to include recreational and commercial stock use in Tuolumne Meadows.

We also think you should retain the gas station for visitor convenience. Surely it can be repaired to bring it up to code.

We feel that Yosemite is for Everyone, including minorities, those of modest means, the elderly, and the disabled, not just a select few.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Correspondence ID: 341 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 20:04:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I recommend you adopt Tuolumne River Plan Alternative 2: Expanding Recreational Opportunities.

It would be a mistake to decrease the capacity of Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. The High Sierra Camps are an excellent opportunity for people to get into the back country and experience the Yosemite high sierra region. They make it practical for a family with children to go into the high country. They also make it feasible for people to get there without investing in a huge amount of camping gear. The existence of the high sierra camps is for many people the only way they will spend an extended amount of time in the back country. This is a very valuable recreational opportunity.

Spots in the high sierra camps are already in such short supply that they are rationed by lottery. They should not be further limited. Surely, the Yosemite ecosystem can support the small impact of the high camps.

I have taken two High Sierra loop hikes with my young daughter and wife, guided by a NPS ranger. (My daughter was 8 and 11 at the time of the hikes.) These have been the most meaningful vacations we have taken together. I believe that my daughter will always remember these experiences in the Yosemite high country, when she has long forgotten more conventional vacations. Hiking deep in the Yosemite high country has created a love for Yosemite that will likely last her entire life. Yosemite needs advocates like my daughter, and they are made by experiences such as this.

The high sierra camp experience fosters a love for the sierra and for Yosemite in a way that few other experiences are likely to do. The national parks are supposed to be a place for the people to experience the wilderness. We should not decrease the opportunity for people to get into the back country.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Please do not further limit spaces in the Yosemite high sierra camps. Please leave Glen Aulin as it is.

Correspondence ID: 342 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 20:09:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see the High Sierra Camps closed down and these areas recovered, and placed into designated wilderness. The High Sierra Camps serve a small minority of Park visitors that afford them, and are inappropriate in the backcountry. I really feel these camps should be eliminated because they concentrate use and thus do a disproportionate impact to the subalpine vegetation and terrain. Not to mention that to service these camps, numerous pack strings must hike the trails causing even more erosion and affecting hikers. I urge you to keep impacts in the developed campgrounds and other areas.

Correspondence ID: 343 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 20:37:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Plan 4 sounds good. Please keep Tuolumne Meadows as wild as you can.

Correspondence ID: 344 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 20:41:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel there are flaws in all the alternatives. Of the five, if I had to pick one, it would be number 1.

My biggest concern is the river corridor between Pate Valley and Tuolumne Meadows. I have hiked this route multiple times. The Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne is one of the most beautiful places in earth, in my humble opinion. I have few issues below Glen Aulin. The trail above Glen Aulin, however, is polluted by the sight and smell of horse manure, which I find very objectionable. Eliminating horse use on this segment would be my first priority in any plan. Eliminating the Glen Aulin HSC would be an obvious result of this action, unless, for instance, the camp could be supplied once or twice a season by helicopter.

I agree with the elimination of commercial use in the case of the High Sierra Camps, but I see little reason to close the store, gas station and mountaineering shop. Closing Tuolumne Meadows Lodge would help a lot in mitigating environmental problems in Tuolumne Meadows proper, but I could still live with it, even though it is an eyesore.

Parking is an issue that must be faced up to. The present policy of just parking along existing roads is so very inconsistent with maintaining outstandingly remarkable scenic values. Automobiles should be concentrated in well designed parking lots.

From personal experience in wilderness management issues at home here in Oregon, I am aware of how difficult it is to deal with limiting use of popular trails by day hikers. Even though, from the standpoint of my own solitude, I would support limiting day use on trails, I feel that the administrative headaches this would cause are too high. Controlling day hiking use could prove impossible given the limited budgets that our national parks are faced with. Do not try to control where people go unless you are able to have boots on the ground to enforce the regulations. My mind reels when I think of what an administrative and public pain in the rear it would be for all day hikers to have to submit to a quota system on trails.

Correspondence ID: 345 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 20:58:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You say: In accordance with the Secretaries' Guidelines for River Areas, the only major public use facilities that may remain in the corridor under this plan are those (1) that are necessary; (2) that would be infeasible to move outside the corridor; and (3) that do not negatively affect river values. pg 2-10

1) sticks in my mind... facilities remain that are NECESSARY. Few of the things in Tuolumne Meadows are truly necessary, so the self reliant experience is the obvious choice.

That said, I prefer Action Alternative 1: Emphasizing a Self-Reliant Experience.

I have frequently backpacked to, from, and through the Tuolumne Meadows area from all directions since the 1970's (and one ski tour through) and still do so. It is a spectacular alpine area that is being love to death and I am glad to see your preferred alternative is addressing many of these issues of environmental quality, parking, day rides, and the general visitor experience.

Thank you for forward thinking and considering reducing the overuse, taking things back to an even more historic, pre commercial use! I see the main problem affecting the most precious resource, which in my mind is wilderness and the whole

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

'feel' of solitude and self reliance, as the crowds and heavy, unceasing use of horsepacking into the Sierra camps. That most egregious harm to the Tuolumne Meadow area (and beyond) from all the commercial use has made the 'trails' very unpleasant to hike on. They are tiring soft sandy trenches, have serious dust mixed with stinky manure, flies, piles of manure fall near or into the pristine water. The giant over-built 'trails' to supply people at the camps with totally unnecessary luxuries in the wilderness are like small freeways. It leaves one with nothing resembling a wilderness experience, but to get into and out of the back country we must use them and suffer for the first day of a trip or go cross country which is not always feasible. It is actually worse to end a ten day backpack on the Glen Aulin or Vogelsang trails... your whole wonderful wilderness experience of solitude and beauty just deflates the minute you get to those camps and then the aforementioned 'trails'. We are not in the 1800's any more and horses do not belong in fragile alpine environments, period. There are hundreds of miles of trails in back country all over the national forests where equestrians can ride. National Parks, Yosemite in particular, are the most precious parks we have and should be a beacon of innovation in leadership and management. I am happy to see at least day rides will be eliminated in most of the alternatives.

The density of people at all the commercial facilities is way out of hand for that area. Sure it is convenient to resupply at the store but totally not necessary. There is no reason dayhikers can't be more self reliant too, using the Lee Vining and Yosemite Valley facilities. With the great shuttle busses and fewer cars, limiting day hiking and taking out unnecessary buildings, etc. will truly give people a taste of what Le Conte and Muir and the other early travelers experienced... probably beyond their imaginations. Without distractions of commercial enterprises, maybe they too will find a bit of solitude and quiet, even in their day use wanderings.

I say bravo to the Self Reliant Experience! There are trails I have never hiked in the Meadows as they always look way too crowded from the number of cars parked on side of the roads. We can go to the Valley for crowds...

Taking out the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp is also a great idea and would eliminate a lot of problems in that special area. I have hiked through many times and camped in the backpacker camp once, and if you left just that, as it states, it would still be perfectly adequate. (Vogelsang could go too but that is out of scope of this document I believe)

In conclusion, there are many complex issues and demands for sure, but opting for the one that preserves and protects the most precious beauty and natural resources of the wilderness is the highest use in my opinion. Once you lose that you can rarely get it back. We humans need it for our very sanity, our spirits! I look forward every year to the long trip down to the Sierra. Having it any bit less crowded and commercialized and without horse manure everywhere would make it even more fabulous.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID:	346	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 21:07:26				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Of the several plans in the EIR, I favor Alternative 4 as a best compromise between recreation and wilderness protection. The increase in roadside parking in recent years has been a distraction from the beauty of the meadow.				

I do have a concern about removal of the mountaineering store and fueling station. Over the years, I have seen all too many visitors arrive missing some essential items which, until now, they have been able to obtain in the store. Will removal of the store result in increased driving - east or west - to another store? And will removal of the fueling station result in increased driving (to refuel) for people who spend two to three weeks in the High Sierra?

The mountaineering school has been an opportunity for people to be safely introduced to rock climbing. Will removal of the school result in untrained people attempting climbs they are not prepared to handle?

An increase in public transportation between Tioga Pass and Tenaya Lake would help reduce automobile traffic.

Correspondence ID:	347	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 21:47:51				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support Alternative 4 with the exception of the proposal to make changes to Glen Aulin. The changes would hinder the ability of hikers to complete the High Sierra Loop. The loop hike is world famous and NPS should not make it less accessible. The High Sierra Camps are a very important part of the Loop experience.				

Correspondence ID:	348	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Yosemite advocates Conservation/Preservation				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	We intend to e-mail these comments to <yose_planning@nps.gov>. We will also attempt to post them to the PEPC web site. If				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

all else fails, we will attempt to fax them to 209-379-1294.

These comments on the Draft Tuolumne River Plan are submitted on behalf of a group of citizens who are tentatively calling themselves "Yosemite advocates." As our group evolves, we may adopt that name formally, or perhaps we will choose some other name.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Draft Tuolumne River Plan (TRP). We also appreciate the dedication of you and your staff in striving to protect Yosemite and its resources unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. And we thank you for your efforts throughout this planning process to keep the public informed in a meaningful manner which goes beyond what is legally required. ----- While the present managers of Yosemite place much emphasis on protecting the integrity of the Park and the quality of the visitor experience, that was not always the case in the past. Nor will it always be the case in the future. The ability of future managers to subvert the intent of the present planning processes should be minimized by making the present intent very clear. An essential step in that process should be to make the TRP very explicit as to which projects will receive further planning and environmental review, including opportunities for public involvement.

It is necessary to provide clarity so it is known which elements of the TRP would be ready for implementation as soon as an ROD is filed, as opposed to which elements would require further planning and environmental compliance prior to implementation. A list of projects which will undergo further review is needed. Such a list would hopefully prevent projects from being allowed to proceed in the absence of adequate environmental review. To make clear our concern, examples of two major projects in Yosemite Valley which were completed with practically no environmental review are: --New (around 2006?) DNC employee housing complex west of Curry Village. --Lower Fall Project. Both of these projects had cursory mention in the subsequently rescinded Yosemite Valley Plan (YVP), but no analysis; yet it was asserted that the treatment in the YVP constituted adequate authorization to proceed with construction. ----- One proposal in the TRP which clearly would require further analysis and public involvement would be implementation of a permit requirement for day-hiking in designated Wilderness. Most day-hiking which is done in the Tuolumne Meadows area falls in this category, and is designated for a possible permit requirement.

On this point, see TRP pages 7-87 and 7-88 under the description of the NPS preferred Alternative 4. Also see 5-72 through 5-78.

Repeated reading of these pages only confirmed our initial confusion as to what NPS intends. It says that under certain circumstances a permit system would be implemented for day-hiking. But it is unclear what those circumstances would be, or at what point on the trail a permit would be required, or when it would be required. So we asked staff to explain it in plain English. We received conflicting opinions from different staff members as to the meaning of the content of those pages. With so much confusion, it is abundantly clear that a future manager would be free to apply his own interpretation and proceed to do whatever he wanted to do. It is imperative that this section be re-written so as to make the intent very clear.

To require permits for day-hiking has the potential to create a disastrous situation, and should be approached only as a last resort after all other options have been exhausted. ----- Most Wilderness managers have acknowledged that it is unrealistic to expect the same degree of solitude near the road as a few miles in on a trail. Even the first mile or two can thin out the crowd markedly. It should be accepted that there are going to be places where there are more hikers, and other places where there are going to be fewer. It should be expected, and accepted, that there will be more hikers near the beginning of a trail, and that the numbers will thin out as the distance from the road increases. To try to manage for solitude near the beginning of a trail would be social engineering at a level which is unwarranted.

Using the Wilderness Act as justification for requiring permits for day-hiking would have the effect of turning people against the concept of designated Wilderness. With its potential to turn people against the concept of Wilderness, this would be a direct threat to the Wilderness Act.

In the case of dealing with congestion on the Half Dome cables, using the fact that it is in a designated Wilderness resulted in calls for removing the Wilderness designation. The NPS had ample basis for reducing the number of hikers based on safety and resource considerations, and there was no need to tell the public that there were too many people to meet the definition of "solitude". The Wilderness Act does not REQUIRE solitude, only the OPPORTUNITY for it. The Wilderness Act also says "or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation", and telling people they cannot start up the trail because it is crowded hardly falls in that category.

Decisions made at this time should be based on damage to natural and cultural resources, since some of that is essentially irreversible. Decisions regarding perceptions of what constitutes "crowding" on a trail should be deferred to a more comprehensive planning process such as the future Wilderness Stewardship Plan. The solution to "crowding" is really very simple---those who are offended can just walk away from it, rather than expecting others to walk away from them. ----- The final EIS and Plan for this river should drop the discussion of how many people are appropriate on Wilderness trails, and defer that discussion to the Wilderness Stewardship planning process. It should be discussed within the broader framework of Wilderness management (stewardship), and not addressed in the piecemeal manner which is being done at present through the TRP. Any decisions made through the TRP to regulate the number of day-hikers

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

allowed on a trail would bias the future Wilderness Stewardship planning process.

Similarly, it seems that planning for the Glen Aulin camp should be discussed within the context of the entire High Sierra Camp Loop as part of the future Wilderness Stewardship planning process. To discuss it now, and reach conclusions about it in a piecemeal manner as part of the TRP, will have biased future discussion about the other High Sierra Camps. -----
----- We asked about increasing shuttle services to Tuolumne Meadows, and were told that if shuttle service is increased, then NPS would have to reduce the amount of parking in order to keep the number of people the same. But why does the number of people have to be kept at some arbitrary number? And we emphasize "arbitrary". It seems to have been originally based on parking capacity. However, if people arrive by some means that does not involve parking, they are going to be limited anyway. The reason for limiting the number of people even though parking may not be filled totally escapes us. If a rationale is articulated in the TRP, we have not found it.

We don't get this obsession with getting rid of people at Tuolumne when practically all the complaints have been about the unlimited roadside parking eyesore. All that is needed is to ban roadside parking, provide small dispersed parking lots away from the viewing areas, and the sense of congestion would be eliminated.

We agree that the flora and fauna might have different standards, but we are talking about the visual standard.

So long as people are not interfering with others, or impacting the resources excessively, we feel that they should be left free to experience the Park as they see fit. We have a big problem with all this social engineering, telling us what kind of experience we ought to be having. ----- CATHEDRAL LAKES TRAILHEAD AND VISITOR CENTER:

We support using the vicinity of the present visitor center, or expansion of the present parking lot, for Cathedral Lakes trailhead parking. If the area can also continue to be used for the visitor center function (as in Alternative 3), that would seem to be preferred, as it would avoid the necessity of new development in the natural area east of the present visitor center, which is proposed in Alternative 4. Keeping the visitor contact function where it presently is would also mean that the public would continue to have access for appreciation of the historic structure, rather than it being converted to offices. It would also save money, which is presumably a consideration. ----- WE SUPPORT:

Elimination of unauthorized roadside parking, so long as equivalent parking is first provided in other locations. Because of uncertainty as to the accuracy of present parking figures, it is unclear whether the proposed amount of parking would be enough to compensate for the loss of roadside parking. Enough replacement parking should be provided so that there is no net reduction in the amount presently available.

Establishment of time-limited roadside turnouts for scenic viewing. It appears that the number of such turnouts should be increased beyond the four proposed.

Combining of NPS and concessioner stables at the present concessioner location.

Cessation of stock day-rides.

Continuation of campground, with reconfiguration to eliminate sites near the river.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft Tuolumne River Plan.

CA facilitator, Yosemite advocates

Correspondence ID:	349	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar.18,2013 22:04:36				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear NPS,				

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on your draft Tuolumne River Plan and DEIS.

My primary concerns about the Tuolumne River corridor are the profound impacts caused by the commercial High Sierra Camps and the Park Service's head-in-the-sand ("corrupt" is probably a more accurate term) unresponsiveness to these perennial concerns.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

The facts:

1. The NPS must address in its River Plan how the High Sierra Camps and all other public use facilities affect river values.

2. The DEIS downplays and does not honestly disclose the harmful impacts of the H.S.C's. The negative impacts of the High Sierra Camps are substantial, and include not only the direct impacts of human occupancy (i.e., sewage, grey water, garbage, noise, significant degradation of scenery due to the ugly facilities, soil compaction, etc.), but also the indirect impacts (i.e., high levels of noise & intrusion on the camps, river corridor, and surrounding wilderness by helicopters and other construction & maintenance activities; degradation of trails, water pollution, and introduction of invasive weeds resulting from packtrains that supply the camps; and even extensive helicopter SAR operations when H.S.C. clients become lost, etc. These all are real, not imaginary, impacts, and none are honestly disclosed in the DEIS).

3. NPS must consider not only the impacts of the H.S.C. sites themselves, but also the connected negative impacts along the supply routes that lead to the camps. The Glen Aulin H.S.C. is clearly located within the Tuolumne River corridor, but the Vogelsang H.S.C. must also be considered for removal because its continued occupation would profoundly affect river values. (The Vogelsang supply corridor runs in and adjacent to the Tuolumne River corridor for many miles). Animal waste (i.e., manure) from packtrains that supply the camps reaches the river via stormwater runoff, packstock are known to spread invasive weeds, and the degraded trail conditions created by the H.S.C. supply trains are known to seriously harm the experience of park visitors.

3. Yosemite's General Management Plan states that: "Potential wilderness classification will prevent any further development of facilities or services; should existing developments be removed, there will be no reconstruction of facilities." (GMP, p. 28.) Despite this clear direction, NPS continues to arbitrarily re-construct (usually with band-aid fixes and little/no public notice) infrastructure at the Camps when facilities fail and need to be retired or removed (failing sewage mounds, leach fields, water systems, etc., etc.).

NPS staff has argued in the past that it's never time to seriously consider closing the camps. That time is now. Such evasion of this serious issue (i.e., the need to close the H.S.C's as infrastructure fails and impacts worsen, as directed by the GMP and Congressional intent regarding the H.S.C's as stated in the 1984 CA Wilderness Act -- see Section 9 and the House Committee Report) is arbitrary and capricious.

In sum, shame on you. Future generations will rue the NPS's meek and corrupt pandering to these abominable commercial enterprises called the "High Sierra Camps." To date, the NPS has a perfect record of refusing to honestly disclose the harmful impacts of these camps or to seriously consider their closure. Such an alternative (to permanently close Glen Aulin and Vogelsang H.S.C's must be addressed in the Tuolumne River Plan due to the significant adverse impacts that these commercial enterprises impose on the river corridor.

And what about limiting commercial services to the "extent necessary"? Those who visit the camps do not truly need showers, linens, fresh meat, fruits, and vegetables. (They can easily go a few days without showering and eat dried foods just like other backcountry visitors.)

And I have to ask the question: When is it ripe to consider closure of the Vogelsang H.S.Camp? NPS says it's not ripe in this plan, it's not ripe in the Merced River Plan, it's not ripe in the GMP, it's not ripe in the Wilderness Plan, and it's not ripe when the next band-aid fixes are applied to cover up the sewage and wastewater problems that perennially occur. It is disingenuous (and corrupt) to always kick this can down the road and claim that the fundamental issue is never ripe for discussion. You're not fooling anyone, and it is only making the public disrespect and distrust NPS as an agency.

Please close the Glen Aulin and Vogelsang H.S.C's, restore the sites, and recommend the areas for wilderness designation. It will be your greatest legacy.

Correspondence ID:	350	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 22:20:41				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	As a frequent visitor to Yosemite National Park, especially the Tuolumne High Country, and as an active environmentalist and conservationist, I would favor Alternative 4 of the Tuolumne River Plan.				

Correspondence ID:	351	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 22:22:39				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Hello. Thank you for working so hard to produce this draft. Here are my comments: THE NPS SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT CONIFER ENCROACHMENT IS AN URGENT PROBLEM IN TUOLUMNE MEADOWS, AND IF THE PLAN DOES NOT INCLUDE COMPREHENSIVE ACTION TO CONTROL CONIFERS, THE MEADOWS WILL DISAPPEAR AND				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

TRANSFORM INTO A FOREST WITHIN DECADES. Background. NPS Management Policies 2006 state that where the natural processes have been disrupted by human conditions it is permissible to take action to reverse this through maintaining meadows and open areas. Lodgepole seedlings and saplings are encroaching into Tuolumne Meadows at an alarming rate. Volunteers under the supervision of NPS staff removed tens of thousands of seedling conifers from Tuolumne Meadows (TM) this decade. People have been removing conifers from TM at least since the 1930s. The plan states that more research is necessary before the NPS removes conifers from TM, except where conifers would be removed from four scenic vista points. At first, actions to remove small trees may appear in conflict with NPS mandates to restore natural processes that sustain native communities. In addition, climatic shifts seem to favor more conifer encroachment in years with higher minimum temperatures, showing there is a climatic variable to this issue. Yet there is one very important point to consider. The vast majority of conifers are encroaching from the south side of the meadow, where the Tioga Road was constructed through the meadow. Conifers rarely encroach on the north side of the meadow, the side away from the Tioga Road! The NPS conducted research showing that the Tioga Road does not act as a dam that halts sheet flow across the meadow, and that the Tioga Road does not significantly lower water table levels in the meadow (Cooper et al 2006). The NPS appears to overreach the conclusion of the research. Because the road does not appear to be lowering water table levels that sustain the meadow, it does not mean that other factors from the construction of the Tioga Road do not contribute to the conifer encroachment. Ground disturbance and clearing creates ideal conditions for establishment of young lodgepole pines. When the road corridor was cleared through the meadow, and deep meadow sod was scraped off the road shoulder or fill material was inserted, lodgepole pines found ideal habitat. It seems apparent that lodgepole pines are moving into the meadow because of human actions that created ideal conditions for growth. Climate change and higher minimum temperatures further exacerbate the conifer encroachment. Because this is a human-caused issue, the park already the justification to continue to remove trees from the meadow. To sum it up, the plan is weak on conifer removal and it is important to continue conifer without a waiting period for research. This is a critical issue because if the NPS does not address it, we will lose the meadow and all associated meadow ORVs. I suggest the following changes: Chapter 2- Major planning issues ? Page 2-7 ? Subalpine meadow and riparian complex. The plan states, "Recent research suggests that TM is undergoing a shift in vegetation (Cooper et al 2006)." This is all the issue section says about conifer encroachment in terms of the meadow! The public deserves to know that if the NPS does not take action, the meadow likely will become forest in decades. Please change the text accordingly. Chapter 2- Major planning issues ? Page 2-8 ? Scenic The plan states, "Views into and away from TM are being encroached upon by roadside parking and by woody vegetation, primarily lodgepole pines. Woody vegetation is encroaching into some vista points within the river corridor." This is a dramatic understatement. It's not just some vista points that will have conifers, the entire meadow will be gone if conifer encroachment continues. Please change the text accordingly. Chapter 5 ? Biological Values ? Page 5-17 ? Altered fire regimes and conifer encroachment This section does not mention the fact that conifer encroachment is likely related to the fact that the NPS built a road through the south side of the meadow. The call-out box does not mention conifer removal. The aerial spraying of pesticides and fire exclusion may also have lead to an unnaturally dense forest which now contributes to meadow encroachment leading to a much higher than normal seed output. Chapter 5 ? Biological Values ? Page 5-17 ? Effects of Historic Trails, Roads, and Camping The first paragraph does not mention the relationship between building a road through the meadow and conifer encroachment. Additional soil and vegetation disturbance occurred with water and sewer lines buried beneath the meadow and river crossing. Chapter 5 ? Meadow and Riparian ORV ? Actions the NPS Will Take to Address Mgmt Concerns One has to dig through the section to "Conduct Additional Research" to see how the NPS would address conifer encroachment in meadows. The NPS solution is to conduct more research, even though conifers are encroaching at rapid rates, and conifer sapling removal has been taking place for 7 decades. The NPS should modify the final plan and continue to allow conifer removal from the scenic section of the corridor when funding and volunteers are available. The Park is literally losing ground by changing current management and stopping seedling conifer removal. Chapter 5 ? Management Indicators and Monitoring for the Meadow/Riparian ORV- Pg. 5-32+ Back on page 5-19, in the summary of current meadow conditions, the NPS states that recent research documented changes to meadow integrity in terms of (1) bare ground levels, (2) atypical plants, (3) conifer encroachment, and (4) diminished willows/unstable streambanks. Management actions and monitoring in the final plan should stem from these findings. The plan proposes meadow fragmentation/social trails, streambank stability, and bare soil as indicators. These indicators track two of the four topic areas of concern ? bare soil and streambank stability. Social trails/meadow fragmentation is an important indicator, yet a very coarse filter. For example, the plan discusses Stoneman Meadow in Yosemite Valley when it was so fragmented by social trails it was considered to be "degraded." This was a critical first filter, and the social trails correctly indicated low levels of biological integrity in the meadow. Stoneman Meadow now has a boardwalk and a much higher level of vegetative cover. Yet the meadow is threatened by an exotic grass with the potential to take over the entire meadow and a low proportion of wetland plants north of the road through the meadow. Once a meadow reaches an acceptable state of fragmentation, then other forms of monitoring are necessary. I appreciate that the Bare Ground indicator discusses other potential metrics ? composition and productivity ? and gives a rationale for why the bare ground indicator is a better choice than the alternatives. Yet we need additional monitoring to track two more metrics- the size of the meadow (as influenced by conifer encroachment), and the presence of invasive plants. Both of these could be tracked with efficiency and ease. Consider tracking the size of the meadow with GIS technology- walking either the meadow perimeter or aerial photos. This would track the status of conifer encroachment, and once every 2 to 5 years may be sufficient. Also, consider tracking the potential for invasive plant invasion and looking at meadow composition to track the "atypical" plant communities. Simple invasive plant inventories could suffice to look for invasive plants unless a major infestation quickly enters the meadow. In addition, plant composition monitoring would let the NPS know the real status of the meadows. Each plant community in the meadow tells a story ? water table levels, trampling history, grazing history, etc. This type of information is not found from monitoring meadow fragmentation. Scenic Actions ? Appendix J The scenic actions proposed in the west end of TM need to be mapped and evaluated in concert with each other. There would be a swath of conifers removed from the Tuolumne Meadow Trail to Parsons Lodge. A swath of conifers removed from the Pothole Dome Turnout, and a swath of conifers removed from Parson's Lodge. Imagine these areas cleared (albeit with feathering), and all remaining areas of the meadow choked with conifers. Again, the aggressiveness of conifer encroachment is not taken into consideration.

Correspondence ID:	352	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:			Unaffiliated Individual		

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Received: Mar,18,2013 22:48:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like it if all mules and horses had to wear mandatory defecation bags as they traveled on trails in the National Parks. It would enhance the experience of all who hike those trails and improve the health aspects of the environment that is now adversely affected by the manure left by these animals. If suitable bags are not available, then having a clean up person assigned to each animal caravan should be mandatory. You don't tolerate human defecations on the trails, why allow animal defecations?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 353 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 22:57:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just trying to sneak in under the wire. I was introduced to the Tuolumne river and associated wilderness areas in 1950 with a long time friend of Yosemite and his family on a mule pack trip ending up in the high Sierra. Sanitation those days was to drink upstream from the mules, and find a "crack with a view" for personal necessities. Obviously long past practical advice. Even with the "crowds" Tuolumne Meadows has a special place in my outdoor life. In reviewing the preferred alternative I was pleased to find that much of what I cherish has been preserved, and has been given priority over sanitation necessities without thankfully ignoring those necessities. I applaud your choice to preserve the wilderness feel for Tuolumne Meadows at the expense of lookie-lous and motor tourists, and look forward to many more short wilderness hikes which are about all I can do these days.

Nicely and sensitively done. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 354 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 23:27:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NPS,

Please withhold my personally identifiable information from public review.

I am writing to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan and specifically to support the complete and permanent removal of the Glen Aulin and Vogelsang "High Sierra Camps," the restoration of those sites, and designation of the potential wilderness additions as wilderness. It is not fair for a handful of privileged commercial visitors to create the pollution and destruction of scenery, trails, and quietude that I value so much. Generations of park visitors would benefit greatly if these commercial camps were closed and the sites restored.

Thank you for considering my views.

Correspondence ID: 355 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: Tuolumne River Trust Conservation/Preservation

Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan. I am submitting these comments on behalf of the Tuolumne River Trust.

Overall, TRT is pleased that Yosemite has put the time and effort into developing a Wild and Scenic Management Plan for the Tuolumne River. As you know, TRT was formed in 1981 for the purpose of protecting the Tuolumne River from dams and diversions and was instrumental in winning Wild and Scenic designation for the river in 1984. Thus the Wild and Scenic Management Plan has been a long time coming.

The Tuolumne River, throughout its length is a highly valued for both its ecologic and recreational value. It hosts a tremendous diversity of fish and wildlife, from Chinook salmon and steelhead, to the Great Grey Owl, black bear, and marten. It provides unique recreational opportunities as well, attracting thousands of visitors to paddle its whitewater and hike along its shores. Within Yosemite, the river provides a unique attraction to visitors to experience a large high altitude meadow complex.

The meadows are delicate however and have been heavily used over the past century and the wear and tear is beginning to show. As such, we support efforts to reduce human impacts and restore the meadow system.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

We provide the following comments on various aspects of the draft EIS:

-It is important to minimize impacts to the river wherever possible. This is especially true with regards to the Tuolumne Meadows Campground, Tuolumne Meadows Lodge, and Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. While we recognize the recreational value of the facilities, we believe that it is important to move them away from the river corridor to the greatest extent possible and restrict access to the river's banks so as to reduce erosion and encourage riparian vegetation growth. We request greater specificity be provided as to how access to the banks will be limited. Potential measures that could accomplish this include fencing and formal trails that allow access as specific designated locations, signage directing visitors to stay on designated trails, and revegetating the banks with native riparian vegetation.

-We are pleased to see and very supportive of the actions that would restore the hydrologic integrity of the meadows. The Tioga Road and Great Sierra Wagon Road in particular are disruptive of natural hydrologic flow within the meadows. Erosion is visible due to the culverts and flow across the meadow is impeded by the Great Sierra Wagon Road. Culverts need to be resized and for the Great Sierra Wagon Road, a boardwalk system should be considered. Similarly, the many informal and unofficial footpaths across the meadow must be removed and visitors must be prevented from similar use in the future.

-To improve the overall ecologic health of the meadow complex, we encourage the park to consider and analyze reintroducing fire as a management tool of the meadow system. Conifers are visibly encroaching into the meadows. We believe that many of the meadow grasses, sedges, and forbes would thrive if fire were periodically applied while conifers would be prevented from colonizing the meadows.

-We wish to encourage the park to allow boating on the river above Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Paddling is allowed and fully supported on the 200 (+) Wild and Scenic Rivers across the country, and is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience a wild landscape. Yosemite National Park should be no exception. As a river conservation organization, we care deeply about the health of the Tuolumne River and support management actions that protect the river within the Park. This includes placing reasonable limits on recreational use of river corridors to ensure visitor capacities are not exceeded. A user capacity of zero aimed solely at paddling, however, is unacceptable particularly above Hetch Hetchy Reservoir.

While some sections of the Tuolumne River contains areas of technically challenging whitewater, we feel it is a mistake for the Park Service to eliminate paddling based upon its own determination of the risk. The risks of paddling the Tuolumne are not atypical of many treasured recreational experiences that are celebrated elsewhere in Yosemite and across the National Park System. Boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience the Tuolumne River given their skills and abilities.

-Alternative water supply approaches should be analyzed, included rainwater collection systems, cisterns, and reuse of greywater. The Tuolumne River is heavily tapped and any opportunities to use its waters more efficiently and wisely must be considered. This could also complement actions designed to improve the treatment and other management of wastewater.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 356 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Mar,18,2013 23:48:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Draft Management plan. I commend you on the materials provided to the public. They certainly made it easier to see both differences and similarities between the alternatives. I found both the 19 page handout (made available at the public outreach sessions) and the "Summary of Comparisons of Alternatives" in the Draft document itself (pages 7-101 through 7-118) helpful. They were a good introduction and handy reference during reading. The maps also were very well done and a fine concentration of info and an aid in visualizing each plan.

In my limited space here I think it easiest to address major areas that run across all alternative plans identifying a preference with supporting reasons.

WASTEWATER: Existing ponds are not overly offensive to me. Not the ideal aesthetic to be sure but they are away from most visitor use. The pumping facility down near the road is surprisingly inconspicuous- most visitors are unaware of its presence. If they can be replaced by a singular facility in area 7 that is also well hidden, all the better. Obviously, no-flush urinals make great sense both from a water conservation and waste disposal standpoint.

VISITOR CENTER: Important to have one easily seen and accessed, therefore right along the Tioga road. Therefore Alt #1's design not a good one. Many visitors are first time/one time. They need and want assistance planning their day. This is also the best time to educate them in how to protect and respect the resources. Current one at location 6 is reasonable size and of historical design. Relocation to better access Parsons Lodge trail makes sense. Designated trail options do need to be near parking areas if visitors are expected to stay on them. My first thoughts were to have the wilderness center in the same area- one stop shopping and all- but I do see advantages to having it at a distance to disperse parking. In fact, probably want backpacker

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

parking in a location where it will be dedicated to wilderness permitting and trail heads so that day use will not fill it.

GLEN AULIN HSC: I think that the High Sierra camps are a unique opportunity for a back country experience for those who otherwise might not be able to enjoy it (young families, physically limited, elderly). There is plenty of other back country for those seeking a more solitary and primitive experience. I say this as a backpacker who has stayed at Glen Aulin on many occasions and never at a HSC "hotel". On the other hand I can see a future when the High Sierra camps may be a wonderful opportunity to keep the high country as a precious destination. Improved sanitation facilities and water conservation make perfect sense. Walk in diners should be eliminated. This would help minimize stock impacts along the trails leading in as well as accommodate the smaller capacity of combining horse facilities.

CAPACITY: is an overriding factor which dramatically effects the quality of visitor experience and the sustainability of the river and its corridor. Alternative 4's approach seems to me to best walk the line between allowing the public to access its park, making sure they have a quality experience, and protecting the natural resources. Day use is reduced a little but that seems necessary to get roadside parking eliminated. Increased bus delivery from the Vally and the east side provides alternative ways to enter and improved shuttle service along the Tioga road will make a car less essential. I am concerned with how the trail day use will be "managed" in the alternatives that implement it. I do advocate a quality experience over "quantity" but am curious about the details of how to ensure this and regulate it. Back country quotas work fairly well but the burden on the system is minimal. Day use is quite another challenge during the high season.

LAND RESTORATION / DISTURBANCE: Alternative 4 has a good balance. Some disturbance (needed for the new visitors center) but also a good restoration effort for the meadow and riparian lands.

ROADSIDE PARKING: I'm 100% with the proposals to remove this- a total blight and contradiction to the natural setting. Particularly offensive when entering from the west. Glad to see all alternatives address this.

GAS STATION AND MOUNTAINEERING SHOP. I agree with removing these. The grill is an extra amenity too. Do need a store for basics for the campers.

RAFTING: I am curious where white-water rafting might be allowed on the Tuolumne River. I cannot envision it anywhere along the Tioga Road corridor. At the very time rafting along the Merced River (at least in the park boundaries) is being considered for removal it seems odd to consider adding it along the Tuolumne. Entry and exit points would have to be highly regulated to protect stream side lands, so would the approaches for rafts and equipment and people.

THANK YOU for the chance to put in my two cents. I am curious what others have to say. Please keep me informed about ongoing developments with the Management Plan. Hopefully creative and feasible solutions rise to the top so that we can all continue to enjoy and yet protect this precious River and its surroundings.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	357	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Mar 14, 2013 Yosemite National Park Dear National Park, Yosemite National Park is a national treasure. The park's high country of Tuolumne Meadows and the Tuolumne River corridor are an integral part of the park . I am writing to support efforts to preserve and restore the Tuolumne River and Tuolumne Meadows. I support the parts of the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River plan which make needed changes to protect the River and the meadows. I applaud certain measures of the Park Service's proposed actions to protect and enhance the outstanding values of the Tuolumne River in Yosemite National Park, including better management of parking and visitor use in Tuolumne Meadows. I support Alternative 4 of the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic Plan to "Improve the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences", but without any increase in maximum day visitor use, because I appreciate the relative solitude and wilderness experience of the Yosemite High Country. I support the removal of unnecessary or potentially polluting development such as the fueling station. I also urge more public transit into and around the Park so that visitors can access and enjoy the Park without the hassle or impact of increased traffic and cars. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Sincerely, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	358	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Mailing Address: [REDACTED] USA				

As a Yosemite Park resident and employee of over 12 years, and an active environmentalist I think that lowering the allotted numbers for either established back country campgrounds or the high sierra camps is a huge mistake. I think these changes are

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

being directed in inappropriate areas. These are the experiences that we should all urge people who visit the park to have.

The campgrounds and high sierra camps should be invested in and expanded if anything. This is the closest "wilderness experience" we can offer to families, the elderly, the frail or the plain inexperienced. I feel if attempts are made to lighten the load of these areas more people will go journeying in areas beyond their self-control and cause more accidents and disrespect to the land because they will be even further removed from their comfort zone which is already being taxed.

The high sierra camps not only provide what to many is the most wilderness-like experience they will probably ever witness (almost all leave touched emotionally, humiliated spiritually and with a new sense of respect for nature and its wonders: far more than I can say for those who come and never leave the pavement) but the camps act as stewards and teachers, constantly reminding visitors of good "leave-no-trace" practices.

Remember that most who venture into the back-country are not as familiar with such activities as those of us who live in the area, which is presumably those who advocate these changes. But these are the experiences we should encourage visitors to have rather than the typical tourist vacation where lots of money is spent and little is gained. The tourists of most concern should be those that remain on the pavement and those searching for a more deeply intimate relationship with nature should be invested in.

Correspondence ID:	359	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,13,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Tuolumne River Plan Planning Team,				

I am writing to comment on the proposed Tuolumne River Plan and its alternatives. Since I was 4 years old I have been visiting Tuolumne Meadows every summer with my family and camping in the campground. I'm now 28 years old, so Tuolumne has been my home away from home for the past 24 years. Too add to this experience, the past two summers I worked in Tuolumne as an interpretive park ranger, helping the public make lasting connections with this place I love deeply. My work in Tuolumne was very rewarding but also challenging. It was difficult to see the impact increasing numbers of visitors were making on an ecosystem with fleeting seasons and fragile habitats. I have read the draft Tuolumne River Management Plan and want to comment on Alternative 4. I know this is the park's preferred plan, and for the most part I support it, but there are a few areas with which I take issue.

Management of Visitor Use and Use Capacity:

--The plan states there will be an upgrade to the shower house at the lodge. I strongly disagree with this. With increasing climate change the flows in the Dana and Lyell Fork are likely to decrease and/or become more unpredictable. Lee Vining, only 30 minutes away, is a perfectly good place to shower. Why not conserve more water for the Tuolumne River. Or if not get rid of showers, limit them to 3 minutes and then the flow shuts off. Three minute showers offer enough water to get clean while conserving

gallons of water.

--I strongly support increasing the frequency of shuttle bus service! As a ranger and a visitor I used the shuttle whenever possible, but more frequent trips are certainly more likely to get people to ride the shuttle.

--I support the removal of roadside parking with a few concerns:

?One concern of mine is the use of designated parking spaces to limit the number of visitors. The idea, as I understand it, is that by having a limited number of parking spaces in Tuolumne the number of cars and therefore people will be limited to a certain number. I support this idea, but I wonder if there is a plan in place for dealing with idling cars waiting for parking spaces to open up, cruising the roadway, and generally causing traffic congestion. I don't think people who really want to spend a day in Tuolumne will give up being able to park so easily. Will law enforcement be prepared to handle this? I wouldn't want Tuolumne to end up looking like the valley with clogged roadways and lots of exhaust.

?I have a big problem with the "Trails and Trailheads" section. "Install protective fencing" is a phrase used more than once, and while I think delineating a trail is very good and helpful, I think fencing is entirely different. Installing "protective fencing" on either side of the trail out to Parsons Memorial Lodge from Tioga Road and on either side of the trail/access road from the Lambert Dome Parking Lot worries me. My experience as a hiker/walker would be strongly impacted in a negative way by having to look over fences. I am a responsible person who will stay on a trail when it is delineated there is no need for fencing. I would think the park is catering to visitors who stay in their vehicles if they remove roadside parking (ah, unobstructed views from the road!) but then put up fencing for those who choose to get out of the car and enjoy Tuolumne on foot. Please consider

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

removing the word "fencing" and defining "delineate" there are ways to delineate trails without obstructing views.

?I would like to see the use trail made from the campground's D loop that crosses the road at the culvert over Unicorn Creek and then follows one of the small side streams to finally meet up with the trail between Tioga Road and Parsons Lodge made into a designated trail (see attached map I've marked the trail). I don't want it to be bigger, and it doesn't even have to be marked, but I noticed at the end of the season it was "closed for restoration." Trails like these, in my opinion, keep people from trampling the rest of the meadow in a fragile area, and provide access for those wishing to walk from the campground to Parsons Lodge. These are sometimes described as "Fisherman's Trails" I would like to see them kept intact because I believe people will want these shortcuts to exist, and will create them no matter what. Another example is the trail between the store and Parson's Lodge. I strongly believe these use trails should be kept intact for those who want to experience Tuolumne by foot. It would impact my experience as a walker to have to go to one of the major parking lots at the visitor center or Lembert Dome just to catch a trail out towards Parson's Lodge. In addition, these trails have defined my Tuolumne experience, which I feel would be lost without them in favor of catering to one-time visitors in cars.

--I am concerned about how/where the Lembert Dome Picnic area would be expanded? It is my hope that none of the very old lodgepoles close to the parking lot will be removed.

--I don't understand the need for stock trips daily to the high sierra camps. The trail between Glen Aulin HSC and Parsons Lodge is highly impacted I hardly hike on it if I can help it. I have had many visitors complain to me as a ranger about the state of this trail, and others like it. Is there another method to deliver goods, such as via helicopter? I strongly support decreasing the number of guests if it will help to limit the impact on these trails. If there are going to be stock trips on these trails, why not keep day rides from the stables? The trails are going to be impacted by horses anyway. The day rides were part of my Tuolumne experience, and if pack trips to the High Sierra Camps are going to exist I don't see why we should get rid of stable rides. I'm in favor of getting rid of the pack animals altogether as I believe they have a high impact, but it seems like the pack trips are here to stay.

--I would like to see packers adhering to stricter rules about where they can take their animals. I was shocked many times last summer to see them guiding their horses and mules into the river to drink. This affects water quality and disturbs the fragile river environment. If we are asking visitors to be considerate of the environment, it only makes sense we take the impacts of pack animals more seriously.

I want to end my comments with a general comment about signage in Tuolumne Meadows. I believe that the public needs to be more informed about how to "be" in Tuolumne, as we interpretive rangers like to say. People do read signs and will, generally, follow directions when provided with guidance. Too many times last summer I encountered visitors who didn't know not to take their dogs on trails or to be careful about where they were walking in Tuolumne. As a ranger it was supremely frustrating to me to see very few signs educating people about why they can't bring their dog with them, or why walking on the meadow can be harmful to vegetation. So many signs that do exist just tell visitors what they can't do, but not why! There aren't enough interpretive rangers out there to educate everyone, which is why I think a network of clear, concise, and interesting interpretive signs are essential to implementing the Tuolumne River Plan. I am also a trained science illustrator, so I see the potential in imagery to convey complex ideas and peak the interest of the public. I feel very strongly that Tuolumne needs better educational signage at vital intersections, such as the start of the trail from Tioga Road to Parsons Lodge, at the Lembert Dome Parking Lot (why feeding wildlife is bad for them!), at the Pothole Dome Parking lot (what feet do to meadow vegetation).

I know I have a lot of comments, but spending so much time in Tuolumne Meadows has made me love this place even more. I want to say a big thank you to the TRP Planning Team. I have met some of you and do have some grasp on how difficult and complex this plan has been to develop. Your hard work is very much appreciated by me and many others. I know that my comments are in good hands and I thank you again for all your hard work on behalf of Tuolumne and the future of Yosemite.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

----- [Redacted Address]

Correspondence ID:	360	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar.13,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Superintendent 3/13/13 Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Plan PO Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389				

Dear Sir, I would like to offer the following comments on the Tuolumne River Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

I believe the Tuolumne River Plan and EIS are deficient in addressing the full impacts of the High Sierra Camps and their

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

infrastructure. Though the Plan looks at some aspects of one of these facilities at Glen Aulin, Tuolumne Meadows is in fact the hub for supporting and supplying 3 and possibly 4 of the 5 High Sierra Camps.

These commercial hostelry facilities located in the Yosemite wilderness require an industrial scale operation to operate. The base for these operations is the concessioner stable at Tuolumne Meadows within the Scenic River area.

Although the Sunrise, Vogelsang, and May Lake camps are themselves outside the Wild and Scenic River zone, the trucking in of supplies, parking for staff and customers and pack stock delivery of supplies and removal of waste from the camps all occur within or partially within the Wild and Scenic River zone and must be addressed.

According to a Park Service information sheet titled "Pack Stock in the Tuolumne River Corridor" there were 2,409 stock "passes" (i.e. an animal passing a fixed point on a trail) in 2011 to supply the High Sierra Camps. The consequences of this scale of activity are extensive and highly detrimental to the wilderness values of the Tuolumne wild and Scenic zone. Specific subjects that should be addressed include: Large truck traffic delivering supplies and hauling away Camp waste from the concessioner stables. Traffic and parking generated by all of the High Sierra Camps at Tuolumne Meadows. Pack Stock operations including: traffic generation resulting from concessioner staff, trucking of feed and supplies for the stock, trucking stock to trail heads, trail damage and erosion caused by thousands of stock animals, pollution of tributary streams and the Tuolumne River by stock feces and soil sediments washed into water courses by rainfall and snowmelt. Introduction of nonnative plant species through stock feed and feces. Aesthetic detriment due to dust, smells, insects, and trampled landscape caused by stock.

Trails that take the brunt of the supply trips in the Wild and Scenic zone are the Glen Aulin Trail (PCT), John Muir Trail and the Rafferty Creek Trail. Segments of these trails are severely eroded by the effects of heavy pack stock use. From my reading of the Plan and EIS this impact is not addressed adequately and there is little or no remediation of these conditions provided for.

In summery I feel it is essential for the Tuolumne River Plan and EIS to thoroughly evaluate the impact of all High Sierra Camp operations at Tuolumne Meadows and in the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic zone. Operation of a commercial enterprise of this scale within the Wild and Scenic River zone and designated wilderness is a conflict that needs resolution. The Preferred Alternative should be amended to mitigate the negative effects of the High Sierra Camp enterprise.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	361	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Here are our comments on the Tuolumne River Draft Plan:				

Overall, Alternative 4 is an acceptable, balanced approach for visitor services and resource protection. However, we strongly disagree on the elimination of the Public Fuel Station. Removal of this station would be a severe inconvenience (and waste of energy) to visitors who would be forced to go all the way down to Lee Vining or Crane Flats for fuel. Given the current environmental regulations regarding underground tanks, the water resources should be adequately protected. Another option would be to replace the underground tanks with aboveground tanks. In addition, the proposed trailhead and trailhead parking for Cathedral Lakes Trail is not very convenient for hikers. Alternative 2 proposed for this trailhead and parking is much more practical.

As frequent camping visitors to Tuolumne Meadows area, we are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain campsites. We are disappointed that the Park Service is not doing more to add camping facilities on the east side of Yosemite.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Plan and all the effort that has gone into preparing the Plan.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	362	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	From: YOSE Planning, NPS <yose_planning@nps.gov> Date: Fri, Mar 15, 2013 at 10:24 AM Subject: 06 To: [REDACTED]				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

----- Forwarded message ----- From: [REDACTED] Date: Wed, Mar 13, 2013 at 12:16 PM
Subject: Paddling In Yosemite To: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Parks system,

I am a member of American Whitewater and I wanted to quickly express that I would love for you to consider opening your rivers for all our enjoyment. the ecological damage kayaking would bring to the rivers is nothing compared to the trails and other necessities much of the other supported activities of the park leave. a boat can float down a river and leave no traces at all. That said I hope you will consider allowing boating down your rivers one day so I might enjoy the natural resource we all care about.

All my best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	363	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	From: [REDACTED] Date: Tue, Mar 12, 2013 at 9:03 PM Subject: From NPS.gov: Open the Tuolumne for paddling To: yose_planning@nps.gov				

Email submitted from: [REDACTED] at /yose/parkmgmt/trp.htm

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

It has come to my attention that Yosemite is doing a re-evaluation of river use on the Tuolumne River in Yosemite Park. I believe that paddlers hold the values that the Park wants to promote and project- human powered, place based, low impact, quiet, non-consumptive, skill based and wilderness compliant. I believe that with proper use limits, and responsible management- opening the Tuolumne River in Yosemite Park for paddling opportunities will create more public benefit within the park boundaries and further encourage responsible use of its resources. Please consider working with organizations like American Whitewater to come up with "best practices" for responsible use, and re-evaluate the public benefit from opening the river in the park. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	364	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 11, 2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389

Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

My name is [REDACTED] I am a California resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

I started boating when I was a kid and I truly believe that boating across several well preserved rivers strongly increased my awareness for these specially preserved areas and made me care much more for nature. I hope you will give the opportunity to boat in the rivers within the park because by doing so you may change forever the life of several people and increase their support for natural parks and in particular for the Yosemite National Park.

Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,



Correspondence ID:	365	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To Whom it May Concern:				

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the four alternative plans for the Tuolumne River. My family and I have been visiting and camping in Tuolumne Meadows for the last 25 years. I would like to know that the park will maintain its beauty and grandeur for my grandchildren. With climate change causing great droughts across the United States, I am very concerned about the water levels of the Tuolumne River as well as the dryness of the meadow. I know that last year there was concern that the campground and Tuolumne Lodge might have to close due to a shortage of water. In my opinion, cutting water use in the meadow and protecting flora and fauna should be the highest priority. As we all know, climate change is expected to get worse, not better.

It seems to me that the only way to ensure that Tuolumne Meadows is not overly impacted by people that are "loving it to death" is to adopt Alternative 1 and emphasize a self-reliant experience. I have been told that Alternative 1 could never be an option because it leaves out too much of the general public so I will not spend too much time on it. I was never aware that Tuolumne Lodge has 69 units. Cutting the use of pack animals and concessioner horses would certainly cut the use of water. I would have no problem with cutting out loop A in the campground. The total number of people would decrease by 1,611 people at one time. Reducing that number of visitors a day would give Tuolumne a chance to maintain its water levels as well as cut the number of cars invading the park every day.

Alternative 4 is the preferred plan that supposedly improves the traditional Tuolumne experience but I have to ask for whom? Day visitors would increase, thereby encouraging more visitors and drivers to come to the park. I am glad to see that parking would have to be in designated spaces but at the same time I hate to see parking lots built. Would there be enough law enforcement to deal with visitors that would insist on parking on the road if they couldn't find parking spaces. When the park is full would there be signs telling people to move on or would people continue to drive around until they found a parking space thus polluting the air with car exhaust?

I would like to see advance reservation for Tuolumne camping spaces reserved for people that live in the United States. Also, campsites should be reserved one at a time. Each year for the past few years it has been impossible for our family to make a reservation. Even though we are calling at the exact date, day, time and second campsites are posted, they are reserved immediately. Rumor has it that travel groups are reserving large blocks of spaces before any one else has a chance. I have even heard that individuals are purchasing sites and selling them on Ebay. The park service even has a phone number for out of country reservations. Of course all people should have a right to camp in Tuolumne, but out of country visitors should apply on a first come first serve basis.

Thank you again for the opportunity to respond to these lengthy alternatives. I hope choices are based on what will be the best

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

for preservation of the flora and fauna of Tuolumne Meadows.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 366 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Hello Park service, Alternative 4 sounds good. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 367 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,11,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: From: [REDACTED] Date: Mon, Mar 11, 2013 at 5:49 PM Subject: To: yose_planning@nps.gov

I support alternative #4 Sent from Xfinity Connect Mobile App

Correspondence ID: 368 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: I would hate to see the reduction of beds in tent cabins at Glen Aulin. The High Sierra Loop Trail would become more difficult without access to that site. Although I am in my early 70's but still in good shape for hiking, to have to skip that stopover would turn hiking the High Sierra Loop Trail into more of a distance challenge. I could do that, but for me, the joy of being there is to see while I am covering the miles.

It seems important to me that a proper balance be maintained between public access and environmental concerns. Without access, the public will not know the magnificent beauty of this place and have no interest in maintaining it, which in the long run could lead to loss of our parks.

Thanks for giving an opportunity for commenting. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 369 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,09,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Superintendent Don Neubacher

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389

Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As an avid kayaker and climber who has visited Yosemite many times over the past 40 years I have had the opportunity to hike along both the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. I am writing to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and EIS for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. I am pleased to see that opening of these rivers to boating is being considered in several of the Alternatives. Kayaking is a non-damaging activity that is permitted in several other National Parks. The Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne would be one of the premier self support wilderness kayak

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

runs in the country if it was open. Having climbed many of the big walls and hiked much of the backcountry in Yosemite I have enjoyed much of what it has to offer. To me a kayak trip down the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne would probably be the ultimate backcountry experience in the park.

Kayaking is just one more way for people of all levels of expertise to explore and develop an appreciation for Yosemite in a non damaging way. I encourage you to pursue those Alternatives that permit boating on the rivers of Yosemite.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	370	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	After attending the meeting in Yosemite Valley on Feb. 21st, I find the preferred plan #4 the most versatile and reasonable to meet varied visitor's needs from backpackers to campers to those who use Tuolumne Lodge. Addressing the roadside parking is essential. I'm only disappointed that Glen Aulin has been reduced so much, since it's the gateway to waterwheel falls. [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	371	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	County Government				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Mono County Community Development Department				

March 7, 2013

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park

Attn: Tuolumne River Plan

PO BOX 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

The purpose of this letter is to request an extension of the comment period deadline for the Draft Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan EIS. Recognizing the importance of Yosemite to Mono County and our gateway communities, we are attempting to coordinate comments from several Mono County commissions and committees for consideration by our Board of Supervisors, and ultimately for your consideration. An extension of the comment period to April 18 to coincide with the comment period closing date of the Merced Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan would be ideal. If not feasible, then a 15 day extension is requested to allow time for the Mono County Board of Supervisors to submit comments at their April 2, 2013 meeting.

The outreach of your staff to Mono County has been very informative, particularly the presentation in Mammoth Lakes February 23, and the briefing to the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team February 28. Your favorable consideration of this extension request is appreciated.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Director

Correspondence ID: 372 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Feb,22,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park

P_O. Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear: Superintendent Neubacher:

I am writing in regards to the Merced and Tuolumne River Plan. I urge you to open these rivers to commercial and private river running activities within the park. Other national parks, like Dinosaur National Monument, Canyonlands National Park and the Grand Canyon permit controlled river running to occur.

I'm sure part of the Park Service's concern is in regards to minimal impact on its flora, fauna and other elements. Running rivers is no more intrusive than rock climbing, or the roads and commercial developments already within the National Park. Indeed river runners are required to, and most always comply with, removing their trash, human waste, using tarps in kitchen/eating areas and other leave no trace, minimal impact activities.

A standard argument against boating in parks like Yosemite is that it is not safe. The development of modern river craft and safety accessories, as well as the continuing advances in river skills make the safe transit of rivers like the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers more practical than thirty years ago. Recent studies by the river industry indicate that river running is safer than driving or playing softball!

The cost of issuing permits and monitoring use can be partially covered through the permit fee process. By providing river use you will also broaden support for management activities through the new individuals, clubs, and the river industry. In the austere times we will be looking at in the foreseeable future that would benefit Yosemite National Park's budget and management activities. In addition less law enforcement time would have to be spent playing hide and seek with the now illegal river users. In regards to permits I caution you to keep their cost low. I have over 45 years river running on the Colorado plateau, and recently with the rising cost of river permits I have noticed fewer and fewer moderate to low income users. When I talk with the 300 some people on my mailing list they almost always indicate that the high cost of obtaining a permit is a major factor in keeping them away in this economy.

As a retired National Park Service ranger, I understand the mission of the Service to "preserve the parks for the enjoyment of future generations." But all too often (and I worked in the old Rocky Mountain regional office for a time) I observed that mission as an oxymoron to prevent legitimate uses and ideas from being implemented. We used to refer to it as the Nikita Khrushchev syndrome: What you have is negotiable, what we have is not negotiable." Thus when the preponderance of users sought to add river camp sites, or improve boat ramps their request was denied on the basis of preserving the Park and the difficulties presented by the NEPA process. But when the National Park Service wanted to build a new road, visitor center, public campground or other developments they simply wrote and selected an alternative, then asked for public input for the pre-selected alternative, did the appropriate studies and went ahead with what they wanted to do. Please do not follow that format in this process.

I will close by saying that I was pleased to see some boating opportunities offered in some of the alternatives, particularly in Alternative #2. But I strongly urge you to simply open up the park to boating on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers.

[REDACTED]

oneway boatworks Life member: Colorado Plateau River Guides & Grand Canyon River Guides

Correspondence ID: 373 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Recreational Groups
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Superintendent Neubacher,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

The Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau is the lead agency for Madera County tourism. The Bureau has consistently advocated for the visitor to our region. It is our goal to ensure that visitation is an experience that is memorable and rewarding. In addition, we strive to promote our region so that our local gateway economy is robust and sustainable. Madera County's tourism economy is second only to agriculture and is a primary provider of employment in the Eastern Madera County gateway communities.

With this in mind, we continue to encourage the National Park Service to remain conscious in their efforts to keep the people that desire to visit their National Park foremost in their planning efforts. We believe that a balance between the resource and a common sense approach to providing access and recreational opportunities for all is achievable. We believe that visitor diversity is extremely important and that Yosemite Park opportunities should not be reserved for only the people of means. Minorities, those of modest means and the disabled need to be encouraged to visit their public parks.

In the Tuolumne River Plan we would discourage the discontinuation of concessionaire horse- back riding. Disabled persons, as well as the general public that are not hikers or backpackers, should not be precluded from enjoying the back country of Yosemite. The gas station should be retained. Those visitors spending time in the area should not be required to drive to Lee Vining or Crane Flat and back to refuel. Managing trails near Tioga Road should be done very carefully keeping in mind that "opportunities for solitude" exist in many areas in the immediate vicinity. The wilderness area, 95% of Yosemite, provides a great many "opportunities". Dispersed parking should be re tained, allowing for an "un-crowded" experience.

Thank you for providing this chance to comment. We understand the difficulty in balancing the positions of a varied constituency. We only ask that the "general public" is not ignored.

Sincerely,

Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau,

██████████ CEO

██████████ President

Correspondence ID:	374	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Federal Government				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Don L. Neubacher, Superintendent				

Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

Attn: Tuolumne River Plan DEIS

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River

Comprehensive Management Plan, Yosemite National Park, California (CEQ#20130003)

Dear Mr. Neubacher:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the above project. Our review and comments are pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. EPA understands that a new Wild and Scenic Management Plan is needed for the protection of Tuolumne River values including water quality, riparian habitats, and visitor experience. The preferred alternative (Alternative 4) would provide a great number of visitor opportunities while still maintaining the integrity of natural and cultural resources. Based on our review, EPA has rated the proposed project as Lack of Objections (see enclosed "Summary of EPA Rating Definitions").

Alternative 4 proposes to eliminate concessioner stock rides to Glen Aulin camp and to reduce stock day rides along the Tuolumne Meadows and Tioga Road corridor (p. 7-88 through 7-89). It is unclear whether the stock rides that transport supplies to the High Sierra camps would be eliminated, as well, or whether they would be reduced or expanded in number. We recommend that the Final EIS provide clarification of the number of commercial versus supply stock rides that would operate in

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

the river corridor under the Preferred Alternative, including the associated impacts.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Draft EIS. Should you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (415) 972-3521, or contact Stephanie Skophammer, the lead reviewer for the project. Stephanie can be reached at (415) 972-3098 or skophammer.stephanie@epa.gov. Kathleen Martyn Goforth, Manager Environmental Review Office
Communities and Ecosystems Division

Enclosures: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"L0" (Lack of Objections) The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns) The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"E0" (Environmental Objections) The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory) The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

ADEQUACY OF IMPACT STATEMENT

"Category 1" (Adequate) EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information) The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which should be analysed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Action Impacting Environment.

"Category 3" (Inadequate)

Correspondence ID:	375	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO CORPS OF ENGINEERS Federal				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Received: Government
Mar. 14, 2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

SACRAMENTO CA 95814-2922

1325 J STREET

March 14, 2013

Regulatory Division (SPK-201 1-001 14)

Mr. Don Neubacher National Park Service Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577

Yosemite, California 95389

Dear Mr. Neubacher:

We are responding to your January 15, 2013 request for comments on the Draft Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (Dra_ Tuolumne River Plan/EIS). This project is located on the Tuolumne River, Tuolumne and Mariposa Counties, California.

The Corps of Engineers' jurisdiction within the study area is under the authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the discharge of dredged or fill material into Waters of the United States. Waters of the United States include, but are not limited to, rivers, perennial or intermittent streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands, vernal pools, marshes, wet meadows, some canals, and seeps. Project features that result in the discharge of dredged or material into waters of the United States will require Department of the Army authorization prior to starting work. To ascertain the extent of waters on the project site, the applicant should prepare a wetland delineation, in accordance with the "Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetlands Delineations", under "Jurisdiction" on our website at the address below, and submit it to this office for verification. A list of consultants that prepare Wetland delineations and permit application documents is also available on our website at the same location. The Draft EIS shows that a wetland delineation has been prepared for this project, but until it is verified by our office we cannot address its validity. Therefore, we recommend submitting the wetland delineation to our office for verification.

The range of alternatives considered for this project should include alternatives that avoid impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States. Every effort should be made to avoid project features which require the discharge of dredged or material into waters of the United States. In the event it can be clearly demonstrated there are no practicable alternatives to filling waters of the United States, mitigation plans should be developed to compensate for the unavoidable losses resulting from project implementation. The Corps of Engineers supports the alternative that restores and protects the most waters of the United States, including wetlands, for this project.

If waters of the United States are going to be impacted, cultural resource sites within the defined federal permit area will need to be evaluated according to the standards of the National Environmental Policy Act. All eligible or potentially eligible cultural resource sites to the National Register of Historic Places within the permit area will be subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 1966, as amended. The Corps of Engineers must also comply with the terms and conditions of the Federal Endangered Species Act with regards to our permitting process.

Please refer to identification number SPK-ZOI-00114 in any correspondence concerning this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at the letterhead address, email Kathy.Norton@usace.army.mil, or telephone 916-557-5260. For more information regarding our program, please visit our website at www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx,

Thank you for your attention in this matter and allowing us to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

██████████ Sr. Project Manager California South Branch

Copy Furnished:

Ms Lisa Aeree, Compliance Specialist, National Park Service, Yosemite National Park, P.O.

Box 577, Yosemite, California 95389

Correspondence ID:	376	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	STANISLAUS COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE County Government				
Received:	Mar,12,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	March 12, 2013				

Superintendent, Yosemite National Park National Park Service

Attn: Tuolumne River Plan

PO BOX 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL REFERRAL NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

TUOLUMNE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Dear Superintendent:

The Stanislaus County Environmental Review Committee (ERC) has reviewed the subject project and has no comments at this time.

The ERC appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

██████████ Associate Management Consultant Environmental Review Committee

cc: ERC Members

Correspondence ID:	377	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	February 18, 2013				

To: Mr. Dan Neubacher, Yosemite

RE: wonderful Hi-Sierra camps

i am writing to tell you how important the Hi Sierra Camps are to me and to others who have actually used them. I have been coming to Yosemite since 1966, first alone, then with my wife, our children, our riends, and relatives. We have participated in almost every available activity and actively support the park through donations and fees. Of all the experiences we have had in the park, our seven~day Hi Sierra Camp Loop Trip was by far the most interesting and invigorating activity we have undertaken. The hiking was right at our capability limit and it stretched our knowledge of ourselves and what we could ccomplish. The ranger leading the trip, Dick Ewart, was excellent both in his ability to teach us about the back country as well as in his encouragement along the way. As a result of that trip we have undertaken many hikes on our own and continue to

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

wander the park enjoying its vistas as well as exploring what we can accomplish.

Recently I heard that you are considering reducing the size of Glen Aulin Camp, which would be a big mistake. The park needs to keep all the camps at about the same size so that a complete circuit of camps can be maintained: reducing the size of one camp means that the number of people able to do the full loop is limited. Hut-to-hut travel is a perfect way for people who are not built like mountain goats to experience the back country, to see the wonders of Yosemite away from the crowded Valley. I suspect that 95% of the park is off-limits to the average vehicle-based visitor, and of those who do manage to enter the wilderness, very few have the strength to carry a week of provisions on their backs. The hut-to-hut approach is a perfect way for lesser mortals to go deep into the park for an extended period.

I wish that you had more camps in the Hi Sierra so that more areas of the park could be explored in this way. I have stayed in high mountain huts in Austria which were a perfect model for you to consider.

These huts are maintained by private hiking groups, yet they are open to all visitors: why can't we have something like this system here? A perfect example of a public-private partnership which would allow more visitors to gain entrance to the thousands of acres of Yosemite that are impossible for most people to visit now. The National Parks are meant to be a resource for all, not just a preserve for the strongest or the richest with their pack animals. If you haven't done the Hi Sierra Loop, I encourage you to experience it yourself, to see how wonderful Yosemite can be.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Correspondence ID:	378	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE County Government				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Don Neubacher, Superintendent Yosemite National Park				

Attn: Tuolumne River Plan DEIS P.O. Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

As a Gateway Community, the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Tuolumne River DEIS). The Yosemite National Park is an essential part of Tuolumne County and our Board is dedicated to working collaboratively with the National Park System towards best management practices to ensure maximum access for the general public. Our Board continues to advocate for maximum accessibility with minimum, unnecessary restrictions. Therefore, any comments submitted by our Board will reflect a desire to emphasize user experience. While the County applauds the fact that Alternatives 2 and 4 maintain the number of visitors to the Tuolumne Meadows region, the County sees greater value to visitors with Alternative 2 due to its continued protection of river and ecological conditions while enhancing the user experience. Alternative 2 maintains a visitor center presence which is replaced in Alternative 4 with a visitor contact center. The visitor center serves as a gathering place for instruction and interaction. During busy summer weekends and holiday periods when Yosemite Valley is congested, maintaining a robust Tuolumne Meadows region is necessary to provide a quality visitor experience. Removing critical visitor features such as the fuel station, mountaineering shop/school, and stock day rides may discourage visitors from venturing to Yosemite's beautiful high country. The good news contained in this Tuolumne River DEIS is the high water quality and the good Condition of the majority of the meadows contained in the plan. The County concurs with the plan's Concerns about the shifting of Tuolumne Meadows to that of a stressed meadow criss-crossed with informal trails. Contained in the Tuolumne River DEIS is the elimination of roadside parking in the Tuolumne Meadows area. While this action may seek to remediate the meadow degradation, the County cautions that this action may actually discourage visitors from venturing into the meadows even on designated trails.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement with its accompanying alternatives. The Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors is committed to ensuring the health and visibility of Yosemite National Park through a proactive partnership with the National Park System and other Gateway Communities.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Chairman

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 379 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: High Sierra Hikers Association Recreational Groups
Received: Mar,16,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: March 15, 2013

Don L. Neubacher, Superintendent Yosemite National Park

PD. Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

RE: Comments on Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive ' Management Plan ("Plan") and Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS")

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

The High Sierra Hikers Association ("High Sierra") is a nonprofit public-benefit organization that educates its members, public officials, and the public-at-large about issues affecting hikers and the Sierra Nevada, and that advocates the protection of park values and preservation of wilderness character in the Sierra for the public benefit. High Sierra represents thousands of citizens living throughout the United States who use and enjoy Yosemite's wilderness, wild & scenic rivers, and other backcountry areas for hiking, camping, backpacking, climbing, mountaineering, cross-country skiing, horse packing, wildlife viewing, photography, and other recreational pursuits, as well as to seek solitude, quietude, and spiritual refreshment.

This letter transmits our comments on the above-referenced Plan and its accompanying DEIS. Our scoping comments (dated September 6, 2006) and our "workbook" comments (dated September 11, 2007) should be already included "in your project record, and are hereby incorporated by reference. Please contact us at the letterhead address if you need additional copies of our earlier comments.

In sum, High Sierra is very concerned that: (1) the proposed Plan fails to ensure timely compliance with direction provided by Congress regarding the "High Sierra Camps" ; (2) the proposed Plan fails to heed the Park Service's Organic Act by allowing impairment of park scenery and other resources; (3) the proposed Plan fails to limit commercial enterprises as required by the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act; and (4) the DEIS fails to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) because it does not adequately evaluate and disclose the environmental consequences of the proposed actions.

High Sierra Camps

High Sierra is especially concerned about the commercial "High Sierra Camps" (HSCs) at Glen Aulin, Tuolumne Meadows, and Vogelsang. These aged and ugly facilities create significant, profound, and harmful negative impacts on the Tuolumne River corridor and on the environment of Tuolumne Meadows. For example, all the by-products of human occupancy are produced at the camps: sewage (human body wastes), "gray water" from showers, grease and detergent from kitchens, etc. Wastewater, sewage, and other wastes from these developments continue to pollute the meadows, soils, and waters of Yosemite National Park. Further, the numerous "packtrains" needed to supply the camps significantly damage and pollute trails and surrounding areas, including the Tuolumne River.

Congress specifically recognized these threats to Yosemite when it passed the California Wilderness Act of 1984. That Act, signed by President Reagan, bestowed formal wilderness designation upon much of the Yosemite backcountry. Congress allowed the HSCs to (temporarily) remain, but stated:

"...If and when it occurs that the continued operation of these facilities...results in an increased adverse impact on the adjacent wilderness environment (including increased adverse impact on the natural environment within the enclaves themselves), the operation of these facilities shall be promptly terminated, the facilities removed, the sites naturalized, and in the procedure set forth by section 9 of the bill, the areas promptly designated as wilderness."

The simple truth is that the HSCs are a destructive commercial venture initiated by the early concessionaires Desmond and Curry. The Park Service climbed onto this money-making (for the Currys) venture in the 1920s, encouraging the building of additional camps in order to get more people into the backcountry. But the problem is now reversed: so many people want to visit Yosemite's backcountry that access is rationed. If environmental impacts in the backcountry are to be kept at or below any certain level, then for every person who goes to a High Sierra Camp you will have to refuse access to ten or more people who travel on foot not need to be supplied by packtrains. The DEIS fails to honestly acknowledge, evaluate, or disclose these

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

fundamental facts.

The Vogelsang HSC (capacity 42) is supplied from Tuolumne Meadows. The camp itself does not lie within the Tuolumne River watershed, but its very existence (i.e., continual packtrains that supply the camp) has a substantial adverse impact on both the river and its corridor. The trail from Tuolumne Meadows to Vogelsang HSC, like all trails traversed by the HSC supply trains, is battered and polluted, featuring flies and stench and dust. One is not out of sight of manure for the entire seven miles. By late summer, one can hardly walk ten feet without having to step around (or in) manure left behind by the 'incessant commercial packtrains. And scientists from the University of California (U.C. Davis Medical School) have documented that the Tuolumne River being polluted in this area, and concluded that: "pack animals are most likely the source of coliform [bacterial] pollution" (Derlet and Carlson 2006).

The same is true of the trail to Glen Aulln, a camp that can support a maximum of 32 people. For the sake of those 32, dozens of people every day-and during the course of an entire season, thousands-are inconvenienced and offended by the disgusting condition of the trail and the pollution of surrounding park lands.

The House Committee Report prepared for the 1984 California Wilderness Act also stated:

"?Because of the importance of continuing monitoring and assessment of this situation, immediately upon enactment of this bill into law, the Secretary of the Interior should document current baseline operational and environmental impact conditions of all of these facilities [HSC camps], and he should also, within one year of the date of enactment, report in the relevant committee of the House and Senate, his findings and recommendations as to this matter. Annual assessments of this situation should thereafter be made by the Secretary to assure continued monitoring of conditions." (House Committee Report No. 98-40)

High Sierra is concerned that the Park Service ignored and continues to scoff at Congress' direction to prepare baseline reports and to conduct annual monitoring of serious impacts at the HSCs.

The HSCs at Glen Aulin and Vogelsang are classified as "potential wilderness additions," which, by law, must be treated and managed essentially the same as wilderness. (See the California Wilderness Act of 1984, Section 9.) However, despite the ongoing and increased impacts of the HSCs, and the clear direction from Congress, the NPS ongoing efforts to hide the impacts of these facilities from Congress and the public, and has illegally continued to use nonconforming methods (i.e., helicopters) to maintain the HSCs and to construct new developments (i.e., sewage mounds, toilets, etc.) at the HSCs. Congress specifically directed that:

"Helicopter use for routine nonemergency purposes associated with visitor use is a questionable activity in national park system wilderness areas and should be eliminated within designated national park system wilderness." (House Committee Report No. 98-40, atp. 51)

In sum, the DEIS fails to honestly analyze and clearly disclose the many environmental impacts to the Tuolumne River corridor caused by the HSCs at Glen Aulin, Vogelsang, and Tuolumne Meadows. Significant impacts include, but are not limited to: (1) impaired scenery; (2) degraded trails; (3) pollution of surface and ground waters by sewage and wastewater produced at the HSCs; (4) pollution of surface waters by manure (bacteria, etc.) produced by pack animals that service the camps; (5) harm to wildlife that come in contact with sewage, kitchen/bath wastes, and human food sources; and (6) harm to native songbirds due to proliferation of brown-headed cowbirds.

Your Plan should permanently remove all three of the HSCs discussed above, restore the sites, and propose that the potential wilderness additions at Glen Aulin and Vogelsang be designated as wilderness as intended by Congress in the California Wilderness Act (see Section 9; and House Committee Report No. 9840).

The HSCs are an anachronism-an out-of-date holdover from bad old days of the 1920s through the early 1960s, when more development and more commercialism were considered desirable and beneficial. It is time for the National Park Service to catch up with the times (and heed its Organic Act) by choosing preservation of park resources, scenery, wilderness character, and wild river values over ongoing exploitation and impairment.

We are aware that some staff members at Yosemite have proposed that the polluting commercial camps be grandfathered, and perhaps even codified in your plan as "Outstandingly Remarkable Values" (ORVs). Any attempt to enshrine the HSCs as "ORVs" would be both ludicrous and unlawful, and is unacceptable.

In order for recreational uses to be considered as an ORV, a value must be: 1) river-related or river dependent, and rare, unique, or exemplary in a regional or national context, The High Sierra Camps are none of these. The camps simply offer a luxury, catered, pampered lodging experience that is neither river-related nor river-dependent. And those who desire soft bedding, fancy meals, and showers can find comforts in thousands of locations throughout the region, state, and nation.

These elitist camps are nothing more than commercial tent villages catering to the comforts and convenience of a gem small

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

minority of park visitors, at the expense of everyone else. The camps degrade scenery, pollute water, create noise, and impair Yosemite's river values and wilderness character in many other ways.

As discussed above and in our previous comments, Congress has expressed serious concerns about the camps, and authorized the Park Service to remove them. Any attempt to designate these commercial camps as ORVs would therefore be arbitrary and capricious.

Others have tried to rationalize the retention of the aged, unsightly and polluting commercial High Sierra Camps on the grounds that they are "historic" and/or somehow an important part of our heritage that should be continued. This is a bankrupt abuse of language that has been used repeatedly throughout Yosemite's history to justify continuing ruinous practices that were, many years too late, recognized as the uniformed, anti-social, and anti-environmental practices that they were. Some examples in point:

The famous firefall. The absurd business of shoving a huge bonfire off a 3,000-foot every evening for the entertainment of the mob. Finally ceased in January 1969, when at long last it occurred to the powers-that-be that this was probably the worst model for behavior in a national park that one could imagine.

During the 1920s and 1930s, by far the greatest tourist attraction in Yosemite Valley was the feeding of bears at a garbage dump. The bear-feeding platform was such a permanent fixture that it even appeared on the USGS topo maps of the time. Initiated by catastrophic ignorance. Eliminated by modest recovery of sanity.

In the prewar halcyon days there was actually a Yosemite zoo, featuring lion cubs, bear cubs, and deer.

And here we are in 2013, still hopelessly mired in the past. The current Plan 'proposes to continue the HSCs with but a tweaks around the edges.

Horses and mules are non-native, disease-carrying, weed-spreading animals. On those grounds alone they should be barred from Yosemite except in cases where they are absolutely necessary. Yet the proposed Plan persists in encouraging their use, and the NPS resists all efforts to reduce or eliminate their damaging and polluting impacts. Why is this your policy, and how can you justify it?

Commercial Enterprises

The HSCs and the packtrains used to supply them commercial activities. The Plan essentially continues "business as usual" with only a few minor cosmetic changes to these commercial enterprises. This violates the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act by failing to adequately limit and regulate harmful commercial ventures.

Invasive Weeds

Our scoping comments of September 2006 discussed at length the issue of invasive weeds. Please refer to those comments for a detailed discussion of this issue. An additional study documents weed invasions in Yosemite (Exotic Species Threat Assessment and Management Prioritization for Sequoia-Kings Canyon and Yosemite National Parks, by J. Gerlach and others, April 2001), and provides clear evidence that domestic stock animals (i.e., horses and mules) are responsible for introducing and spreading weeds in Yosemite. The DEIS fails to honestly evaluate and fully disclose these impacts, and the Plan fails to incorporate mandatory measures that would effectively prevent the introduction and spread of Weeds.

Water Quality & Water Pollution

Our scoping comments of September 2006 discussed and provided a copy of a publication by Derlet and Carlson (2006), which documented contamination of surface waters in Yosemite National Park due to pack & saddle stock animals (Leg, horses & mules). Subsequent research has confirmed those findings (see "Risk Factors for Coliform Bacteria in Backcountry Lakes and Streams in the Sierra Nevada Mountains: a 5-Year Study," by R. Derlet and others. *Wilderness and Environmental Medicine* 19:82-90).

Because stock animals are known to contaminate surface waters with disease-causing pathogens (and because of the many other stock-related impacts discussed in our September 2006 comments), the use of stock animals should be prohibited within the Tuolumne River corridor, except in cases where they are absolutely necessary. When stock animals must be used, their numbers should be kept as small as possible, and every feasible effort must be made to avoid water pollution from animal wastes, such as by requiring that all stock animals be outfitted with manure catchers, which are now readily available and inexpensive. (See, for example, www.bunbag.com and www.equisan.com.au.)

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately


Summary & Conclusion

For the reasons stated above and in our prior scoping comments and workbook comments, High Sierra is very concerned that:

- (1) the proposed Plan fails to ensure timely compliance with direction provided by Congress regarding the "High Sierra Camps";
- (2) the proposed Plan fails to heed the Park Service's Organic Act by allowing impairment of park 'scenery and other resources;
- (3) the proposed Plan fails to limit commercial enterprises as required by the Wild River Act; and (4) the DEIS fails to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) because it does not adequately evaluate disclose the environmental consequences of the proposed actions as required by NEPA.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide comments. Please keep us informed of all opportunities for public involvement for this project, and send complete printed copies of all planning workbooks and environmental and decision documents for our review.

Sincerely,

 Conservation Associate High Sierra Hikers Association

Correspondence ID:	380	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Tuolumne County Transportation Council County Government				
Received:	Mar,07,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Tuolumne County Transportation Council				

Dear Superintendent,

The Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) would like to thank the National Park Service efforts in developing the first comprehensive management plan for the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River portion inside Yosemite National Park and for the opportunity to comment on the Plan. The Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, is commonly referred to as the Tuolumne River Plan. The Tuolumne River Plan addresses existing and potential impacts to segments along the Tuolumne River and Tuolumne Meadow corridors. Four action alternatives highlight different concepts that aim to preserve and enhance the areas cultural history, natural environment and renowned scenic views.

The TCTC supports the efforts to preserve Yosemite National Park cultural history and natural environmental Values, in respect to groups who have a historical connection to the Tuolumne Meadow & Tuolumne River Corridors, local County residents and tourists Who visit the Park yearly. We believe that Yosemite National Park is a world-renowned destination and wish to preserve it unique values as much as possible, without limiting or restricting existing public capacity.

The TCTC has reviewed the four proposed action alternatives, each of which provides their own unique concepts independently, but also comprehensively share in the intent to eliminate roadside parking along Tioga Road in favor of expanding existing designated parking spots at current locations. Tioga Road is a main parking alternative for Park visitors because of the limited number of designated parking spots in the Tuolumne River Corridor. The TCTC fears that eliminating roadside parking along Tioga Road will displace a lot of the existing parking capacity if adequate parking supply is not supplemented. A parking survey conducted within the Tuolumne River corridor in ZO I stated that at peak visitor hours an additional 337 vehicles exceed the 533 designated parking spaces, approximately 39% over the designated parking

Francisco Building Mailing: 2 South Green St. Phone (209) 535-5603 48 West Yaney St., Sonora Sonora, CA 95370 Fax (209) 533-5698

capacity (Chapter 8, 8-234). Any action alternative considered should be able to supplement the loss parking capacity along Tioga Road. Alternatives that result in a net loss of total capacity do not reflect the interest of the County and are not supported by the TCTC.

Based on our stance of a no net loss parking capacity within Tuolumne Meadows, the TCTC recommends action alternative 2. Alternative 2, which is the only alternative that retains the commercial services, while also meeting the current demand for vehicle parking, reflects the standards the TCTC wishes to keep in the Yosemite Valley and Tuolumne Meadows.

Sustaining the existing standards at Tuolumne Meadows is an important goal for the TCTC. We believe that Yosemite National Park is a national and state attraction that provides economic benefits for our region and do not believe limiting public access to the Parks services is beneficial to the County or the general public. The TCTC will not support any action alternative that results in a net loss of existing capacity.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

If you have any questions regarding out comments, please do not hesitate to Contact me.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Executive Director

Correspondence ID:	381	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Mono County Local Transportation Commission County Government				
Received:	Mar,11,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Neubacher,				

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan. Due to the importance of Yosemite and access-related issues to Mono County and gateway communities, the Mono County Local Transportation Commission respectfully requests consideration of the Mono Count Regional Transportation Plan as a part of the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS review. The following highlights our applicable policies and in some instances notes their significance to the Tuolumne Plan:

GOAL

Yosemite National Park is a national and World-wide treasure that must be protected and preserved. Bordering the Park's eastern boundary, and serving as its only access point from Eastern California, Mono County is an important component of the Yosemite region. Through its transportation planning efforts, the Mono LTC will assist in the preservation and protection of the Park by strengthening the relationship between the Yosemite region and its eastern gateway.

OBJECTIVE A

Support the Park's mission to preserve the resources that contribute to Yosemite's unusual character and attractiveness: its exquisite scenic beauty; outstanding wilderness values; diverse Sierra Nevada ecosystems; historic resources, including its Native American heritage; and its role in a national conservation ethic. These resources are to be made available for enjoyment, education, and recreation while leaving them unimpaired.

Policy 1: Management of Yosemite's congestion and access should be accomplished in a way that does not adversely affect the quality of life and quality of experience in gateway communities.

Note: The Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS), of which Mono County is a founding member, has successfully assisted in managing Yosemite congestion and enhanced connections to gateway communities such as Mammoth Lakes, June lake, and Lee Vining. The Mono LTC appreciates the additional shuttle service to Tuolumne Meadows tllis past year, and looks forward to continued Park support for this service. The maintenance of the Tioga Road for access across the Sierra is also a critical element for travelers from Mono County and areas east to central and coastal California. Recognition of these access characteristics in thejinal plan is requested.

Policy 2: Work cooperatively with the National Park Service to support environmental preservation within the Yosemite region.

Policy 3: Transit related infrastructure should maximize consideration for the environment.

Objective B Improve opportunities by alternative modes (transit, bicycles, pedestrians, air, other non-auto modes)

Policy 1: In support of YARTS regional transit and other alternative modes for access to Yosemite, encourage mulit-modal infrastructure projects that complement the gateway communites, emphasize alternative to the auto, and integrate joint use of facilities.

Note: The Plan's proposed removal of roadside parking provides an opportunity for integrating a bicycle route along the Tioga Road where environmentally feasible and where past user disturbance has occurred. Improved facilities for cyclists provide an alternative to the auto and a low impact form of recreation that can complements gateway communities and their economies.

Policy 2: Encourage the use of alternative travel modes for access into Yosemite, including transit and bicycles; eg., transit

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

riders should have priority access at Park gates and guaranteed access to the Valley.

Policy 4: Maintenance and improvement projects on Highway 120 should focus on accommodating alternative transportation modes.

Note: The hiking trail paralleling the Tioga Road promoted in the Preferred Alternative complements this policy. It should be noted that Mono County is currently working with the National Park River, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program to draft a Mono Yosemite Gateway Trail Master Plan for the Lee Vining Canyon area including a possible connection to Yosemite National Park. Such a trail would align with the proposed goals of the Tuolumne River Plan.

Policy 5: Encourage Yosemite National Park, Caltrans, and Mono County to work cooperatively to develop bicycle facilities on Highway 120 both within and outside the Park.

Note: The LTC recommends that the Tuolumne Plan promote bicycle climbing lanes on appropriate sections of the Tioga Road during maintenance/improvement projects.

Policy 6: Encourage the development of a transit Connection between the east side and Tuolumne Meadows.

Note: This policy is consistent with the recent Tuolumne YARTS service addition funded by the NPS.

Policy 7: YARTS should be designed to accommodate bicyclists and bikes.

OBJECTIVE C Encourage diversity in visitor destinations and experiences.

Policy 1: The Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) should be developed and implemented in a way that best supports local economies, including: a. Using YARTS to Change Visitor behavior to include longer stays in the Eastern Sierra.

b. Encouraging Yosemite National Park to promote a policy of dispersing visitors to other areas in the Park and the gateway Communities.

C. Promoting YARTS marketing efforts to include information about gateway attractions.

Note: The Plan's proposed removal of the commercial gas station appears inconsistent with the Plan's retention of the a(fueling facility for the NPS. Gas station removal could cause visitor inconvenience and generate needless additional trips out of the Tuolumne area for fuel. Should the gas station be removed, the Plan should require signage directing visitors to the nearest services in Lee Vining.

Plan for and promote the concept that the Yosemite experience begins in the gateway Communities. Marketing the Yosemite experience should be a Countywide effort.

Provide facilities that support a diversity of Visitors.

Note: The elimination of horseback day rides negatively impacts visitor diversity, for it eliminates backcountry park access for a segment of the visitor population, particularly families and individuals with mobility issues. Mono policies support retaining day rides for visitor diversity purposes.

OBJECTIVE D

Provide for safe and consistent access between Yosemite National Park and its eastern gateway.

To facilitate Visitor travel planning and provide some certainty for local gateway economies, the LTC should work with Yosemite National Park to guarantee opening and closing dates for Tioga Road (Highway 120 West).

Note: Tioga Road opening dates are not only important for visitor trip planning and YARTS operations, but are a critical factor to eastside gateway Community economies.

Promote opening the areas along Highway 120 to Tuolumne Meadows as soon as conditions are safe. Provide sewage system

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

alternatives to facilitate this policy.

Policy 3: Consider using pricing mechanisms as a means to fund Tioga Road opening activities.

Policy 4: Accurate and timely information about Conditions in the Park should be available in the gateway communities.

Policy 5: Maintenance and improvement projects on Highway 120 should focus on improving safety, including providing turnouts to allow for safe stops and passing areas.

OBJECTIVE E

Develop transportation infrastructure that supports access to and within the gateway communities.

Policy 1: Highway 120 should remain a trans-Sierra highway open to through traffic.

Policy 2: Support improvements to key access routes to Mono County and the eastern gateway corridors.

Policy 3: Resource management decisions in the Park (e.g., changes in allowable land uses, access, and overnight accommodations) should consider associated impacts to gateway communities and access corridors.

The Mono County Local Transportation Commission appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments, and commends Park staff for traveling to Mammoth Lakes for the recent public scoping session. Please direct questions regarding these comments to Heather deBethizy, Associate Planner, at hdebethizy@mono.ca.gov or call 760.924.1800.

Respectfully,

 Chair

Correspondence ID:	382	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Tuolumne County Chamber of Commerce County Government				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	March 14, 2013				

Don Neubacher, Superintendent Yosemite National Park

Attn: Tuolumne River Plan DEIS

PO Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

Subject: Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

The Tuolumne County Chamber of Commerce is most interested in ensuring maximum access to the Park for the general public. Although none of the current alternatives fulfills all of our desires, Alternative 2 most closely adheres to our beliefs.

Alternative 2 maintains the number of visitors to the Tuolumne Meadow region while having continued protection of river and ecological conditions while enhancing the user experience. It also maintains a visitor center. The visitor center serves as a gathering place for instruction, interaction and education.

We are supportive of the high water quality and the good condition of the majority of the meadows contained in the plan. We are concerned that the elimination of roadside parking in the Tuolumne Meadows area might discourage visitors from venturing into the meadows at all. We strongly recommend monitoring this action very closely as roadside parking might in fact enhance the visitors' experience.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Thank you for your time and consideration of our input.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

cc: Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors

Tuolumne County Visitors Bureau Congressman Tom McClintock Senator Dianne Feinstein

Correspondence ID:	383	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Delaware North Companies Parks 8L Resorts Business				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	March 15, 2013				

Please Reply to @ 2152-CO-DJ-TM

Mr. Don L. Neubacher Superintendent Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear Mr. Neubacher,

On behalf of DNC Parks & Resorts at Yosemite, Inc. (DNC) we thank you for the opportunity to Comment on the Tuolumne River Plan (TRP). Our response uses the NPS preferred alternative, Alternative 4 Enhance the Traditional Tuolumne Experience, as the basis for our comments. Basically, we believe that some aspects of the Plan are unduly restrictive on traditional visitor uses, which we hope can be adjusted before the plan is made final.

Alternative 4 calls for some actions that we believe suggest the TRP has been influenced by the Merced River court ruling (specifically, the language of footnote 5), rather than an interpretation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) that has been applied to other Wild and Scenic River (WSR) plans implemented by the NPS and other land-managing agencies. We are making this observation as it appears certain actions and recent changes to Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) do not appear consistent with earlier public information regarding the TRP and because of the reduction in visitor services, in spite of the public's desire to see Tuolumne Meadows remain basically unchanged.

The "Call to Action", released by the NPS in 2011, is intended to guide NPS activities, actions and programs in preparation for the 100th anniversary of NPS beginning in 1916. The "Call to Action" has broad statements of principle, as well as specific activities designed to make NPS and the country's national parks more relevant in the next 100 years and beyond. One of the main goals is "Connecting People to Parks", under which the NPS calls to: "Expand the use of parks as places for healthy outdoor recreation that contribute to people's physical, mental, and social well-being." It would appear that the visitor recreation reductions advocated in the TRP are not consistent with the NPS national goals or with the intended opportunities presented in our national parks.

COMMENTS ON ORVS

We understand that the ORVs of a WSR are the foundational elements to be protected by the land-managing agency. The Tuolumne's ORVs were identified when Congress listed the river in 1984 and have been refined over the years. The first draft of ORVs was shared With the public for comment in 2006. Revisions were made based on public scoping, internal work-shops and scientific investigation and a second draft was released in the 2007 Tuolumne Planning Workbook, with another version of ORVs presented in a draft baseline conditions report in 2011.

The ORVs that are included in the current plan are different than the 2011 iteration, indicating that ORVs are moving targets and not foundational elements of the plan. We believe that the 2007 version (included in Appendix Comparison Chart) of the Recreational ORV, is more appropriate than the current language and more consistent with WSRA.

The Recreational ORVs in the TRP changed significantly from the previous version. The 2007 Recreational ORV was characterized by a traditional wilderness experience for the wild segments of the river. For the scenic river segments in Tuolumne and at Glen Aulin, the Recreational ORV was described as: "Outstanding High-Elevation Recreational and Educational Opportunities that Are Accessible to People of Various Ages and Abilities." Additionally, specific values were listed as examples such as rustic lodging at Tuolumne Meadows Lodge and Glen Aulin.

In 2011, the Recreational ORV that was applied to the scenic segments was reduced to include the Tioga Road only and the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

description of the types of experiences characterized in the scenic segments was dropped. The 2011 Recreational ORV that applies to the wild segments of the river was also revised, but retained a description of character: "Wilderness travelers along the Tuolumne River engage in a variety of activities in an iconic High Sierra landscape, where opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation, self-reliance, and solitude shape the experience." (Appendix F, pg. F-5). Conversely, the 2007 ORV that applied to Tuolumne Meadows and Glen Aulin was stripped of its character defining description, leaving the Tioga Road as the primary river value to be protected and enhanced.

We agree that the Tioga Road should be protected, but is it an ORV? After all, it is not the road itself that is outstandingly remarkable, but the access and recreation that the road allows. The 2007 ORV was written to acknowledge this variety of recreational options in the scenic segments of the Tuolumne River regardless of one's ability, which provide a unique recreational value in a setting that is largely characterized by wilderness. Numerous high quality recreational experiences for a variety of visitors such as fishing, hiking, climbing, painting, accessible horseback rides, and strolls to Parson's Lodge are no longer represented in the ORV. We believe there is an exhaustive list of appropriate recreational visitor experiences and the change in the ORV inappropriately minimizes those values,

Reducing the ORV to only the road seems to minimize all the other activities that visitors with varied abilities love to do within the river corridor. The justification for the ORV revision listed in Appendix F, "The recreational ORV was rewritten to express the recreational value of the front-country river setting rather than specific kinds of activities, which would not necessarily be river-related or unique, rare or exemplary," needs further clarification. It is vague, and does not explain a major change that did not involve additional public comment or new studies. We also don't understand how the Tioga Road is all that characterizes the "recreational value of the front-country river setting." Our suggestion would be to retain the 2007 version as the basis for the final plan. Doing that would give more weight to the traditional recreational experiences that visitors to Yosemite have valued for generations.

Another issue with the ORVs is the apparent inconsistency in the approach to identifying and managing the Cultural ORV of the Tuolumne River as compared to the Merced River. The TRP originally included a broad list of historic sites/districts in the Cultural ORV; however, the latest plan changed the Cultural ORV to focus on only Parson's Lodge, rather than the entire historic district. The justification for this reduction in the Cultural CRV was that the "Statement was too broad and too inclusive to be useful in guiding river management," and "Under a tighter interpretation of the ORV criteria...sites were not considered to be river related or unique, rare, or exemplary." (Appendix F, pg. F-4). Conversely, the MRP has greatly broadened the Cultural ORV of the Merced River to include entire historic and archaeological districts (which even includes sites/resources that are outside the river corridor) and has not provided a justification for a more inclusive Cultural ORV as compared to previous versions. It appears that there has been an inconsistent application of values and criteria in applying ORV criteria for the two Wild and Scenic Rivers in Yosemite National Park.

COMMENTS ON CHANGES TO VISITOR SERVICES

The name of the preferred alternative, "Enhance the Traditional Tuolumne Experience", might be misleading to the general public: as several traditionally offered recreational activities in the Tuolumne River corridor are being removed. While the overall character of the Tuolumne River corridor may not look substantially different, the traditions that characterize the experience will be significantly altered with the removal of the mountaineering school, horseback day-rides, elimination of recreational commercial groups along segments of the Pacific Crest Trail and major reduction of the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (HSC) and resulting impacts to the HSC loop system. The removal or reduction of many traditionally offered recreational opportunities in the Tuolumne River is not clearly defined for the public and suggests that the TRP is influenced by the NPS's interpretation of the Merced River litigation. We are also concerned about complying with ADA standards, as many of the recreational offerings eliminated are a viable quality experience accommodating visitors with special needs. We urge the NPS to listen to the overwhelming public sentiment to keep Tuolumne the same and to not unnecessarily reduce traditional and appropriate visitor experiences.

The removal of the mountaineering school needs further explanation and justification. Chapter 7 - Alternatives, calls for the "mountaineering shop/school" to be eliminated (pg 7-91). Chapter 8 only analyzes the mountaineering store removal (where visitors can buy outdoor supplies and is the primary resource for outdoor, hiking and inclement weather gear and camping supplies). The store is also the home for the very active Yosemite Mountaineering School (YMS) in Tuolumne Meadows. This operation is based out of Tuolumne in the summer so visitors Camping and staying or visiting in the High Sierra may participate in an outdoor experience provided since the 1970s Climbing equipment rentals support the operation, which provides climbing lessons and guided excursions in the Tuolumne area, both in and out of the WSR corridor. Is the plan calling for only the physical removal of the building or is the YMS also to be removed from the Tuolumne area? The elimination of the YMS from the Tuolumne area has a significant adverse impact on visitors seeking a guided recreational opportunity in Yosemite, removes an ADA accommodation service and has socioeconomic impacts in that only those who are fully equipped will be able to enjoy these traditional services in the Tuolumne area. We believe the removal of the mountain shop and the YMS will adversely impact visitor services, recreation, and visitor experience and these impacts are not analyzed in these sections of Chapter 8. Are guided climbing lessons and excursions adversely impacting river values? The entire Tuolumne area, including many locations outside the river boundary, offers visitors with a variety of skill levels the opportunity to climb. Are climbing instruction and guided excursions activities that will no longer be commercially permitted in Tuolumne by concession contract or special use permit?

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

As to removing the mountaineering shop, we question if this action is a reaction to the language in footnote 5 of the Merced River court ruling, which the NPS has judged to place a standard for allowing commercial services which we believe is beyond the requirements of the WSRA. This shop, which mainly sells outdoor, hiking and inclement weather gear, camp supplies and climbing gear, is adjacent to the largest campground in Yosemite and a great resource for visitors, particularly during periods of changing weather.

Removal of horseback rides, in combination with the removal of day-rides in Yosemite Valley, removes a traditional recreational activity that has been enjoyed in Yosemite prior to its designation as a National Park. It is unclear why the day-rides are being removed yet private stock use, and commercial/operational stock use continues to be permitted. It appears that there are socioeconomic impacts that have not been analyzed relating to eliminating the ability of ordinary citizens to engage in an activity that those who own and bring their own stock can utilize. If conflicts between hikers and stock are the reason, can alternatives for separate trails, additional regulations, poop bags, etc. be considered to reduce conflicts between hikers and horse riders? The conflict will still exist with the commercial and private stock use being allowed. The TRP indicates that localized impacts to soils and vegetation will exist even with removal of the day-rides and monitoring and restoration efforts can be used to reduce impacts. The baseline studies do not tie widespread degradation of resources to stock use and water quality has consistently been monitored and recorded as excellent. If the removal of this activity is to reduce stock presence in wilderness, should the Wilderness Use Plan be the vehicle to consider that action? Many other wilderness areas allow for stock use, including those in Yosemite.

It also appears to us that the inconsistency between the treatment of day stock use in Wawona, Yosemite Valley and Tuolumne requires more explanation. The Preferred Alternative for the MRP will allow day-rides at Wawona in a WSR corridor, but not in Yosemite Valley. The TRP eliminates similar use in Tuolumne. We do not understand the dissimilar treatment accorded this visitor experience. Further, despite the TRP reasoning that removal of day-rides will enhance "self-reliance," it should be noted that stables rides provide a primary means for ADA accessible access to Yosemite and the removal of this activity will have a negative impact on "self-reliance" for that visitor segment. We do not believe the NPS has provided compelling reasons for the removal of this traditional experience in the Tuolumne River Corridor and do not understand the basis for the disparate treatment between Wawona, Yosemite Valley and Tuolumne Meadows.

The drastic reduction in capacity at the Glen Aulin HSC from 32 to 20 overnight occupants is an action that should be reconsidered. In addition to the localized impact on the experience at Glen Aulin, this reduction will also have a significant adverse impact on those who enjoy HSC guided loop trips because the reduced visitor capacity is incompatible with the adjacent camps, which accommodate 32 hikers. We question whether the tradeoff between a negligible gain in natural resource protection (which will likely result from improving infrastructure as contemplated in the plan) as compared to a major reduction in a traditional recreational experience is consistent with NPS objectives and also question whether it is required under WSRA.

The TRP calls for the construction of composting toilets at Glen Aulin. This is an excellent idea and illustrates actions that can be taken to maintain the camp's current capacity, while improving resource conditions, and reducing water consumption. If the concern with the current capacity is water usage, the composting toilets will assist in that regard and further advantage can be taken similar to other very successful efforts over the past 10 years to reduce water consumption at the Camp. We believe the NPS should evaluate options that would allow maintaining traditional use levels more fully because we believe the value of the visitor experience is minimized under the current plan.

In analyzing consequences of the action to reduce the size of Glen Aulin, the TRP does not adequately consider the major adverse impact to the visitor experience caused by the impact of this reduction on the HSC Loop system. The HSC Loop System is unique on a national scale, with three of the six camps situated next to a WSR (Tuolumne Meadows Lodge, Glen Aulin HSC and Merced Lake HSC). Other parks may have one or two rustic camps to which visitors may hike, but the HSC loop system is one of a kind in the Sierra. While hut-to-hut hiking is common in the Alps and South America, it is a unique experience for Yosemite visitors, conceived by Mary Curry Tressider and endorsed enthusiastically in the past by NPS. These camps were specifically called out as enclaves when 95% of Yosemite was designated as wilderness in 1984.

The system is historic, traditional, and many of the camps are eligible for listing on the National Register. In fact, the NPS recently considered listing the HSC loop system as a historic district. The HSC loop system is a traditional form of recreation in Yosemite and clearly has value. The camps are more or less equal in capacity, which allows for the best hut-to-hut experience, a major benefit to the arrangement of the HSC loop.

This impact on HSC Loop Trips was not adequately addressed in the TRP environmental consequences (Chapter 8), nor was it outlined in the alternative. We believe the NPS needs to clarify how the HSC loop system will be impacted and reconsider the relative benefits of preserving this traditional and unique visitor experience through alternative approaches at Glen Aulin. Also, the NPS should reconsider including the Glen Aulin HSC as an ORV of the Tuolumne River as its situation is clearly river related, river dependent and unique. The ORV description of 2007 appropriately included this recreational value.

In regards to recreational use at Glen Aulin, guided services, and commercial stock use, we believe the TRP restrictions on recreational commercial users need further clarification. On page 7-87 the TRP states that commercial groups seeking solely a recreational experience will not be permitted in the Glen Aulin zone and Lyell Canyon zone during July and August (Lyell Canyon permitted Mon-Thurs). This information is buried in the TRP description of alternatives and readers are referenced to Appendix C, which we find to be a long and confusing section and it is difficult to understand the implications to and impacts

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

on commercial recreational use. The TRP does not clearly define a "recreational purpose" or a "commercial group" unless one traces the information down in a large appendix.

The Alternative 4 summary bullets in the TRP, summary guide, fact sheet, etc. state that recreational offerings will be the same as the no action alternative, with the only exception the elimination of commercial stock day-rides. This greatly understates the restrictions, on recreational use included in the preferred alternative and as more fully described below.

The TRP should highlight that recreational commercial groups will not be permitted on sections of the Pacific Crest Trail/John Muir Trail in July and August. Guided climbing, fishing, backpacking and commercial stock trips will no longer be permitted in the Lyell Canyon on the weekends or at Glen Aulin all week during July and August. We believe this is a significant impact to recreation and the visitor experience. It also eliminates several traditional employment opportunities for both the concessionaire and independent business operators within Mono and Inyo counties, with the result that east side pack stations might no longer be financially viable with this restriction. We did not find that the socioeconomic impact of this restriction was analyzed. Additionally, we question if the Wilderness Management Plan might be the more appropriate vehicle to consider and analyze this type of action.

We also believe that the action should be better defined in the main TRP and in supporting documents. For instance, a "commercial group" should be defined so the general reader can understand its meaning. As examples of the types of questions and issues that we believe are relevant, we offer the following examples: Do the ranger-lead High Sierra Camp Loop Hiker groups fall into the commercial group category? Does a family hiking to stay at a HSC count as a commercial group since they are assisted through the commercial offerings offered at the HSC? Does this restriction apply to commercial stock trips, guided climbing lessons and/or backpacking trips originating from the Eastern Sierra? Will the restriction apply to the YMS and guided group backpacks along the Pacific Crest Trail? Will those travelers need to time their trips to avoid Yosemite during July and August? Will a novice mountaineering couple from the Bay Area be allowed to hire a guide to take them up to the top of Mt. Lyell for a weekend backpacking trip in July and August? These restrictions need to be clarified in the TRP so that the public understands the nature and extent of limitations that are being placed on recreational opportunities and the visitor experience. The summary of recreational restrictions in the TRP is misleading when only day-ride elimination is called out. We also believe the stated bias against commercial use (i.e., guided hikes and packer services) is a subject that should be more fully vetted in a Wilderness Use Plan.

The Tuolumne Meadows Lodge capacity is to remain the same; however, three tent cabins closest to the river are designated for removal throughout the plan. Since the occupancy of the camp remains the same, it appears the plan intends for the tents to be relocated, but does not give a location. We believe the final plan should clarify where these three tent cabins will be located within the existing camp boundaries. We also encourage the NPS to adopt the 2007 description of the recreational ORV, which placed recreational value on rustic lodging at Tuolumne Meadows. We believe this is another example where the Merced River litigation has had the consequence of adversely impacting the visitor experience in an area not directly under the jurisdiction of that settlement.

We do not believe the existing visitor and operational use of the gas station was accurately described in the TRP and removal of the gas station was not adequately analyzed in the "Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences" chapter of the TRP (Chapter 8) under the Visitor Services, Park Operations, or Transportation sections of this chapter because removing the station affects all those areas. Its removal was only briefly mentioned in the analysis of Visitor Experience and was noted to affect a "very small number of people that need to re-fuel" (pg. 8-192). The table included below illustrates the number of gallons sold at each service station within the park during peak summer months over the past two years. These numbers show that while Tuolumne is less used than other service stations in the park, it provides a service to more than just a "very small number of people" and as use goes up in Tuolumne, it decreases at Crane Flat.

Gallons Pumped

Tuolumne Wawona	*Crane Flat	July 2011	15,558	79,501	123,387	August 2011	29,604	79,405	119,304	July 2012	28,491
79,264	133,807	August 2012	33,410	81,054	131,263						

Chapter 8 should include a quantitative statement of current use and adequate analysis of the impacts of the station's removal, including the impact on adjacent services, such as the Crane Flat service station. If the Tuolumne service station is removed, much of the current use will be transferred to another service station in Yosemite (some will go to locations outside the park). The TRP should consider the impact of this transfer of use on Crane Flat. The Crane Flat service station is currently very congested in the summer months and it requires frequent refueling trips each week. Expansion may be a clear consideration if visitor use increased by roughly 25% in the summer months due to the closure of the Tuolumne station. Expansion is difficult at Crane Flat due to sensitive resources in the area.

The TRP also does not adequately address how the removal of the station will affect Park Operations. The service station is currently the primary source for fueling concessioner and park vehicles stationed at Tuolumne and for private vehicles of employees who live in Tuolumne. The preferred alternative calls for the retention of the existing above ground diesel fuel tank and its relocation from the NPS maintenance yard to the waste water treatment facility. While the retention and relocation of diesel fuel in the Tuolumne area will benefit some park operations, the majority of vehicles stationed in Tuolumne require

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

gasoline, not diesel. The TRP should analyze the operational efficiency of removing gasoline service in the Tuolumne area. For instance, it takes approximately one hour to travel from Tuolumne Meadows to Crane Flat and the round trip would consume roughly 20% of the fuel supply from an average fuel tank and over two hours of employee time. The plan calls for an increase in employee housing so it is fair to assume that there will be a correlated increase in operational and private vehicles in Tuolumne. Unless there is a plan to add gasoline to the waste water treatment site where diesel will be relocated, this is an impact that should be discussed and analyzed for the administrative vehicles and employees that are stationed in Tuolumne for the summer in the Park Operations section of the plan.

The existing station at Tuolumne was recently upgraded to meet all state and federal codes. We believe that it may be most practical and a cost savings measure to retain the existing station, rather than to demobilize two fueling stations and rebuild one. These actions will likely require additional environmental review and mitigation and could become very expensive. Retention of the station should be reconsidered or the impacts of removal should be adequately analyzed in the TRP.

COMMENTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE/OPERATIONAL ACTIONS

The TRP and the Merced River Plan (MRP) have taken very different approaches to addressing administrative use in the user capacity programs. The TRP includes administrative use (including numbers of employees, housing, and utility usage) in the user capacity program and analysis, while the MRP omits administrative use from the user capacity discussion and is inconsistent in its treatment of items in and out of the river corridor. The NPS should clarify the reasoning behind its different approach to user capacity between the two river plans.

The NPS is calling for an additional 59 housing or campground units in Tuolumne for administrative use; however, park operations staff will only slightly increase by 13 (150 to 163). (Refer to Table 7-11 and pg. 7-92). The reason for this apparent inconsistency is not clear. At the same time, concessioner housing capacity is the same and yet concessioner-offered activities are being reduced. This logic requires clarification. New and additional NPS housing is called to be placed where the NPS stables operation currently exists, which is within the scenic segment boundary of the Tuolumne. While we agree with this action, we question why new and additional housing is permitted in a scenic corridor segment of the Tuolumne while long existing infrastructure must be relocated out of recreational segments of the Merced; this does not appear to be a consistent application of values.

As an additional point, the TRP is inconsistent in Citing the appropriate codes that new housing must meet. New concessioner housing (relocated away from the river at Tuolumne Lodge) is required to meet current federal codes, OSHA standards, and NPS standards, while the new park service housing is required to meet NPS design guidelines (included in Appendix K). The NPS should clarify if this was an oversight or explain why NPS and concessioner housing are subject to different standards.

The TRP calls for the NPS stables operation to be relocated to the concessioner stables area, but also notes that separation of stock and operations will be required for the health and safety of the animals and operational efficiency. NPS and concessioner stock currently share the same winter grazing area separated only by a single barbed-wire fence. We recommend that NPS consider contracting with the concessioner to provide administrative/operational stock support rather than constructing separate corals, feeding stations, storage, and corral housing. We believe this solution would be an efficient way to meet operational requirements, reduce the footprint and impact of maintaining segregated stables, eliminate Concern over the health and safety of the animals and reduce the number of stock being corralled in Tuolumne Meadows.

COMMENTS ON PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

The NPS began the TRP planning process in 2006 by starting public scoping, with a stated timeline of two and a half years. The draft plan has now been released seven years later. While the NPS has done an excellent job of soliciting public input along the way, with public meetings supported by workbooks and other tools, the past several years of planning for the Tuolumne have not been as engaging. It is unclear to the public why the NPS did not release a plan until now.

Alternatives were developed and ORVs were penned in 2008, with four public meetings in 2009 and two public meetings in 2010. The Baseline Conditions report, released in 2011, stated that the draft plan would be released that summer, but there was no announcement to the public when that release did not occur. The last factsheet for the TRP, issued in December of 2011, gave a 2012 date for the plan, with no subsequent information until the plan was released in January 2013 along with the MRP. A separate major EIS was subsequently released for the Mariposa Grove on February 14 and is currently under public review as well.

We are concerned that this overload of information (more than 4,500 pages in total) will result in a lack of public involvement in the planning process. Based on the timing of its release and the degree of publicity around the MRP, this is certainly a particular concern with the TRP. This concern could be mitigated by extending the public comment period for all the plans to the maximum 120 days allowed, rather than the shorter periods that have been adopted.

In summary, we commend the NPS on their work on the TRP; however, we are concerned about the inconsistency of the treatment of similar items between the MRP and the TRP, incomplete analysis of some of the plan actions and the reduction in

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

visitor recreational opportunities, with resulting impacts on ADA access, socioeconomic implications and visitor enjoyment. We hope that a final plan will maintain traditional uses in Tuolumne for future generations of visitors, consistent with the NPS goals identified in its "Call to Action". We are prepared to provide background information about our opinions should you so desire and thank the NPS for the opportunity to provide comment.

Yours truly,

██████████ President DNC Parks & Resorts at Yosemite, Inc.

Correspondence ID:	384	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	city of sonora Town or City Government				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	March 18, 2013				

Don Neubacher, Superintendent Yosemite National Park

PO Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

VIA: Email and US Mail

RE: Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan Draft EIS

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

I am writing regarding the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan Draft EIS (Draft EIS). Chapter 8 addresses the socioeconomic impacts of implementing the four alternatives. The study defines four counties as the "affected region" which includes the counties that either encompass the park or border the park. Tuolumne County is one of the counties that encompass a portion of the park. However, the study only specifically addresses the impacts on five communities within the four County region. These five communities are identified as being in the top fifteen communities mentioned in the referenced visitor study but the Draft EIS is silent regarding the impacts to the remaining ten communities. Given the social and economic similarity between Sonora and the communities identified, we surmise that the City may be one of the remaining fifteen communities that were not analyzed. As a result, the socioeconomic analysis need to be expanded to include an assessment of all of the communities within the "affected region" identified.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

██████████ City Administrator

Correspondence ID:	385	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION Conservation/Preservation				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please accept the attached comments on behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.				

Thank you for your consideration. ██████████ | SENIOR FIELD OFFICER AND ATTORNEY P 415.947.0692 M 415.683.8057

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

San Francisco Field Office 5 Third St., Suite 707, San Francisco, CA 94103 www.PreservationNation.org

March 18, 2013

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

VIA EMAIL to yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Mr. Neubacher,

On behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, please accept the following comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS).

We have found that Draft EIS indicates that a disproportionate amount of moderate, long-term adverse impacts to cultural resource values would occur under the preferred alternative as compared to all other values. We request that you re-evaluate the rationale for causing such impacts and adopt avoidance strategies rather than rely on mitigation as a way to enhance the public appreciation of cultural resources in Yosemite National Park.

In particular, we are concerned with the proposal to remove 3 of the 18 contributing historic cabins in High Sierra Camp to "reduce water use." As acknowledged in the Draft EIS, this would cause an adverse effect on the historic district. Further, we take issue with the plan to remove 7 tent cabins at Ranger Camp, a barn and tack shed, and the fuel station and mountaineering school at Tuolumne Meadows store and fuel station. We do not find compelling the proposed rationale to reduce risks to water quality and consolidate operations at the stables.

Finally, our concerns are heightened by the fact that several additional serious impacts to cultural resources are proposed in the preferred alternative in the Merced Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan, for which we will be commenting separately. The impacts must be contextualized with the approved Tuolumne Plan given that they will cause significant cumulative effects to historic resources.

Please contact me at bturner@savingplaces.org if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Senior Field Officer & Attorney

San Francisco Field Office

The Hearst Building, 5 Third Street, Suite 707 San Francisco, CA 94103 E info@savingplaces.org P 415.947.0692 F 415.947.0699 www.PreservationNation.org

Correspondence ID:	386	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Ahwahneechee/Mono Lake Paiute Tribal Government				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	For the Tuolumne Meadows area we would recommend the No-Action Alternative. The areas in this alternative have already been disturbed so just keep disturbing the same grounds. You can remove but you can't disturb anymore. No more rebuilding on undisturbed ground. No more buildings or parking lots except where they are at this present time.				

If you look at the whole park it can be clearly seen that you are unable to take care of what you have now. Everything you have now is in shambles and in need of repair and has been this way for many years; this is not something that just happened recently. We are not going to give you the OK to tear up or change anything more in this park. Do you know what this is? Part of your Mission Statement--quit destroying this National Treasure. The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations.

██████████ Ahwahneechee/Mono Lake Paiute The Real Indigenous Peoples of Yosemite ██████████

Correspondence ID:	387	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,20,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River.				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 388 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,19,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: From: [REDACTED] Date: Tue, Mar 19, 2013 at 1:33 PM Subject: Alternative 2 support To: "yose_planning@nps.gov" <yose_planning@nps.gov>

Please allow limited whitewater boating as described in alternative 2 of the wild and scenic Tuolumne river plan. Thank you in advance, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 389 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,19,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Tuolumne Planners

It is nearing the deadline and I have after a lapse of several weeks returned to reviewing your document. I have several observations to make.

First your common to all action alternative actions seem to be appropriate given your description of the Outstandingly Remarkable Values and the existing condition description. (except changing the colors of tents at Glen Aulin, the white is historically correct and it fits with the light colored granite of the region)

The remainder of my comments reflects over 60 years of visits to Yosemite and at least 55 years since my first visit to Tuolumne Meadows. I also had over 16 years as a NEPA nerd for the Forest Service and BLM, not to mention 10 seasons as an NPS ranger (most as a backcountry Ranger in SEKI).

So here goes.

My second observation is that under existing management, with the exception of a couple portions of meadows, all of Outstandingly Remarkable values are supported by the existing condition of the affected environment.

Consequently it is appalling that you would be willing to reduce recreational opportunities under alternative 1 by eliminating Concessioner Accomadations and amenities. Furthermore without reducing or controlling numbers of vehicles entering the Tioga road from both east and west you seem to think that limited parking will somehow solve overcrowding and the need for such amenities. Without adequate parking alternative 1 seems to guarantee gridlock. But there is not even a suggestion of that possibility in the Environmental Consequences analysis.

Similarly the elimination of facilities at Glen Aulin is not warranted by the description in the affected environment. As I am well into my 7th decade I am coming to appreciate the role of the High Sierra Camps in extending my backcountry travels.

Alternative 2, while mostly reasonable, eliminates all but 2 Composting Toilets at Glen Aulin as permanent structures. As a result more stock trips would be required at the beginning and end of the season to set up and tear down the camp.

Alternative 3, I don't understand how a reduction of about 3% of the total daily users can result in the reduction of 17% of NPS staff when the reduction comes from fewer concessioner accommodations and yet there is no reduction in concessioner employees.

The reduction in tents at Glen Aulin would seem to make it less economically viable to run the High Sierra Camp and would reduce availability to independent hikers if the same number of saddle trips and ranger led trips were maintained. Same

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

comment about Alternative 4

Also the table concerning Alternative 4 seems to be in error concerning the number of busses. I assume that is a typo.

Again the changes in daily uses vs. NPS staff is difficult to understand.

Finally I was extremely disappointed in the environmental consequences analysis. It was primarily a list of judgements that required me to guess what beneficial or adverse consequences were the outcome of an action under an alternative. For example a recurring theme for Glen Aulin was that relocation of trail access to the camp would be beneficial I guess that means a worn down to bare earth section of trail would become revegetated. I still don't know what the threat of the leach mound is to vegetation. I always thought that vegetation was a good way to filter out nasties.

And the discussion of risk of the leach mound to water quality is never really assessed. What is the probability of some kind of breach? What would the magnitude actually be? Would the water quality impacts be (quantifiably) downstream? It is also laughable to think that a high sierra camp will impact bear or deer migrations in any significant manner in a national park

I really have to think that the greatest risk to water quality is the risk of a motor vehicle accident at the Bridge over the Tuolumne or along side the Dana Fork and the introduction of petroleum products into the river. That risk is not even mentioned or assessed in the entire document.

Finally I would consider some additional actions to mitigate some of the problems the various alternatives try to resolve.

1.No over night stock at Glen Aulin, except that a packer horse and 2 or 3 pack animals may stay 1 night on what used to be the saddle horse trips. If the entire HSC loop were done from Tuolumne Meadows to Vogelsang to Merced Lake to Sunrise to May Lake on horseback then the People capable of that amount of riding should be able to walk down from May Lake to Glen Aulin and walk up to Tuolumne Meadows from Glen Aulin, the easiest leg of the loop. All other service trips must be round trip from Tuolumne Meadows. This would greatly reduce the need for corral facilities and reduce the need to pack feed down to Glen Aulin. 2.Similarly no overnight stock use should be permitted in Lyle Canyon (or if most use is currently multiple nights then consider a one night limit.) 3.I am strongly in favor of not allowing grazing until meadow conditions are suitable. Nor should stock use be permitted if trail conditions are such that the stock will go off trail to avoid muddy sections. 4.Do not dismiss the impacts of NPS use servicing trail crews. Many user trails have been created by NPS pack strings. 5.Finally manage the busses in a manner that encourages use. For example consider a parking area in Lee Vining. And a shuttle from there. Provide one night free in Backpackers Camp for people who arrive on a bus, from either the east or west. Do something creative here, think of other ways to encourage people to give up their cars! Michael Williams -----

As usual I left something out of my comments Re the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Plan. Please append this to my previous submission.

Please do something when planning for parking to assure there is adequate parking for longterm parking for people with wilderness permits. Perhaps a permit only parking lot. thanks [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	390	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Don Neubacher Superintendent Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577 Yosemite CA 95389				

Re: Comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Plan

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (TRP) as a member of The American Alpine Club (AAC), the International Mountaineering and Climbing Federation (UIAA), the California Recreational Resource Advisory Committee (CARRAC), and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

BACKGROUND

As a member of the AAC for 25 years, I have served as Vice President, a member of the Board of Directors, and leader of its Yosemite Committee. I also serve as President of the Mountain Protection Commission (MPC) of the UIAA based in Bern, Switzerland, representing millions of climbers and mountaineers worldwide, many of whom have climbed or aspire to climb in

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Yosemite National Park and World Heritage Site. As a member of the California Recreational Resource Advisory Committee, I represent summer non-motorized recreation, including climbing and mountaineering. I also serve as a Deputy Vice-Chairman of Mountains and Connectivity Conservation for the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) of the IUCN.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE #4 OFFERS REALISTIC WAYS TO BALANCE VISITATION AND USE WITH RESTORATION AND PROTECTION OF THE TUOLUMNE RIVER CORRIDOR

The members of the organizations I serve often recreate, visit, advocate for, and appreciate wilderness and wild lands such as the Tuolumne River corridor. A sizeable number of them have experience as land managers, seasonal workers, visitors, and volunteers in these special places. So we are quite aware of the need to find the right balance of protection, use, and visitation of these special places.

After reviewing the various Alternatives offered in this Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, I believe that Alternative 4 offers the best balance of protection, use and visitation for the Tuolumne River Corridor. It addresses the negative impacts of decades of roadside parking and social trails damaging the Tuolumne Meadows area, and offers good alternatives with a hiking trail parallel to the road and alternate parking locations. I especially like the temporary viewing turnouts, which will offer many visitors the chance to simply and conveniently pause on their way through the Tuolumne Meadows to enjoy the views, without having to spend a great deal of time to find a parking place.

Remediating the highly-popular Cathedral Lakes trailhead and its perennial parking issues is also a very valuable part of this alternative.

I have been in favor of the removal of the public fuel station next to the commercial services for many years, and am very supportive of this aspect of Alternative 4. Given the highly sensitive and fragile ecosystems of Tuolumne Meadows, and the possibilities of leakage and/or run-off of toxic substances from this station, its location is inappropriate. The three public fuel stations in Lee Vining are just 20 minutes to the east and help to support the economy of this historic small town.

The expansion of the parking area and retaining the picnic area at Lembert Dome are very appreciated. This is the perfect place for climbers and other visitors to rendezvous and have a coffee or a meal with friends in the morning and evening, before and after the day's activities. It's also allows visitors the opportunity to walk along the flanks of Lembert Dome and see some excellent examples of glacial polish on the granite slopes.

Climbers also cherish access to the quiet, low-key campsites at the Tuolumne Meadows campground, far away from the noise and congestion of those in Yosemite Valley. Retaining the capacity of this campground will be greatly appreciated.

CONCLUSION

On behalf of the groups I represent, I would like to express appreciation for the significant time and effort you and your planning staff have expended to inform the public about the development of the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement and to solicit our comments. I look forward to actively participating in this process as it moves forward.

Respectfully submitted,



The American Alpine Club Past Vice-President President, The Yosemite Committee

International Mountaineering and Climbing Federation President, Mountain Protection Commission

IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature WCPA - World Commission on Protected Areas Mountains and Connectivity Conservation Deputy Vice-Chairman, Communications

California Recreational Resource Advisory Committee Representative, Summer Non-Motorized Recreation

Correspondence ID:	391	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar, 18, 2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Subject: Public Comment on the Tuolumne River Plan 2013-03-18				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

From: [REDACTED]

Reference: Contact Info for the Yosemite Park, Tuolumne River Plan

Email: yose_planning@nps.gov Phone: 209-379-1110, or Tuolumne River Plan website at:
www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/trp.htm.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the National Park Service: Thank you for the presentation at Groveland of the 4 Plan alternatives for improving Tuolumne River within the borders of the National Park. I understand and accept that the main effort will be in the region of Tuolumne Meadows, where for the most people come in contact with the River via HW 120. Please accept, for the record, the brief statement I make next before going into my suggestions and thoughts on the 4 alternatives:

My brief statement on the travesty of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir: The most profound problem with the Tuolumne River is the dam built and owned by the city of San Francisco on Federally owned public land within the borders of an established National Park. I realize that an act of Congress produced this travesty. It is my recommendation that the National Park service take a more proactive stance for the benefit of the vast majority of Americans, whom you serve, so as to put on notice the City of San Francisco that the dam is inconsistent with the purpose of the National Parks and must be removed - the sooner the better. In the meantime, the city of San Francisco should be held responsible for environmental damage caused by its water system. I am disappointed that Yosemite Park does not at least inform the public of the environmental problems posed by this water works, an anachronism from the 20th century.

Now, onto a few comments on the Tuolumne River Plan. I hope some of my comments prove helpful. 1) Restoring Riparian areas in Tuolumne Meadows: I was very pleased to see from the presentation that old photos show thickets of willows protecting erosion vulnerable streambanks. I have worked as a volunteer on many, many meadow restorations with CSERC (Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center). These meadows were damaged by logging and cattle practices. It's easy to plant willows. Please, at the very least, start the restoration as soon as possible by planting locally native willows in all areas we know (from photos, etc.) had willows in the past. This is easy to do, as you know, just stick those willow stems in the ground in soil that is well enough watered. 2) Restoring Sheet Flow Spring runoff watering of the Meadows: I am not a biologist. I am an electrical engineer. But I am a keen observer of Nature. I have walked most of the Tuolumne River from the Glacier to Don Pedro Reservoir, and as well, most of the tributary rivers and many of the streams. Please send a biologist or soils specialist to study the excellent sheet flow found in the south spur of upper Akerson Meadows. Get there by taking Evergreen Road to Akerson Creek crossing. Go up the creek about 200 meters from the road. A small spur creek enters from the South. Follow that Creek up about 1/4 mile. The upper section of the meadow found there has superb sheet flow with correspondingly tall grasses throughout. In contrast, the main stem of Akerson Meadow (where the old, dilapidated ranch house prominently stands east of Evergreen Road) is badly eroded by serpentine channeling. That meadow is parched dry in the summer and the grasses are scrubby, nothing like the beautiful south meadow. I worked on a project with CSERC on a tributary creek of the Tuolumne River up near Cherry Lake (don't remember the exact spur road name). Contact CSERC for more info. That was a highly successful restoration because we had a lot of hard working volunteers as well as government employees. We made lots of LITTLE check dams to catch silt, making sure the over-flow goes over the center of the dam and onto a rock apron to prevent storm run-off undercutting of the check dam and further downstream erosion. These check dams were about a foot to 2 feet high, no more. In some spots we used log and branch debris to make check dams. This stays in place by proper placement, natural inter-ties, water logging, and sometimes with anchor stones strategically spaced. This is cheap and easy to do with local materials found on the site. You should visit this site near Cherry Lake. I can take you there or show you how to get there with a map, if you cannot get the info from CSERC. There are experts with proven methods on how to stop channelizing erosion, build up soils in stream flows with check dams, and how to make sheet flow dams. The best reference I have found is Brad Lancaster's series of books. You can check his website: www.harvestingrainwater.com. His books, a series of 2 volumes, Rainwater Harvesting for Drylands and Beyond. He has visited Groveland and is well known by Rob and Regina Hirsch, greywater and rainwater harvesting local expert from Groveland also - they own Mountain Sage Nursery. They also did the greywater and rainwater harvesting system for the sprawling Evergreen Lodge complex just west of the Park boundary. Brad Lancaster is one of the single most inspiring persons I have ever heard speak. I highly recommend you consult with him. He knows, and has done, what he is talking about. Finally, I have used both the brush & log jamb method, as well as stone check dams on my own property to catch silt for my garden and to restore a channelized creek (runs only when it rains). The effort was modest for such great results. Brush and log debris dams on larger creeks and rivers are reinforced by materials floating down from upstream - such as spring flood logs, sticks, and uprooted brush. The stream flow correctly directs the debris to the weakest part of the dam - as you likely have seen yourself. What I recommended at the Groveland meeting is that you do NOT issue a single contract for restoration efforts, but instead, parcel out small TRIAL SITES to competing enterprises (may be NGO's like CSERC, Sierra Club, etc. or private contractors, whatever). Whomever performs the best, let them get larger contracts. It is well worth experimenting this way, to save money - some of it is my money too - and to find out who is the most resourceful and effective at getting the sheet flow to happen. I recall reading from John Muir, I think it was, and he said that the meadow grasses in the high Sierras where tall and wonderful before the sheep. Sometimes the grass grows tall in a wet winter in Cottonwood Creek (again, east of Evergreen Road, in the Park - must hike to). This meadow could be easily restored to sheet flow with a couple of check dams where the creek flows through on the east side of the meadow.

3) Make a Village Center in Tuolumne Meadows outside of the Flood Plain: I won't go into much detail here because I haven't studied the topology much. But between the Gas Station and the campgrounds, maybe a bit west of there, or as well using part

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

of the campground, all of the human social activity of the meadow should be congregated. Views to the North can be had from there, so the Lodge should be moved there. The model to go by is a pedestrian friendly European Village (like city center Salzburg, Austria). Cars can only get to the periphery. Now the meadows experience is disjointed with a visitors center here, a store there, a lodge (that even I have never seen) over there. A model book to reference is "A Pattern Language" by the great architect Christopher Alexander, et al. It tells how there is a timeless way of natural order for communities large and small. Right now, the social experience for Tuolumne meadows is poor. The idea that needs to be built on, for a small community, is a town center based on a right-sized town square (easier said than done, especially when necessarily, and rightfully respecting nature). 4) Water Conservation Needs to be More Aggressive: Water conservation is another subject I am keen on. The best resources I know of are the before mentioned Brad Lancaster, but even more-so, Art Ludwig, the Greywater Guru (contact him at Oasisdesign.com). Art is located in Santa Barbara. He is also an excellent resource for cost effective, and KISS (keep it simple, stupid) design of rainwater catchment systems and greywater disposal systems. These people are top experts and they are affordable. Do not hire big engineering firms and consultants. They will give you a Rube Goldberg disaster. On Rainwater Catchment: Rainwater caught from roofs and clean runoff can be stored indefinitely without any treatment if you keep sunshine off of it. You can use it for toilets, washing cars, landscaping, gardens, etc. The trick is to get mass storage for the dry season (although thunder storms may replenish you at the higher altitude). Storage is the expensive part. It can be done economically, but not with conventional civil engineering techniques that will over-design, and go over-budget. Purified rainwater catchment can be used for showers and even drinking too. There are lots of options here. This is a big deal too, because you already have the roofs to catch the water. On Greywater: Greywater is any water from inside a house that is not toilet water, including sink, shower, clotheswashing, and in some cases kitchen sink water. It is safe to use again on exterior landscaping. I use it on my fruit trees. Topsoil quickly and effectively purifies greywater. Greywater use is a fine opportunity to take advantage of even if you don't have landscaping - just feed it out in the forest on native plants (as they do at Evergreen Lodge). Greywater CANNOT be stored without excessive cost. It quickly putrefies and the odor is over-whelming. You must immediately disperse it into the soil. Greywater can work year around in a properly designed system, but for sure, you need it summertime, and that is ideal. Do not forget, you are massively reducing water sent to your sewer treatment when you send only blackwater (toilet water). Most interior water use (about 75%) is greywater, so THINK how much smaller your new sewer treatment plant can be if you employ greywater techniques. This is the biggest deal of all. Greywater is relatively cheap to do, because no storage is done. On Blackwater: Composting Toilets can eliminate all Blackwater. In a rural environment, it is possible to totally eliminate wastewater treatment plants with effective use of greywater combined with composting toilets. I do not have a composting toilet, but others know much about them. People like Art Ludwig and Brad Lancaster can help you with this. It is important to poll knowledgeable people who are NOT SALESMEN (neither Art or Brad are) about what works best. Again, I would be inclined to, as soon as possible, try out a few types of composting toilets in a pilot program, and choose, after experience in your environment, the best one(s). 5. What plan do I like: I appreciate most the back to nature plan, but I also want Tuolumne Meadows to be more than a quick stop or drive-thru to tourists. That's why I think the village center approach will capture them, then they can take a hike. Most important is to get sheet flow of water in the meadow, re-deposit silts and sands, and get the tall grass growing again - and riparian willow trees. It can happen. The very best of luck to you all. Be wise and persevere. If I can help in any way, please call me Thank you for this opportunity to respond.

Correspondence ID:	392	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Hi- I don't see a form or link to comment so I'm sending a long email. Thanks for your efforts.				

1. I disagree with the preferred alternative in the first place. This is a national park not an amusement park (as it has been treated thus far). There's too much "access" in Yosemite all around. The park is too well loved because it is close to urban areas, has a freeway going through it, has hotel and cabins and hamburger stands and pools and junk stores. There are too many people in the park now to make it enjoyable for anyone, especially the natural residents (who don't ever seem to be accounted for). How many animals get run over every day to accommodate tourists and their cars in the name of "access"? Your plan should be a more self-reliant one to start off this discussion. Tradition is all well and good if it is sustainable for nature in a national park. This isn't Lincoln's Boyhood Home NP based on a human development. This is a NP based on preserving nature. 2. If you won't change your preferred alt plan then here are my thoughts on it.

A. What does campground overhaul mean? The campground is just that- a place to camp on the ground. Don't go changing that with 6 million parking places, showers, pavement everywhere, lights, etc please. The A loop is practically in the river so eliminate it, I agree. The toilets and sinks are a joke. The amount of water wasted is ridiculous and should be an embarrassment to the NPS. Why are there even water-based toilets at all when technology has given us preferred alternatives years ago? Composting toilets that don't drain any water from the river or require sewage treatment? Septic? Ultra low flow? Solar lighting too? Why is this not in place already? (And don't give me the money excuse.) Moving the entrance away from the river and the floodplain is great. But please do not go crazy and make a million dollar sign and entrance kiosk and unnecessary garbage like that. This isn't a private movie star campground in Aspen CO please. It's a campground, I repeat. The bathrooms and shuttle bus stops in the Valley are a perfect example of what we don't need in Tuolumne- movie star development. Who approved all that money spent on bathrooms?! B. I like the elimination of roadside parking but not at the expense of new development for parking lots. We have to get people on the buses and make the buses more efficient, timely, easy, mandatory, etc. People will adjust. Give them some credit for understanding global climate change, noise and air pollution, traffic jams, ugly sights in NPs. Visitors to Zion have adjusted to the mandatory bus system in summer or they don't go. They'll survive. Protecting the natural resources is equally as important as providing access to lazy people (in my opinion, more important). Force people to ride the bus and provide more electric/banana peel powered/hybrid/??? buses and do not increase parking so more people can drive around the park. It's like expanding the freeways to make traffic better but it's never enough, the cars just keep coming. When do you stop? 2 lanes? 5 lanes? 10? Force people to ride a bus and they will. It works in Denali and Zion and Tokyo. As everyone knows the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Valley is a nightmare of cars. No matter how big the parking lots, they're not enough. People who can't find a spot are not going to leave. That's ridiculous. They just sit in their cars idling, or driving around in circles, waiting for someone to leave a spot. More parking is not the answer, as any city can tell you. A mandatory bus is. Not the current silly bus system that never runs on time, has surly drivers, no rhyme or reason as to when or if it will show up and only goes a few places. We can do better. Look to Denali and Zion if you need help. C. I do not agree with eliminating trail rides. That's a back to nature, low noise and air pollution, "traditional" way to get around. I like horses a thousand times better than I like cars. A million. Give lazy people the access they desire on horseback. I know which trails to avoid if I don't want horse poop in my boots or to walk in dusty ruts. I also think that horse damage can be much more easily repaired than car. Roadkill, damage from building parking lots and cutting down trees, oil and gas in the meadows and river, air and noise pollution far outweigh horse poop. If lazy people get to ride horses, they might be deterred from driving a little and cutting across the meadows and river and trails. The ultimate push for everything to be ADA accessible can be mitigated by providing access for some differently-abled people, as well. An entire NP cannot be made accessible but horses make some of it accessible. But I do agree on consolidating the stables into one area.

D. I also wholeheartedly disagree with a new visitors center. The old one is just fine. It's cute, small, historic, appropriate and the right scale. Again, I envision one like the Valley that looks like a movie star Aspen CO mansion with a million car parking lot in front and I want to die. It will look like the Getty instead of a NP visitors center. And what a colossal waste of tax money. "Improvements" are not always. The old one is often empty and those who do visit it love it. They say how cute it is. It's just right, don't change a thing. Except the disgustingly dirty, water-wasting bathrooms please.

E. The employee housing is just fine too. The Aspen CO housing in the Valley by the ice rink is ridiculous. Call that low impact? Small footprint? Energy efficient? Good for the environment? NP-like? HA! It's the Getty again. Not necessary. Anything that was mistakenly built too close to the river should be moved and bathrooms should be water and electricity-wise but that's it. Employees should expect to live in cabin-like accommodations. And the El Portal housing where employees have to drive or ride a bus (30 mins) into the park every day is ridiculous. Those are air conditioned, cable TVed, ugly apartment buildings in a suburb of the NP. How is that better than a tent cabin within walking distance?

F. Along with better and mandatory buses I think there should be a trail/bike path through at least the downtown Tuolumne area. Lots of folks ride bikes which are non-polluting, healthy, historic, appropriate and noiseless. Why can't we accommodate them? That would eliminate lots of cars and free up seats on the buses and not cause zillions of other problems. And racks to lock them up would keep people off the meadows, trees and the like. Bikes are the almost perfect urban solution to overcrowding. Why not the NPs? And no, I don't think we need to provide rentals. Lots of folks will know and/or learn to bring their own.

G. THE WHOLE PARK SHOULD BE 25 MPH. PEOPLE DRIVE TOO FAST FOR THEIR OWN GOOD AND ALL THE ANIMALS'. WHY IS THIS SO? SLOW DOWN!!! IT'S A PARK NOT A CUT THROUGH. AND IF THEY'RE USING IT AS A CUT THROUGH THEN THEY'LL HAVE TO DRIVE 25 TO CUT THROUGH. MAYBE THEN THEY WON'T USE IT FOR THAT. WHY ARE ANIMALS BEING KILLED IN THEIR HOMES TO ACCOMMODATE STUPID HUMANS WHO REFUSE TO DRIVE CAREFULLY? THIS IS THEIR SANCTUARY NOT THE HUMANS'. PLEASE FORCE PEOPLE TO DO THE RIGHT THING AND GO SLOW THROUGH NATURE'S SANCTUARY. PEOPLE DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO KILL ALL THE ANIMALS IN THE NATIONAL PARK IN THE NAME OF CONVENIENCE. "SLOW" AND "SPEEDING KILLS BEARS" SIGNS DON'T WORK. HOW MANY ANIMALS HAVE TO DIE BEFORE WE WAKE UP? ISN'T A NATIONAL PARKS JOB TO PRESERVE NATURE? HELP THE ANIMALS SURVIVE IN THEIR OWN HOMES. You can probably guess my thoughts on the MRP by now. I am not going to reiterate the whole Aspen CO or LA Getty Museum theme about the Valley's problems. Suffice to say that it's ridiculous down there and eliminating lots of people's access would do the park and it's visitors a world of good. I do not believe that access should be the paramount concern in National Parks to the detriment of the natural park. There is such a thing as loving a place to death and smothering something you love and I believe poor Yosemite, the flagship park and John Muir's beloved, is well into that territory. Thank you for your work on this and listening to the public's thoughts. I hope something good and sensible comes out of all these tax dollars in the end... It's a critical time for nature and setting a good example for the world to follow in this ever-warming, ever-humanizing, ever-(de)civilizing time.

Correspondence ID:	393	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please consider Alternative 2 and incorporate limited whitewater boatin recreation into the management plan for the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne.				

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	394	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Friends of Yosemite Valley University/Professional Society				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	18 March 2013				

The following brief comments are submitted by the Friends of Yosemite Valley (FOYV), concerning the Tuolumne River Plan

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

(TRP):

1) We hereby incorporate by reference our prior comments and concerns submitted to NPS Planners with respect to the Tuolumne Plan.

2) We ask that the comment period be extended. We have never encountered a more impossible task than the one at hand; reading and digesting the Tuolumne Plan while trying to read the Merced Plan, and the Plan for the Mariposa Grove, and preparing serious comments on all three. If there was ever an impossible task, this may be it. The Park Service should acknowledge that by the sheer volume of the plans out for comment, it has structured a public process in which the public can no longer reasonably participate. This does not serve the Park. We submit what follows under protest, and in light of the need to reach the administrative deadline.

3) The TRP should make explicit which elements it intends as programmatic elements, and which it intends as project level elements. The NPS should clarify which projects would receive further environmental review prior to adoption or enactment, what elements are still being studied, and where there may be revisions to the plan. There is a risk that the NPS will wrongly proceed with any number of projects without further environmental review, compounding environmental and visitor experience problems.

4) We have repeatedly expressed our belief that the High Sierra Camps should be removed, and both NPS and Concession stock use drastically reduced. The NPS has, by our measure, failed to justify the continued use of stock per se. The NPS has failed to justify the continued use of the HSC's. Our members hike the trails upon which the Camps drive stock to transport linens and fresh food to people who insist that the wilderness be conformed for their comfort. This adversely impacts the ongoing use of these trails by our members who reasonably expect not to encounter horse/mule manure, flies, eroded trails and meadows, and polluted Sierra waters.

5) Commercial day stock rides should be ended immediately.

6) Planning for the Glen Aulin Camp should be discussed in the context of the Wilderness Stewardship plan; the discontinuation of all High Sierra Camps should be discussed at the programmatic level in the Wilderness Stewardship plan.

7) The final EIS and Plan should defer the discussion of how many people should be on Wilderness trails to the Wilderness Stewardship planning process. Discussion under the TRP might suggest that the NPS has defined some quality of "Wilderness experience" for trails that serve well-beloved day hikes, and where un-needed restriction will just alienate public while serving no defined environmental purpose. The current approach is merely piecemeal planning.

8) Conversely, we do think that there are some areas where there is real damage that needs to be reversed. We Support actual restoration actions at Tuolumne. We think the NPS should re-focus what it is doing by using the reversal of actual problems as a starting point of its proposed actions in the TRP.

9) We support the continued use of the campground, with elimination of sites unreasonably close the River.

10) The EIS fails to justify continued presence of stock, and fails to adequately justify the number of stock in actual use. This notwithstanding, the consolidation of NPS stock at the concession stable would be acceptable to us as an interim measure. Site specific analysis should at least measure some benefit in order to justify the move from the NPS stable.

11) The parking situation is unclear. We do not support the random elimination of parking without analysis and justification. Moreover, we do not support a net reduction in existing parking. People access Tuolumne and its outstanding recreation and solitude opportunities primarily by car; talk to the contrary has left a sense that the NPS will begin to undermine the existing pattern of visitation without justification. We do support the elimination of unauthorized roadside parking. But we ask that further analysis fully justify any such changes by showing no net loss of places to stop. This is a matter directly affecting recreation itself. We ask that the NPS look more carefully at the use of small, dispersed, unobtrusive spots where people can park.

Sincerely

 Director

Friends of Yosemite Valley

Correspondence ID:	395	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: To whom it may concern at the NPS:

I am a resident of Sacramento and an avid whitewater boater and instructor. From both my perspective as a science teacher and whitewater kayaker I ask that you provide access to the Tuolumne as provided for alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. This allows for boating on the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne, which I believe will not degrade the habitat or yield any severe impacts on the park. This is an elite run that only a few expert kayakers would be attempting in a given year. It would be possible to still limit the impact and presence by the put-in at Tuolumne Meadows by simply requiring a short hike-in (perhaps 0.5 - 1 miles from the nearest road) before individuals would be allowed to put on the river. This measure would prevent the large traffic of day hikers in the Tuolumne Meadow area from entering the water and destroying the habitat. I believe that these large crowds are the threat to the environment in the park and not the few kayakers that would attempt a run of this caliber on a yearly basis. Similar to the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne, other high sierra runs in the class V+ realm such as the NF Mokelumne, Middle Fork Kings, and Devil's Postpile Run of the San Joaquin only see a few small teams of boaters per season. The majority of these boaters are practiced in leave no trace techniques and are at managing themselves in a wilderness environment. Please take my comments into consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	396	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	American Whitewater Recreational Groups				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	[REDACTED] California Stewardship Director 4 Baroni Drive Chico, CA 95928 530-343-1871 dave@americanwhitewater.org				

www.americanwhitewater.org

March 18, 2013

Yosemite National Park Superintendent Don Neubacher Attn: Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

American Whitewater appreciates having the opportunity to provide comment on Yosemite National Park's Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft Plan"). We also appreciate that you and your staff took the time to meet with us on February 26th, 2013 to discuss our interest in the plan and concerns regarding managing boating within the Park. A complete prohibition on boating is an usual management approach for both National Parks and on Wild and Scenic Rivers throughout the country, and we're pleased that Yosemite National Park is open to considering options for allowing paddling on the Tuolumne River.

American Whitewater is a national 501(c)(3) non-profit organization with a mission to protect and restore America's whitewater resources and enhance the public's ability to enjoy them safely. With over 5,500 members and 100 affiliate clubs, we represent the conservation interests of tens of thousands of whitewater enthusiasts across the country. A significant portion of our membership either resides in California or frequently travels to the state to enjoy our whitewater resources and connect with the landscape through rivers. As such, we have a direct interest in the future management of the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River within Yosemite National Park.

Experiencing Yosemite National Park while boating on the Tuolumne River would be a peak experience for many of our members. More than just a means of travel, boating literally and figuratively immerses people within spectacular places, and does so with minimal impact. The Tuolumne offers a meaningful and significant opportunity for expedition-oriented kayakers to enjoy and connect with one of the most awe-inspiring and stunningly beautiful places in the world.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Unfortunately, boaters have been denied this experience due to a long-standing prohibition on boating along the entire length of the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River within Yosemite National Park. While this ban has been in place for decades, it is a highly unusual management tool² both for National Parks and on Wild and Scenic Rivers across the country. Out of over 300 units of the National Park System, Yosemite is just one of three with such a prohibition. And on the over 200 Wild and Scenic Rivers throughout the country, paddling is allowed as a general rule. Rather than ban boating,

there are other tools available to the Park to address management concerns, which we discuss below.

Yosemite National Park is truly a special place, and American Whitewater and our members care strongly about protecting the valued ecological, cultural and historic resources within the Park. We also value preserving a wilderness experience for all who visit the Park. As a result, we fully support implementation of appropriate use limits and management actions that are necessary to protect park resources and ensure capacities are not exceeded. We believe that protecting these values can go hand in hand with allowing boating on the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River.

Wilderness Goals, Standards, Capacities, and Management Actions in the Tuolumne River Corridor

The Draft Plan establishes that the overall management goal for recreation values within the Tuolumne River corridor is to provide experiences characterized by primitive and unconfined recreation, self-reliance and solitude.¹

In order to meet this management goal, the overall management indicator used is defined by the number of encounters a visitor will have with another group per hour. The management standard for the Park for this indicator is no more than ten encounters with other groups per hour, 80% of the time, exceeding not more than two out of three consecutive years.²

Shelby and Whittaker define visitor capacity as "the level of use beyond which impacts exceed standards."³ The Draft Plan establishes an overnight visitor capacity for the Tuolumne River Corridor of 350 people per night in the wilderness zone above Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Visitor use above this number assumes that the standard would be violated.⁴

To ensure that the standard is met, and capacity not exceeded, the Draft Plan proposes a number of management actions intended to regulate recreational use numbers and behavior. These include direct management actions that limit use, with the most relevant example being a limit of no more than 50 people per day beginning an overnight hike on the Glen Aulin Trail,⁵ as well as indirect actions like placing limits on group sizes, available campsites, parking lot locations and sizes, and permit acquisition.

American Whitewater believes that the overall goals, standards and capacities outlined in the Draft Plan are well reasoned. We support the majority of the management¹

Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, January 2013, p. 5-7 and 5-75. ² Id. at p. 5-76. ³ See Whittaker, Doug and Shelby, Bo, "Allocating River Use: A Review of Approaches and Existing Systems for River Professionals." River Management Society. 2008. ⁴ Tuolumne Draft Plan, p. 7-20. ⁵ Tuolumne Draft Plan, p. 7-88. Note that trail quotas in the Draft Plan could be considered as either trail capacities or management actions. The Draft Plan is unclear about which is the case.

actions suggested by the Park in order to uphold these goals, standards and capacities² with one exception. The Draft Plan separates boaters out from all other overnight uses, banning paddling within the Park. Under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, management actions that limit use must be "necessary" and must not limit uses that do not "substantially interfere" with the values that led to designation.⁶ ¹ Paddling is Consistent with the Goal, Standard, and Visitor Capacities

While the Draft Plan bans boating in the Preferred Alternative, it offers no evidence that paddling the Tuolumne is incompatible with the management goal of providing an experience that fosters "self-reliance and solitude." Rather than running counter to this management goal, we believe that paddling embodies it. Overall, paddling is a low- impact, Wilderness compliant activity, and it is exactly the kind of activity and experience that the National Park System was created to foster. The Tuolumne River itself speaks to this management goal as well, as it is a remote river that provides a challenging, and peak experience for paddlers who are capable and motivated enough to take the trip.

Similarly, while the Draft Plan bans boating in the Preferred Alternative, it fails to describe or document how paddling would cause the management standard of no more than ten encounters with other groups per hour, 80% of the time to be exceeded. The Park acknowledges that paddling use would be extremely low due to the level of challenge and the small seasonal window of acceptable flows, and we support this assumption.⁷ Regardless, we believe that appropriate river management actions would undeniably keep paddling from violating the management standard.

Finally, the Draft Plan also fails to describe or document how a few paddlers would violate the 350-person per night capacity for the wilderness zone above Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Standard river management actions could undeniably keep paddling from

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

violating the standard.

2. Reasonable Determination of Paddling Capacity

American Whitewater understands your mandate to define capacities for "kinds and amounts of public use,"⁸ and fully supports defining reasonable capacities for paddling and all other forms of appropriate recreational enjoyment of the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River corridor. We agree that there is a number of paddlers that would be too many (like all visitors), but disagree that that number is one. We suggest that 6 ----- 16 U.S.C. ' 1281(a). The Tuolumne is a very committing expedition run that will only be attempted by highly skilled boaters. Additionally, this run is only considered to be boatable when flows are between 500 and 1,500 cfs, as measured at the USGS gage above Hetch Hetchy reservoir. This range of flows typically occurs during a two to four week period in May, June, or July, depending on snowpack. 8 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Guidelines for Eligibility, Classification and Management of River Areas, Section III. Federal Register, Volume 47 No. 173, September 7, 1982. -----
----- 7

instead of a blanket prohibition, boaters can be included with other visitors to the Park, and that existing wilderness zone capacities apply to boaters as well as other visitors.

9

Wilderness zone capacities in the Park are based on overnight use. Through this lens, camping in the wilderness as a paddler is the same kind of use as camping in the wilderness as a backcountry hiker. The target capacity is the same, regardless of whether overnight visitors arrive at their campsite by foot or by boat. Thus, we feel the backcountry capacities proposed for hikers in the Draft Plan should be inclusive of paddling.

While we strongly advocate that the Park include boating within wilderness zone capacity numbers, we recognize that the Park may feel that it is necessary to define a specific capacity for paddling. In this event, we understand that determining capacity can be a complex exercise that must consider other uses within the park, and that ultimately, the Park is best able to determine this number. In our opinion, however, the capacity of the Tuolumne River through the Meadows and Grand Canyon is, at a minimum, two groups of up to eight people per day.¹⁰ With an existing overall wilderness capacity of 350 people, this places boating capacity at a very small percentage of the total capacity within the Tuolumne corridor. At this scale, paddlers would be unlikely to encounter or compete with each other or other visitors to a detrimental degree.

Paddling capacities in this case are an academic exercise only. Flows, difficulty, and physical challenge all contribute to keep demand low. In light of these conditions, we expect that the number of groups paddling the Tuolumne River will not exceed ten per year, and thus it is not reasonable to assume paddling will approach or exceed any reasonable capacity specific to paddling, nor significantly contribute to violations of the total zone capacity.

3. Reasonable Application of Direct Recreation Management Tools (Quotas) to Meet the Standard and Stay Within The Capacity.

Capacity is "the level of use beyond which impacts exceed standards," and the Park Service has a full suite of management tools to ensure those standards are not exceeded, including trailhead quotas, group size limits and parking restrictions. While using these tools can be an effective way to protect valued resources within the Park, they also place limits on the public's ability to enjoy the Park and require Park resources to

----- 9

The Draft Plan states that "[t]he Yosemite Wilderness is the most crowded in the NPS system, and it is somewhat hard to find solitude within day hiking distance of Tuolumne Meadows trailheads during the summer hiking season. However, beyond that distance (usually 3 to 5 miles) conditions for solitude are more abundant." (TRP, p. 8-173.) This statement makes it clear that the primary issue is day use at Tuolumne Meadows rather than overnight use in the wilderness. Banning paddling will not solve this problem, and we find it surprising that no limits are proposed on day use for all visitors.

10

If a user capacity for paddling is established, we suggest that it be stated on a per-day or at-one-time scale. Alternative 2 considers capacities at the per-year scale, which is impossible to directly connect with most relevant standards. -----
----- implement. As a result, these tools should only be used when they are necessary to 1) to reduce use, if and when use approaches capacity, and 2) to address specific resource concerns.

As previously stated, we believe that paddling capacity far exceeds demand for the Tuolumne Meadows and Grand Canyon, but

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

we recognize that paddling also occurs with more popular hiking activities in some of the same areas. Paddling use is unlikely to ever threaten to exceed standards because of seasonal flow availability and the technical challenge of the river. However the total use of the area may.

As we discussed at our meeting on February 26th, we support the Park's concept of considering river use similar to trail use. The Tuolumne River could either be considered a (water) trail with its own daily quota specific to floating, or it could be included as part of the adjacent Glen Aulin Trail quota. As we understand trail quotas, they are intended to meet a desired encounter standard and limit use based on available camping sites and wilderness zone capacities. Provided that trail use is defined by these criteria, we support either approach.

The Glen Aulin Trail currently has two quotas for overnight use, one for people camping their first night at Glen Aulin Camp (35 people total: 21 reservations, 14 first come first served) and another for people camping beyond Glen Aulin Camp (15 people total: 9 reservations, 6 first come first served). The Preferred Alternative would reduce the quota for the Glen Aulin Camp to 20, while keeping the overnight Glen Aulin Wilderness Zone capacity at 50.

For managing boating on the Tuolumne, we propose either:

a. That those who seek a permit for using the Glen Aulin Trail (whether they camp at Glen Aulin or beyond) have the option of choosing whether to paddle or hike. The Draft Management Plan limits the group size for hikers venturing off-trail to eight per group,¹¹ and we suggest that this limit is acceptable and reasonable for paddling as well. In this scenario, the Park would not allow additional use of the river corridor or adjacent camping, but would allow paddlers the opportunity to enjoy the river under these strict existing limits. There would be no additional work or permit changes required by the Park;

or,

b. The river could be managed as a trail in and of itself, distinct from the Glen Aulin Trail. In this case, we recommend the same permitting requirements and quota be instituted as is the case for hikers camping beyond Glen Aulin Camp. (Currently, 15 people total [9 reservations, 6 first come first served], or 30 people, as we understand the Preferred Alternative). This option would recognize that river users travel a different route, camp in different locations, and would be far less likely to encounter hikers than other hikers would be.

----- 11

Draft Management Plan, p. 7-7. -----

American Whitewater supports either approach, but prefers the first. We believe that the first option is the easiest to implement and would have no effects on other Plan components. Both would be fair, equitable, protective of the resource, in compliance with capacities, and ensure standards are not exceeded. Also, importantly for us, either would provide a reasonable chance for paddlers to enjoy this river.

4. Reasonable Application of Indirect Recreation Management Tools to Address Specific Resource Concerns

The Draft Plan references several resource concerns regarding paddling that are easily addressed through standard river management actions. We outline several suggestions below that have been utilized on rivers throughout the country. Rather than unnecessarily banning boating on the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River, the Park should instead implement some or all of the actions outlined below.

Specifically, the Draft Plan cites concerns about impacts to riparian plants in the Meadows as a justification for banning paddling. As conservation-oriented paddlers, our members highly value preserving the ecological health of the rivers we enjoy. Except for putting-in and taking-out, paddlers generally stay in the channel rather than on the banks. Floating on the water has much less impact on riparian vegetation than visitors who are walking along the banks.

The Draft Plan considers actions intended to keep visitors, such as day use hikers, anglers and swimmers, away from sensitive vegetation areas and on trails and boardwalks in order to prevent additional riparian zone damage.¹² It also describes how wilderness campers receive instruction on how to minimize and avoid impacts to the wilderness when they receive their permit.¹³ We propose that the Final Plan include actions that seek to accomplish the same goal for paddlers, keeping them on the water and away from shore. These actions could acceptably include:

*Designated river and shore access areas. *Education on riparian vegetation through signage or permit materials. *Mandatory equipment requirements: Personal Floatation Device, helmet, and a boat designed specifically for river travel. *Request that boaters stay off the shore as a voluntary measure, except at designated areas. *Mandatory closure of shore access except at

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

designated areas or in case of emergency, so long as those areas are closed to all visitors.

Banning boating to protect riparian vegetation, just as banning any other activity within the Park to accomplish the same goal, makes little sense. Any of these management tools would protect riparian vegetation from possible impacts for all uses and visitors to the Park. ----- 12

Draft Management Plan, p. ES-12 (Describing options for management under Alternative 2). 13 Draft Management Plan, p. 8-174.

We understand that there is a great deal of congestion and crowding along Highway 120, and are sensitive to the fact that boaters will be part of this. In order to ease crowding for both general visitors and boaters, we suggest that Soda Springs may be an ideal place for boaters to put-in. It is removed from Highway 120, there is room for multi-day parking, and there is a gravel bar on the river that would be appropriate as a launch site. While there are many potential launch sites, we believe that the Soda Springs location is most appropriate.

In addition, we understand and appreciate the sensitivity of cultural resources within the Pate Valley. We expect that the same restrictions that apply to other visitors to this area will also be applied to paddlers.

Another reason cited in the Draft Plan for prohibiting boating is safety. Safety on technically challenging whitewater is managed consistently across many federally managed rivers with some simple management actions. They include:

*Mandatory permit required for river use. *Mandatory equipment requirements: personal floatation device, helmet, and a *boat designed specifically for river travel. *Education on the conditions to be expected on the water.

Paddling prohibitions or use limits are not used to manage river safety on any other river we are aware of in the United States. The management tools listed above serve river managers well across the country, and we encourage the Park to employ them to address safety concerns.

Tuolumne River Below O'Shaughnessy Dam

Our members would also appreciate the opportunity to boat on the Tuolumne River below O'Shaughnessy Dam, and we believe that boating here, as upstream, is appropriate and can be managed along with other uses in the area. We note that the Draft Plan does not specifically address whether boating will be allowed on this segment, and we request that boating also be allowed on this reach. Table 8-14 shows that trailhead use to Poopenaut Valley is the lowest in the Tuolumne River corridor.¹⁴ Use here is far below the trailhead quota of 25 people per day. Boating use numbers should be incorporated into the existing wilderness zone capacity limit and trailhead quota. There is no indication that boating use would significantly increase use in this area.
Conclusion

As it currently stands, the Draft Management Plan creates a double standard between paddling and all other uses allowed within Yosemite National Park. The Draft Plan's Preferred Alternative establishes specific trail quotas for people who seek to hike the Glen Aulin Trail at 50 people per night, and overnight wilderness capacities at 350 people per night above Hetch Hetchy. These management actions and visitor capacities are implemented to stay within the realm of a preferred encounter standard. At the same time, the capacity for those who also seek to camp in the backcountry, but arrive by boat, ----- 14

Draft Management Plan, p. 8-173. -----

is found to be zero. In response to this finding, the Preferred Alternative selected in the Draft Plan proposes a total ban on all boating. This action completely lacks justification, and is incongruous with how the Park is required to establish user capacities under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Wilderness Act and the National Park Service's policies.¹⁵

The Draft Plan fails to support setting the capacity of the river for paddling at zero, and similarly fails to justify banning boating completely throughout the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River corridor. Specifically, the Draft Plan fails to provide a reason for managing one person who chooses to hike through an area differently from another who wants to float through that same area. Making such a distinction in this case is arbitrary and capricious.

American Whitewater believes that the Tuolumne River has a capacity to support recreational use, and that the established wilderness zone capacity, target encounter standard, and Park resource values can be maintained if boating is managed in an integrated fashion with hiking and camping. We have outlined proposals for managing paddling on the Tuolumne River through the Meadows and the Grand Canyon that are simple, nationally-consistent, protective, and in compliance with the Wilderness

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

and Wild and Scenic Rivers Acts. We ask simply that informed visitors with the right equipment be allowed to choose to paddle through this area rather than hike through it, and that they be managed under the same capacities and with the same tools that apply to hikers.

We welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the Park in order to ensure that the Final Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River Management Plan is protective of Park values while offering visitors a high quality wilderness experience whether they chose to paddle or hike. Thank you for considering our suggestions and requests.

Sincerely,

██████████ California Stewardship Director

██████████ National Stewardship Director

██████████ Associate Stewardship Director ----- 15

See American Whitewater's scoping comments for the Merced River, dated February 4, 2010, November 23, 2011, and April 20, 2012.

Correspondence ID:	397	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar.18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 18, 2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher

Yosemite National Park ?

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 ?Yosemite, CA 95389

Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a California resident, avid kayaker, professional whitewater raft guide, and member of American Whitewater, I am writing to formally submit my comments on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Tuolumne River. I appreciate the opportunity to comment and your time for reviewing this letter.

After attending the Tuolumne River Plan Public Meeting on February 19th, 2013, I am compelled to inform you that I do not feel that the Plan itself, nor the proposed alternatives adequately consider the potential to allow boating on the Tuolumne River. Whitewater kayaking is a low impact, wilderness appropriate activity, which qualified individuals should be allowed to enjoy on the Tuolumne River in Yosemite National Park.

Save for a brief mention concerning the safety of participants, I find no explanatory evidence within the plan concerning the ban on kayaking on the Tuolumne. As with all wilderness activities and recreation, risk management is a key element in kayaking, and one which should be left to the discretion of individual boaters. Moreover, Yosemite Search and Rescue is one of the preeminent Search and Rescue teams in the world, and it is doubtful that additional expenditures would be required to help bolster the safety of the small number of self-selecting individuals interested in boating the more difficult sections of the Tuolumne River.

Whitewater kayaking has given me and countless others access to some of the most meaningful wilderness experiences and beautiful places across America's vast landscape. I wholeheartedly urge you to consider lifting any and all bans which prevent people from respectfully experiencing the majesty of the Tuolumne River.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 398 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence:

Dear Yosemite Planners, Kayaking on the Tuolumne river from Tuolumne meadows down to Glen Aullin is an amazing stretch of river that deserves to be paddled. Kayaking is such a small recreational activity compared to the climbing that goes on in the park. The very least you could do would be to approve of kayaking on this one fine stretch. The boatable flow window for this stretch would only make it available to be paddled one or two weeks out of the year and deserves protection so that the public still has the chance to do so in the future. If climbers can climb all over the peaks and faces when ever the rock is dry why can we not paddle the creeks and rivers when they are wet enough? The rivers are natural trails that when traveled upon the user leaves no trace. When falls are portaged we only use hundreds of feet of foot paths to portage our boats. If you allow for more kayaking within the park the Tuolumne and Merced will most likely see no increase in kayaker traffic than it already does. Please do not ban kayaking in Yosemite. For as amazing as the rock climbing is in Yosemite the kayaking is just as spectacular. I beg that you don't ban kayaking as it allows people to interact with nature in such a sustainable way that it shows others an example of how we should all be in nature. Alive and celebrating it's great glory, cherishing it for those who are not as lucky as we.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

----- second email from [REDACTED]

My name is [REDACTED] and I have paddled from tuolumne meadows down to Hetch Hetchy through the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne. This was a great low impact experience that other paddlers deserve the chance to paddle. The run would be great if you paddled down to above Glenn Aullin and hiked out there as well. Kayaking is such a low impact sport with boatable flow windows in the range of 1 or 2 weeks out of the whole year when the rivers and creeks within Yosemite can be paddled. Please do not take away further opportunities for our children to explore Yosemite in a unique and low impact way. Please let kayakers paddle on all of the stretches of the Merced and Tuolumne within the park so we don't have to run or hide whenever a Ranger approaches. Prohibiting kayaking is not a viable solution. Sincerely, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] From the American River

Correspondence ID: 399 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence:

Dear Park Planners, I would like to see the Tuolumne River from below Tuolumne Meadows to Pate Valley opened to whitewater paddling as proposed in alternative 2 of the draft comprehensive management plan. I believe that floating should be allowed because the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides "for public recreation and resource uses which do not adversely impact or degrade those [river] values." The South Merced within Yosemite National Park is a class V run which has been allowed for many years without issues or conflicts. This history should be considered as evidence that paddling does not "adversely impact or degrade those [river] values." Boaters will not impact the river corridor more than other river users who hike alongside the river. Boaters can follow the existing permit system and abide by existing regulations. I named my son "Aulin" for the Glen Aulin on the Tuolumne River, so the free enjoyment of the river is an issue near to my heart. Please allow for whitewater paddling as proposed in alternative 2 of the draft comprehensive management plan for the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River. Best, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 400 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence:

From: [REDACTED] Date: Mon, Mar 18, 2013 at 8:36 PM Subject: Comments on Tuolumne Wild and Scenic CMP EIS To: "yose_planning@nps.gov" <yose_planning@nps.gov>

By way of background, we have been visiting Yosemite, including the Tuolumne area, several times per year for over 20 years, including day trips, backpacking trips, and staying at the High Sierra Camps.

The following comments are based on our personal experience and observations and are all are directed at the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4). Glen Aulin HSC Size Reduction While we understand and overall agree with the water-treatment reasons given for the reduction in size of Glen Aulin HSC from 32 beds to 20 beds, we would suggest considering the following ways to mitigate this reduction:

1) Maintain the additional 12 rooms as "lodging only" service: no meals, showers, linen, firewood, use of bath facilities (sinks),

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

etc. Such use should not result in increased use of the water treatment facilities at the camp over that of backpackers. OR 2) Add an additional 12 spots to the Glen Aulin backcountry wilderness quota, since the reasons given for reducing the size of Glen Aulin are specific to HSC use (water treatment, stocking), not general corridor user capacity. 3) Discontinue guided and pack trips to Glen Aulin. Such trips could still take advantage of "semi-loops" incorporating the other four backcountry camps. This would maximize the number of individual hikers who could complete 5-camp loop itineraries essentially 20 hikers per day, since Glen Aulin would be by far the smallest HSC and would thus set the upper limit for number of loop hikers. Also, based on advice given by DNC for the HSC lottery application, there is already an oversupply of guided and pack HSC trips relative to individual hikers, compared to relative demand. Relocated Cathedral Lakes Trailhead 1) The map for the preferred alternative suggests that a new trail (labeled with a "5" on figure 7-11) would be constructed from the relocated Cathedral Lakes parking area to the currently existing trailhead. The alignment of this trail should leverage the existing JMT to the fullest extent possible. 2) The existing shuttle stops at the current Cathedral Lakes trailhead should be maintained, since their impact on the meadow would be minimal and they would avoid the need for hikers to hike the additional half-mile (each way) or so from the new parking lot. Non-shuttle use of these stops' pullouts would of course be restricted. Visitor Center Repurposing We believe that the existing visitor center building should be retained as a visitor center, with continued public access, instead of being repurposed for administrative use. Despite its size, it would provide a better visitor experience than a "visitor contact station". The building is a good example of the NPS rustic style and is an integral part of the Tuolumne area's early park history.

Stock and Commercial Use While we expect this topic will be studied more under the Wilderness Stewardship Plan, we would propose that all stock use in the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic corridor be eliminated, except for necessary administrative use, stocking of Glen Aulin HSC, and for use by individuals who require the use of stock due to mobility or other disabilities, and then only to the extent needed for them to have an experience consistent with modern minimum impact, leave-no-trace backcountry use. Although stock use is a historic practice in the Tuolumne area, so are activities such as burning large bonfires, building fire rings, downing live trees, improving campsites, constructing bough beds, and hunting all of which are now not allowed per current backcountry management policies.

Modern backpacking equipment has eliminated the need to use stock to carry anachronistic items such as heavy wool blankets, cast iron pans and stoves, fire arms, canvas tents, etc., allowing self-sufficient backpackers to be able to travel for several days in the backcountry, more than enough time to experience the entire Tuolumne River corridor from Donohue Pass to Pate Valley/White Wolf. A lot of current backcountry stock use is in support of high-impact practices that are not consistent with a leave-no-trace, minimum-impact philosophy, such as hauling in heavy tables and tents to establish large base camp installations. Finally, the trailheads leading into the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic corridor (White Wolf->Pate Valley, Glen Aulin, Lyell Canyon) are among the most popular in the park and their reservable quotas often fill up months in advance. Discontinuing stock use in the corridor would most likely not result in a reduction in overnight use, but rather would shift utilization from high-impact stock use to lower-impact backpacking use. This discontinuation would also reduce the wear and tear and other negative impacts such as manure and grazing on and near the trails. Remaining non-stock commercial use should be given a lower priority than non-commercial, private use. There are many areas of Yosemite that receive much less visitation than the Tuolumne corridor that commercial users could take advantage of without displacing non-commercial users from this highly-popular corridor. Additional Comments 1) Consideration should be given to making the unofficial route from the Pothole Dome trailhead to the Twin Bridges above Glen Aulin a maintained trail. Currently this route does appear to receive occasional, informal maintenance, such as cutting branches and logs. This route provides a superior river experience compared to the north-side trail, including better visibility to cascades, meadows, and Little Devils Postpile. It is also a popular, well-known use route that will only get more use as knowledge about it becomes more common. Formalizing this trail would greatly reduce the proliferation of multiple social trails created to avoid downed trees and other obstacles. 2) Similarly, consideration should be given to constructing a stock-use-only trail from the Twin Bridges above Glen Aulin to the stock corral area, moving the stock impacts (manure) further from the river and visitors hiking to Glen Aulin. Current stock use often results in significant manure on this trail, the sight and smell of which detract from enjoying the natural, outstanding values associated with the Tuolumne River along this particularly scenic section. 3) The bridge over Register Creek on the Pate Valley - Glen Aulin trail should be rebuilt. This crossing can be dangerous in early season, and hikers who encounter it may take unnecessary risks instead of backtracking a significant distance due to its location roughly halfway between White Wolf and Tuolumne Meadows. Other significant creeks along the trail are bridged, including nearby Rodgers Creek and Return Creek, so a bridge over Register Creek would not change the wildness or rustic nature of the trail; instead, it would allow more hikers to safely experience one of the most outstanding parts of the Tuolumne River corridor. Thank you for taking this feedback into consideration.

Correspondence ID:	401	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Wilderness permitting decisions should be left to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. The Wilderness Act requires opportunities for solitude. It does not require solitude at all locations within wilderness. Plowing of the Hwy 120 should be based on snow conditions and not pushed into early season. Having the road closed creates greater opportunities for wilderness solitude.				

All overnight accommodations, including camping, should provide an option for a smoke free environment for those with health issues related to smoke. This includes respiratory and other disabilities related to smoke. My wife gets disabling migraines from

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

some types of smoke and diesel fumes. Camping in the Park is nearly impossible because of campground smoke. This also creates an issue with retrieving wilderness permits that should be addressed both by this plan and the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. Please address these issues in terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA.)

Resource protection should come first followed by visitor experience. The two are closely related. One of the key factors in Tuolumne Meadows is vehicle parking. Lack of parking is a large factor in resource damage and visitor unhappiness. Most of the structures in the Tuolumne Meadows area are unneeded and result in the visitors focus away from the natural environment. Remove the store and other commercial buildings. Stores and motels are close enough outside of the Park. Remove the Visitor Center and direct visitor information to the inter-agency facility at Lee Vining or on foot interpretive staff. In the place of buildings, provide additional parking. More people out of their cars without congestion should be the goal.

Please better identify which parts of the plan are programmatic and which are project level and which are subject to further review.

[REDACTED]

P.S. I was unable to submit comments through the PEPC site. It appears there is a router problem between HughesNet satellite Internet and some DOI websites at router ios.doi-gw.customer.alter.net [152.179.104.238]

Correspondence ID:	402	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River.				

Recreational whitewater boating is central to the Wild and Scenic Act. A Wild and Scenic River should be publicly open to boating. Whitewater kayaking and rafting has little environmental impact and exemplifies the wilderness recreational ethic that the Park Service embodies. Please align these interests by allowing whitewater boating as proposed in alternative 2.

I have floated many sections of the Tuolumne and the Merced during my visits to Yosemite National Park, and I support non-destructive access to these public resources. For these reasons, please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River.

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	403	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River				

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	404	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	I feel it is very important to allow limited whitewater boating on the upper reaches of the Tuolumne River. Please consider alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. Thank you, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	405	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River.				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	406	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Tuolumne River Planning Team: Please accept the attached file as my comments on the Tuolumne River CMP & DEIS. Sincerely, [REDACTED]				

[REDACTED]

March 18, 2013

Superintendent, Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Plan DEIS P. O. Box 577 Yosemite, California 95389

Dear Superintendent Neubacher and Tuolumne River Planning Team,

Please accept this letter as my comments regarding the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (TRP). Given the size of the TRP document, some of the concerns and questions I raise in this letter may have been addressed in the Appendices in Volume 3 or escaped my notice in the first two volumes of the TRP. I apologize in advance if what I am requesting clarification for is indeed in the draft document. This letter begins with some general observations before commenting on specific chapters of the draft plan.

It is my understanding that when the General Management Plan (GMP) for Yosemite National Park was adopted in 1980 a previous plan, adopted circa 1965, was stamped "rejected." Since the adoption of the 1980 GMP the National Park Service has taken the approach that all subsequent planning and environmental reports will be "tiered " off the GMP. When you consider the significant changes that have occurred since the 1970s in the environmental sciences, the expansion and sophistication of data gathering and understanding associated with cultural resources management, and the extensive changes in technology, I find it difficult to understand why the GMP is still being utilized as a platform document for present day planning. It should be stamped "outdated" and relegated to the Yosemite Library archives along with its predecessor.

Consequently, I challenge the validity or relevance of using the GMP for the TRP or any other current planning instrument. I also question whether modifications or "amendments" made to the GMP truly negate policies and directions in the GMP some of which are highly controversial and probably environmentally unsupportable given information that has come to the fore since 1980. In other words, as long as the National Park Service insists on the relevance of the GMP all the language contained in that outdated plan may still have a bearing on present and future actions undertaken by the Federal Government.

Turning to a different issue, the TRP rests partially on baseline data that appears to have been collected only within the past ten years or so. This underscores the relevance (or lack thereof) of the GMP but begs the question where is the baseline data that was used to justify designating the Tuolumne River "wild and scenic." Why was that data not more fully utilized in determining resource conditions in 1984, and determine extent of change since then? The draft TRP does refer to some of that older information but not to the extent that I think it should, unless there simply was not an extensive amount of research done back then to justify the legislative action that was taken.

Another concern I have is the constrained time frame for the public in responding to this draft plan. The National Park Service has expended a lot of effort over the past seven to ten years to develop the TRP which was legally supposed to have been prepared and adopted decades ago but the Public has been given only 60 days to review and comment on this draft. Additionally, the TRP references other planning documents that must be reviewed to gain a comprehensive understanding of how other proposed projects and policies being undertaken by the National Park Service will directly or indirectly impact the TRP planning area. Complicating things even more is the concurrent issuance of the draft Merced River plan. Policies governing the use of Yosemite Valley will have a significant impact on the Tuolumne River corridor. I request that the public commenting period for both plans be extended.

On page ES-5, the TRP identifies user capacity as a "...program that addresses the kinds and amounts of public use that the river

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

corridor can sustain while protecting and enhancing the river's outstandingly remarkable values." However the 1982 Federal Register provides a more expansive definition that user capacity is the "...quantity of recreation use which an area can sustain without adverse impact...on the outstandingly remarkable values and free-flowing character of the river area, the quality of the recreational experience, and public health and safety."

The TRP focuses primarily on two benchmarks to determine maximum use (i.e. user capacity) in the Tuolumne Meadows area. One is a cap on the total amount of water that can be diverted from the Tuolumne River for consumptive use at Tuolumne Meadows. The other benchmark addresses the number of encounters with people per hour on the trail system. For the rest of the river corridor the existing wilderness permit quotas are cited as the user limit but there is no information provided regarding how those limits were established.

Regarding water diversion for use at Tuolumne Meadows, I find it disappointing that the National Park Service is using conjecture and inference to arrive at consumptive use rates for employees and visitors. It seems to me the National Park Service should have realized the importance of this issue long ago and data collection via the installation of water meters should have been in place before the current planning process was initiated. As it is, the National Park Service still has not installed meters and can only guess at what the consumptive use is by person, location, activity, and through loss from leakage.

Regarding "encounter" rates on the trails I have two comments. First, the language of the TRP is inconsistent. The issue of encounters with individuals (i.e. one person) versus groups is discussed but the words "groups" and "parties" are used alternately within the document proper. This creates an ambiguity that leaves the public in the dark as to what the "trigger" will be for the National Park Service to justify implementing a day reservation system. Secondly, at a public meeting in Yosemite regarding the "science" behind the Yosemite planning documents it was disclosed that the automatic trail counters will record people and large animals. I did not see a discussion in the TRP about how this error factor will be addressed when determining "encounter rates" in future trail monitoring activities.

Another comment about user capacity is the issue of Tioga Road. The TRP does not address what the current "level-of-service" rating is for the Tioga Road. It does not identify when or where level-of-service falls to "unacceptable" levels nor what would be considered unacceptable. The TRP also does not identify design constraints or natural constraints that would prohibit or hinder enlarging the road system. Clearly, the National Park Service is not going to widen Tioga Road into a four-lane highway, but in the absence of such a discussion there is no certainty as to what the National Park Service's policy will be when vehicle volumes exceed the current capacity of the Tioga Road system.

The Tioga Road is a significant cultural resource and its over-utilization will create safety issues, environmental and cultural resources impacts, economic impacts, and a host of other problems. I raised under scoping the idea of placing restrictions on vehicle type and setting clear policy on opening and closing dates. I did not find any discussion in the TRP about limiting types of vehicles. The TRP states that year round operation of the road has been dismissed but the guidelines for extended operation of the road is not addressed.

In commenting on the Executive Summary, I believe language should have been included to underscore the historical significance of Tioga Road. The management of the road as a cultural resource should be given priority throughout the document. Furthermore, when it comes to regulating cars and eliminating "informal parking," of equal importance is the issue of regulating "oversized vehicles" and specifically documenting impacts associated with bus traffic and staging areas. Restrictions placed on volume and vehicle type to protect the integrity of the road will also have beneficial impacts on protecting the river and the Tuolumne Meadows area. Specifically on page ES-9, statements are made about controlling visitation by controlling the number of designated parking spaces, but if traffic volumes are allowed to increase indefinitely and if oversize vehicle encroachment is not dealt with, environmental degradation will take place (or continue).

In giving a brief review of the alternatives, the Executive Summary addresses the number of employees proposed to be housed at Tuolumne Meadows but I did not find information in the document to explain why the National Park Service needs to have so many employees at Tuolumne Meadows. As an aside, I believe many cities and towns have an employee-to-served-public ratio much smaller than the employee-to-public ratio that is in place at Tuolumne Meadows (this includes factoring in day visitors with overnights). Here and throughout the document the need or justification for all these employees (government and private) should be fully explained. It is also not clear if family members are staying with any of the employees stationed at Tuolumne Meadows during the summer season. In addition to this, no mention is made of additional employees that may be commuting to the area, and what is the status of the bus drivers, road workers, vendors, law enforcement and etc. that are assigned along the Tioga Road corridor. Do they use services at Tuolumne Meadows during the course of their shifts? Another concern I have is the titles of the alternatives. "No action" is misleading because the Park Service has taken and is taking many actions that have, are and will be affecting the environment and recreational experiences of the public. Furthermore, the National Park Service has a number of proposed actions in other planning documents that will have a direct bearing on the Tuolumne River corridor and the Tuolumne Meadows area regardless of the status of the TRP.

Alternative 1's title of "self reliant" should also be clarified because it appears that the per capita demand for water use per camper and employee is the same under all alternatives. While visitors will not find fuel and store supplies available they will still expect the same amount of water to be available per person as would be expected under any of the other alternatives. Emergency services support will stay the same, and existing infrastructure will be maintained for a variety of the "self-reliant"

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

tourists.

Alternative 2's title "expanding recreational opportunities" is also misleading. No increase in overnight wilderness use is proposed and it is noted in the TRP that since the adoption of a quota system the number of requests for wilderness permits routinely exceeds the quota limits. The TRP also notes wilderness use is less today than what is believed to have occurred prior to implementing the wilderness reservation system. No increase is proposed for day or overnight use in the Hetch Hetchy area or below the dam. The proposed increase in day visitor parking does not completely offset the proposed loss in the current number of "informal" parking spaces and, as noted in the TRP, the growing demand for more parking is not met by this alternative in future years. The modest increase in campsites at Tuolumne Meadows comes nowhere near the historic high of some 600 campsites and it is unclear how many of the added campsites are for the public and how many will be needed for increased employee staffing. Ironically transit service is proposed to be expanded under Alternative 4, but not under Alternative 2. It seems the main expanded recreational activity for Alternative 2 is the consideration of permitting kayaking on the river. That is about as

palatable as proposing the permitting of snowmobiling into Tuolumne Meadows during the winter.

Alternative 3 and 4 have ambiguous titles "Celebrating the Tuolumne Cultural Heritage" versus "Improving the Traditional Tuolumne Experience" and the explanations offered are couched in highly subjective terms. So, does the reduction of the Tuolumne Meadows campground from 600 to 300, the increase in car volume, the introduction of transit service, the allowance of charter/tour buses, the establishing of an overnight permit system, the reduction in the Glen Aulin bed-space and the elimination of the gas station and store contribute to or detract from the "cultural heritage" or "traditional Tuolumne experience?" I could argue both ways on each point depending on where I set the baseline which is the fundamental flaw of these alternatives because the baseline is not clearly defined. Tuolumne Meadows has been in the National Park system for over one hundred years, and cultural awareness and visitation pre-date that timeline. What is the future vision? An area reflecting late 20th century visitation practices and patterns, mid-20th century, early 20th century or is it some other ideal? This should be explained in the TRP.

The TRP should also have made it clear that the component parts of each alternative could be commented upon in isolation and variations offered back to the National Park Service in rebuttal to what is being proposed. For example, the fuel station should be retained in all alternatives for many reasons including the fact that tourists that have access to hybrid vehicles might use them if they have assurances of finding fuel at Tuolumne Meadows. Those supportive of a more "self-reliant" experience might still want to see Glen Aulin kept at 32 beds. People against the expansion of the public transit service might otherwise support Alternative 4 if this component is deleted.

On ES-11, and throughout the document, wilderness permits are identified as 350 persons "above the reservoir" and 50 persons "below the dam." Later the document pairs use of Poopenaut Valley with Miguel Meadows implying that they are the same destination. The fact is they are not. Miguel Meadows is higher in elevation than the dam, and could be misunderstood as being "above" the reservoir. Furthermore, there is no information in the TRP about the infrastructure to support overnight and day guests at Hetch Hetchy reservoir. This infrastructure has a direct bearing on visitor use of the Tuolumne River corridor and surrounding areas. Additionally, the four vehicle spaces noted as providing access for 12 people below O'Shaughnessy Dam does not take into account that overnight guests may also be using this location to gain access to Poopenaut Valley.

Chapter 1 provides a description for the boundaries of the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River. What I have a problem with is the excluding from the planning discussion the 8 mile segment at Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. As noted above, the supportive infrastructure for both overnight and day visitors at the dam site and the trail system that radiates from there has a profound impact on the visitor activity that

will occur within the wild or scenic segments of the river. Furthermore, the discussion on page 1-5 about Section 12 management policies seems to reinforce the need for coordination with the City and County of San Francisco and Yosemite Park's other management actions (such as the fire management strategies) to comply with the management directions found in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and in the Wilderness Act. Also troubling is the lack of any discussion anywhere in the TRP about the impact or potential impact of day visitors trekking in from the White Wolf resort.

In Chapter 2 the TRP discusses the need for a Tuolumne River Plan but does not make clear that the National Park Service is years behind legal compliance. This is important because there have been changes to the environment, the visitor supportive services, and the physical (trail, roads, and etc.) infrastructure since the Tuolumne River was included into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system. These changes are only lightly touched upon within the TRP and yet they have a real bearing on understanding what may be appropriate or inappropriate when proposing "traditional recreational experiences" or justifying why certain activities and services should be continued or eliminated. For example the significant redesign of the Tuolumne Meadows campground and the construction of overnight staging facilities for wilderness users at O'Shaughnessy Dam have had a significant impact on recreational experience and visitor volume and yet I found little to no information on these changes and their impacts in the TRP.

On page 2-5 the TRP discusses the scoping process and how public comments were recorded and consolidated. As expressed during that process and reiterated here, I do not believe the National Park Service captured correctly all concerns nor do I

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

believe the scoping documents adequately summarized all issues that were raised by the public. The National Park Service should acknowledge that it is presenting an abridged report on public scoping and clarify that some editorial license was committed in consolidating its impression of the public's input. Subtle or not, the rewording of public input is a concern to some of us that took the time to go through that part of the preparation of the TRP.

On page 2-7 water quality is addressed but there is much information not presented here or elsewhere in the document. For example, are monitoring wells in Tuolumne Meadows for the sewer treatment plant or just for the fuel station? Where is the data on the capacity of the wastewater treatment system, and on the disposal policy for sludge from the plant? There are those in the agricultural community who have reservations about using treated wastewater on pasture lands, and the use of this water on golf courses is highly regulated, yet there is no discussion in the TRP about the impact the disposal fields have on browsing wildlife. I've already touched on my concerns regarding the lack of water meters to determine consumptive use but there should also be flow meters at the RV dump station, and there should be a discussion on how wastes from RVs are managed by the treatment facility.

On page 2-8 and elsewhere in the document the encroachment of Lodgepole pines and actions associated with tree removal are discussed. However, I did not find information regarding the role of fire in regulating tree growth and forest expansion, nor information on where the cut trees are disposed of. Since green house emissions are discussed in the TRP should not the subject of carbon sequestration be addressed? And, would a portable biomass generating plant be a possible substitute to the current propane dependent generator system?

On page 2-9 crowding and congestion due to limits on parking spaces is addressed, but the effect that oversized vehicles have on parking capacity or the impact that increasing bus activity at Tuolumne Meadows will have is not mentioned. Bus stops are a footprint that can have a cumulative effect as well as a site specific impact but I did not see a discussion about this in the TRP. The TRP indicates that the Park Service expects a continued increase in vehicle volume on Tioga Road but traffic management strategies used successfully in Yosemite Valley to reduce traffic gridlock should be more fully discussed in the TRP. The suitability and adaptability of the Yosemite Valley policies for the Tuolumne Meadows area would shed light on what infrastructure changes would be most appropriate to both protect the environment and protect visitor experience. In this context, a discussion on the feasibility of caps on vehicle volume and limits on vehicle type should be addressed in the TRP.

While the Park Service has "dismissed" the idea of year round operation of Tioga Road the TRP also acknowledges that the road has been opened in the early winter during dry years. Since climate change is frequently addressed in the TRP and generally is characterized as probably leading to smaller snowpacks and lower river flows it seems logical to conclude that there will be more winter openings. I believe the TRP should have addressed this and the National Park Service should have proposed in the alternatives a discussion on either staying with a fixed closing date and a not-to-exceed opening date or assess what it would mean in the future if there are more Winter openings and earlier Spring openings. The seasonal closure of the wastewater treatment plant, the seasonal closure of the water treatment plant, the safety issues of winter driving, the impact on animals, economic impacts and so on, are significant if in future years the Tioga Road is routinely operated further and further into the "shoulder seasons."

On 2-10 the TRP touches on the subject of issues that will not be addressed by the Tuolumne River Plan. Given the list of other planning documents that are cited and the admission that other strategies will overlap the TRP, why is there not a programmatic environmental review and planning process being adopted. Furthermore, how is the public going to know or understand which plan takes precedent on a given impact when it appears that the National Park Service retains the right to freely move between these sometimes competing actions at its sole discretion with little warning or explanation being given to the public at the time the decision is made.

On page 2-11 the subject of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir is addressed and the National Park Service has opted to not discuss the impact removing the dam would have on the Tuolumne River corridor. That is understandable but as mentioned earlier in this letter, the existing supportive infrastructure for day and overnight guests has a direct and ongoing impact on current recreational activities and the environment. I believe this must be addressed in the TRP as well as the operational policies that govern the use of the road to the dam, the operational policies that govern the use of the road/trail system from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir to Lake Eleanor, and the rationale for the day visitor operating hours for access to Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Finally, I do not believe that the Raker Act gives the City and County of San Francisco "carte blanche" from the guidelines and rules of the Wilderness Act nor from the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Furthermore, the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act and the many other laws and policies cited in the TRP are mechanisms that the Park Service should use to protect both visitor experience and the environment both within and adjacent to the reservoir area. Because counties are "subdivisions of the State" even charter counties like San Francisco must comply with State laws, many of which the TRP should have addressed in the context of how they could mutually benefit all interested parties. For example, protecting water quality along the trails around Hetch Hetchy Reservoir meets San Francisco goals, State law, and the directives of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Yet the National Park Service does not seem to aggressively enforce the campsite and water-human contact set-back rules for this area nor is it discussed fully in the TRP.

On page 2-15 the TRP states that wilderness zone "capacities and trailhead quotas may be revised as necessary to reflect changing visitor patterns and resource sensitivities under the overall guidance provided by the current Yosemite Wilderness Management Plan or upcoming wilderness stewardship plan. However, in the future all capacities within the river corridor must remain within the maximum levels allowed under this Tuolumne River Plan." Translation: we may increase or decrease the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

number of people going through the Tuolumne River corridor based on present and future plans and we will only tell you in this plan (the TRP) what the current capacity is within 1/4 mile of the river, unless we change our mind here too. While flexibility is a good thing the absence of absolute guidelines and the constant referral to other planning documents, which seems too common in the draft TRP, creates a disappointing level of uncertainty about the future condition of recreation within the Tuolumne River corridor and at Tuolumne Meadows.

On page 3-3 of the TRP Glen Aulin is described. "Any detraction caused by the camp is minor when compared with the over-all primitive character of this section of the river. This segment of the river meets criteria for a 'wild' classification." This quote is from the original documentation that was used to justify nominating the Tuolumne River into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act system. It is critical to not disenfranchise the American people from their land. The National Park Service and all people concerned about the protection of natural resources understand it takes money to manage and protect our resources. That money comes ultimately from an engaged and supportive public. Glen Aulin provides a personal and up close encounter with a wonderful and glorious Yosemite Park treasure: the Tuolumne River. It does so in a minimalist fashion but in a way that people with modest health and physical challenges can still navigate. In this context the trade-off from pristine setting to accommodate human fellowship with the natural world is more than justifiable. Consequently, I believe that Glen Aulin should stay at its 32 bed capacity. There are ways to reduce water usage, improve disposal practices, and minimize service needs The National Park Service should explore using llamas instead of horses and mules for supply trains, and aggressively manage all aspects of the Glen Aulin "footprint" to ensure the continuance of this facility (and all other High Sierra Camps).

In the context of chapter 4, I reiterate my concerns about the need for a complete description of the wastewater treatment plant operation, including how sludge is disposed of, how RV dumps are managed, and the consideration of installing flow meters and monitoring wells. Consumptive use of river water should be understood as to type of use, the location of use, who the consumer is, all of which a network of water meters would identify. I would also note that the road system's impact on hydrology should also underscore the need to protect existing roads from excessive degradation. This would include studying the impact of such things as vehicle weight to considering the effects of temperature and water on the surface and structure of paved roads when used during "shoulder seasons."

Chapter 5 addresses "management standard, adverse impact, and degradation." These concepts operate in relation to what were the baseline conditions. For the Tuolumne River corridor and for Tuolumne Meadows, the baseline condition is either the condition of the environment and visitor experience in 1984 (the time the river was included into the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act system) or it is the condition of the environment and the visitor experience that existed in the late 1970s when documentation was prepared to justify nomination of the river. Unfortunately, there is not the level of documentation that one would expect for either the late 1970s or 1984. Furthermore, I do not believe the National Park Service has fully disclosed all the actions that have been taken since 1984 that have had an impact on the environment and visitor experience. For example, the reduction of the Tuolumne Meadows campground was done, in part, to "...accommodate larger modern recreational vehicles..." How did this action impact the area. In the past, the National Park Service targeted Memorial weekend as the traditional opening date for the Tioga Road but since the 1990s the National Park Service has been increasingly more aggressive in attempting to open the road in early May. How has this affected the Tuolumne River planning area?

Chapter 5 contains excellent language about the mandate the National Park Service is under. For example, page 5-11 cites the court case where the court ordered that "bot past and ongoing degradation" is to be addressed in a "comprehensive river management" plan but I believe that the TRP has failed to comply fully with this requirement. Page 5-12 addresses that the "...river management plan...establishes the baseline conditions at the time of designation---including a description of any degradation---and proposes management actions..." Acknowledging the law and the guidelines from Federal agencies and courts does not mean that the National Park Service actually complied with these directives. As already mentioned, the TRP lacks clarity on the baseline conditions of the river corridor and Tuolumne Meadows for either the late 1970s or 1984. The TRP touches on certain degradation issues, such as the little blue slide and the failure of the leach mound system at Glen Aulin but details on what happened are variable. Some impacts are not noted at all, such as the promotion of "modern recreational vehicles" to Tuolumne Meadows by redesigning the campground to accommodate their needs.

Specific questions about the balance of chapter 5 are as follows:

Page 5-14 addresses transitory impacts. Does the road bridge at Tuolumne Meadows constitute a transitory impact if it impedes water flow only during high water years or does it impede run-off every year?

Page 5-16 addresses the impact sheep grazing had on the meadows and that the negative consequences of the late 19th century activity are still present today. Are there examples elsewhere in California or the Nation where meadow restoration has been successful? If so, can those remedial steps be taken at Tuolumne Meadows? Page 5-17. Fire ecology should not be limited to a discussion about tree encroachment into the meadows. The problem of fuel loading and soil pathology, the effects of runoff into the river, and plant vitality should also be addressed, as well as other factors associated with the absence of a frequent fire regime.

On page 5-17 the TRP addresses in general terms some of the actions that the National Park Service has taken since 1984 that have affected the environment and visitor experience. These actions are also coupled with a discussion about climate change and impacts associated with increasing visitor activity, and with influencing animal behavior. I believe the list is not complete and care should be taken to separate controllable impacts from uncontrollable impacts, and a distinction made between acceptable

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

and unacceptable changes. For example, what was the staffing level in 1984 at Tuolumne Meadows and what effect has the change in number of employees and number and type of housing units had on meadow ecology?

On page 5-19 the TRP addresses informal trails but what is not clear is did visitors pioneer the trails or did people follow animal paths and through over use make them larger and more invasive?

Page. 5-28. The removal of informal parking along the shoulders of Tioga Road in Tuolumne Meadows is an overdue corrective action in my opinion. However, this reduction of parking space inventory will affect day visitors arriving in private vehicles more than any other visitor group. I am concerned that no alternative completely restores the number of spaces being deleted under this planned action and the expanded "formal" day parking spaces will not keep pace with expected increases in visitation in future years. How does the National Park Service propose preventing future informal parking encroachment? How will the National Park Service address the impacts of increased informal parking that the TRP identifies will likely occur east and west of the Tuolumne Meadows area?

I support the proposed actions to fix the culvert system of Tioga Road with compliance with the guidelines of the National Historic Preservation Act; however, the frequency of repair for the road will be a function of traffic volume, type of vehicles, and period of operation. As mentioned earlier these issues should be addressed with the same care being afforded the culvert replacement program.

Page 5-31. I raise again the idea of using llamas instead of pack mules and horses for supplying the High Sierra Camps. I agree with the management direction that opening dates, regarding stock use, should vary based on the differences between dry years and wet years.

Page 5-35. The role that climate change has on hindering meadow restoration should be a part of the ongoing monitoring process. This would seem to me to suggest that even meadows without "visitor impacts" should be monitored annually if for no other reason than as a control for understanding what is beneficially or adversely affecting all meadows independent of visitor use.

On page 5-67 of the TRP it is disclosed that "...the number of campsites in the Tuolumne Meadows campground has been reduced from about 600...to 304 regular sites plus 7 group campsites, as part of [a] redesign to accommodate larger modern recreational vehicles, provide better site separation, and better protect natural resources." When did this redesign take place? What percentage of the change was to accommodate larger modern RVs? It is my understanding that the campsites are designed to accommodate two passenger vehicles or RVs up to 35 feet in length. Consideration should be given to redesigning the campground for only a limited number of sites for large motorhomes or trailers. The TRP consistently reports that the sewer treatment plant receives 32 RV dumps per day. Using that as a guideline it would seem that more than 80% of the Tuolumne Meadows campground could be redesigned for a smaller vehicle footprint. This could either increase "separation," or the additional land area could be used to increase the number of campsites without increasing the overall footprint of the campground, or land could be converted back to natural conditions, or the additional land could be used to accommodate more day use parking. Whatever the goal, the fact remains that the TRP should address whether or

not all 304 campsites are designed to handle up to 35 foot long RVs. It should also be considered from a risk management perspective. Should the National Park Service be encouraging RVs over 26 feet in length on Tioga Road. One reason the TRP cites that pack animals are not being relocated outside of the Tuolumne Meadows area is due to safety issues associated with trailering them in for support of High Sierra Camp services. How much greater is the safety concern associated with people driving oversized vehicles up Tioga Road who are not required to have a special driver's license to operate these vehicles, and may have little to no experience navigating steep, narrow mountain highways?

Page 5-71. The TRP states that "...day use capacity will be managed through the availability of day parking and the capacity of the buses that serve the Tuolumne River corridor..." While additional language is provided about noting the number of cars that are "...actually parking in the Tuolumne Meadows area..." and at Hetch Hetchy Reservoir there is no mention about monitoring bus impacts. Buses can bring more people per hour into the Tuolumne Meadows area, the larger the bus the greater the impact. The buses need infrastructure support (stops, shoulders, wider turn arounds, etc.) and yet no comments are made about this. Later in the document it is noted that buses are not allowed on the Hetch Hetchy Road with no discussion about why this is or what is considered a "bus." The TRP also notes that charter/tour bus traffic apparently declined between the years 2000 and 2010 but no explanation is given as to why nor is it clear in reading the TRP what use charter/tour buses make of the Tuolumne Meadows area. All this should be addressed.

Pages 5-75-76. As stated earlier in this comment letter, the words "parties" and "groups" are used interchangeably throughout the TRP as it pertains to trail use and as it pertains to user capacity triggers. The TRP should avoid ambiguity by consistently using the same term throughout the document. On Page 5-76 we read "...encounters have been chosen by many wilderness managers as an indicator for the social setting..." It should be clarified that the National Parks cannot be all things to all people. The emphasis should be that National Parks (like Yosemite) provide an opportunity to enjoy a natural resource area under conditions that are distinctively different from the hustle and bustle of urban life. Solitude, quiet, individualistic experience, and family recreating as opposed to group activities, and organized sight-seeing tours should be discussed in the TRP and it should be acknowledged that certain visitor groups may not be as readily accommodated in wilderness areas or near wilderness areas as

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

others.

On Page 5-76 the TRP also states that "...field measurements are easy to accomplish." However, as noted earlier, automatic counters also count animals. Furthermore, while sensitivity is afforded to the protection of endangered animals, data should also be collected on common animals to detect if trail use has an impact on animal behavior and animal numbers.

On page 5-79, and following, water quality is addressed. The subject of garbage disposal is mentioned but nowhere in the TRP is there an in-depth discussion about the solid waste stream being generated at Tuolumne Meadows. Recycling programs should be noted. Volume and type of waste and where and how it is disposed should be addressed. Stock manure is talked about but again no mention of substituting pack mules and horses with some other means of transport. The action to remove showers at Glen Aulin does not address the possibility that people may then use the river for bathing, an activity that is not allowed in the area of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and the reason for that prohibition should be stated in the TRP.

Human waste disposal is another issue that should be more fully studied. First responders (i.e. emergency personnel) are instructed to take care at emergency scenes to treat all body fluids as potentially a biohazard. People coming from foreign countries may be carriers of pathogens that are uncommon in the United States. On the other hand, given the high use of medications and dietary supplements Americans may be introducing into the environment a host of contaminants that should also not be allowed into the Tuolumne River. Where is the complexity of this issue addressed in the TRP and how does the National Park Service intend on monitoring for these intrusions into the ecosystem. E.coli sampling is not the only thing that should be under discussion. Furthermore, on Page 83, E.coli sampling is said to take place in the "frontcountry." It isn't until much further into the document that this term is defined as referring to the developed areas of the Park. I believe testing should also be routinely performed in Yosemite's "backcountry."

Page 5-87. The TRP states that an "unknown amount of the water withdrawn from the river leaks from the underground pipes..." This is a problem in planning for future use and in defending current user capacity. It is also a problem, not fully addressed in the TRP that the National Park Service really does not know how much water consumers are using by location or type of user. For example, employees housed at Tuolumne Meadows who work at the facilities in Tuolumne Meadows daily probably use a different amount of water than employees who are staged at Tuolumne Meadows but are then sent out into the wilderness on maintenance projects. Where is this addressed in the draft TRP? The presence or lack of family members also would change daily consumption rates. I believe the employee use is being understated in the TRP.

People in RVs, camper trucks, and cars could potentially bring water with them to reduce the per capita need at the campgrounds but I did not find a discussion about this possibility. Since water for consumptive use is an overriding consideration for setting user capacity, information on type of use and use by consumer should be provided beyond the generalizations and conjecture that are found in the TRP. Again, I would note that metering should have been implemented for employee housing, service centers, and the campgrounds years ago.

On page 6-4 the TRP quotes the Ninth Circuit Court in the context that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act "does not mandate one particular approach to user capacity." However, as noted earlier in my letter the 1982 Federal Register Guidelines does list three significant areas to address. While the TRP is heavy on addressing the protection of the Tuolumne River's outstandingly remarkable values and free-flowing character I believe more work should be done to address the quality of the recreational experience, and public health and safety. The introduction of more transit service will degrade the visitor experience by bringing in more people per hour to the Tuolumne Meadows area (and bus customers may or may not be displaced by auto-tourists; in other words bus traffic should be viewed as an additive to the visitor population). The reduction in informal day visitor parking without a commensurate increase in formal day use parking will impact the auto-tourists experience. Climate change as characterized in the TRP would suggest that the possibility of catastrophic fire is increasing in Tuolumne Meadows area yet there is no discussion about how people would be protected if such an event occurred. It is noted that the removal of the fuel station and store would potentially mean that people "unprepared" would take resupply trips to Lee Vining or Crane Flat. Cars running out of fuel and campers bringing in greater amounts of fuel in separate containers should also be fully vetted in the TRP.

Pages 6-7 and 6-8. I reiterate again that meters need to be installed to determine the actual consumption rate for campers, day visitors, resident employees and others. I believe that the wastewater treatment plant capacity should also be stated. It may be that the wastewater treatment plant is just as critical at setting user capacity as trail monitoring or water consumption and the TRP should have addressed this. The impacts of RVs dumping into the wastewater treatment plant should be specifically discussed. For example, the National Park Service has control over what cleaning solutions are used to sanitize bathroom facilities, store facilities and other plumbing fixtures but you have no control over what chemicals are potentially being used in private recreational vehicles. Additionally, if the time of the RV dumps follow visitor departure patterns then the sewer treatment plant is probably receiving a highly variable flow rate from the RV dump station and when large volumes of liquid waste hit the plant in a short span of time operational deficiencies will occur. Does the plant have an equalization chamber to attenuate this problem. Did the National Park Service consider closing the RV dump station?

On Page 9 Table 6-1 presents the number of people allowed per camp site. 304 sites allow for up to six people per site, up to 30 people are allowed per group site. Elsewhere in the TRP it is acknowledged that the campground is generally never at maximum capacity, suggesting that it is rare for six people to occupy a site. This seems to be supported by the fact that the average occupancy per passenger vehicle is set at 2.9 per vehicle for planning purposes. Consequently water use for the campground

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

may be overstated in the TRP. It is also my understanding that Tuolumne Meadows

campsites are designed to accommodate two passenger vehicles or RVs up to 35 feet in length. Why are two cars allowed per site? What percentage of the Tuolumne Meadows campground is generally occupied by two cars? What percentage is occupied by only one car. What is the average number of oversized vehicles that use the campground during the week, and on weekends. What is the occupancy rate of RVs versus "tent" campers. To understand the significance of the proposed changes under the different alternatives there needed to be much more information presented about the nature and type of visitors camping at Tuolumne Meadows.

Table 6-1 also notes bus carrying capacities. If 45 passenger buses are being used for transit service then the National Park Service is encouraging 40 to 45 foot long buses to ply the Tioga Road corridor. As stated earlier, the bigger the bus the bigger the adverse impact on the environment. There is little evidence to suggest that buses displace cars because there is little evidence that auto-tourists will readily change plans to ride a bus. It also should be noted that listing buses under the "no action" alternative is misleading. No action should be based on the conditions that existed in 1984 when did 5 transit buses get sanctioned for traveling to Tuolumne Meadows?

I would note that the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1-3 maintained 5 buses while Alternative 4 (the preferred alternative) proposes increasing the number to 8. (As an aside Table 6-8 on page 6-20 has a misprint as it list 2 buses under column two instead of 8.) On page 6-21 of the TRP we read that "...regional transit capacity would be increased...to encourage use of regional transit and relieve traffic congestion at Tuolumne Meadows on peak days." Where is the evidence that buses relieve traffic congestion? There is lots of evidence in Yosemite Valley that better signage, information dissemination and enforcement of traffic rules helped to significantly decrease congestion in the Valley. There is also evidence that YARTS ridership is predominately employees or it is tourists that would not have gone to Yosemite in a private vehicle. This scenario is highly unlikely for the transit service to Tuolumne Meadows. Furthermore, given the travel times from Yosemite Valley or other staging areas, and the probable departure times from Tuolumne Meadows, bus passengers would have very little time to actually explore the Tuolumne Meadows area between off-loading and re- boarding the bus.

Page 6-21. The TRP goes on to state that the "...regional transit service levels (YARTS, the hiker bus operated by the concessioner, and other transit services) would remain under NPS control, with the number of visitors delivered into the river corridor by such services managed according to the user capacity limits established for alternative 4. The NPS may use any combination of limits on the numbers of buses, the stops they make, the number of passengers they accept, and/or the number or routes they run per day." This is an open ended policy that begs several questions. First, where is the authority to continue to expand the YARTS service which is an external (to the park) transit program. Second, where is the cumulative environmental analysis for increasing bus use including emissions data, fuel consumption data infrastructure impacts, and

system costs? The TRP should not embrace or incorporate any proposed transit service increases until environmental and socio-economical analyses have been completed.

In Chapter 6 there is no discussion about why the water consumption rate for RVs dumping at the wastewater treatment plant is projected to be the same under all alternatives. Does this reflect the capacity of the dump station. Is there no growth in RV use at Tuolumne Meadows expected. Why is this not explained?

Chapter 7 is perhaps the most important section of the TRP for the public. Here we get to consider "alternatives" to managing visitor experience. But these are not alternatives as much as they are variations on a theme. The differences are subtle between the alternatives in some respects but they can foreshadow significant changes in the future, especially when we considered the National Park Service's "preferred alternative."

What is missing from the TRP is a concise, clear description of what the status was of the natural and cultural resources and visitor experience as it would have been encountered in 1985. Snap shots of the past are offered in different locations of the TRP document but at the beginning of Chapter 7 there should be a vivid word picture of what it was like to have visited the subject region in 1985, with the supporting data. Certainly the Tuolumne River corridor which constitutes the majority of the planning area has maintained the greatest level of integrity but there are documentable changes that have impacted the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir area, the area below the dam, as well as the Tuolumne Meadows area. The reader must hunt throughout the TRP to piece together a picture of what it was like and even then it will not be a complete view.

Each alternative may have components I like but the format leaves the impression that you must choose between the alternatives rather than cherry pick what you like and create a hybrid "fifth" alternative. Will the National Park Service consider this approach or is modification of Alternative 4 the only approach the public can take?

The four alternatives are couched in contrast to or in context with the so-called "No Action Alternative." Unfortunately, the No Action Alternative is not an accurate description because the National Park Service must take actions to address the fact that increased use of the Tuolumne Meadows area has led to a degradation of the conditions that existed at the time the Tuolumne River was nominated for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act system. No Action also means that things will be allowed to continue as they have been but user capacity trumps this concept, at least theoretically. Day visitors presently comprise about 50% of the daily population at Tuolumne Meadows according to the TRP and parking inventory is at capacity,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

so how can there be continued increased use without taking action to control traffic or enlarge the infrastructure?

The following are questions regarding the No Action Alternative:

Page 7-4. How will the National Park Service regulate increased winter demand? What does "to inform releases" mean regarding Hetch Hetchy Reservoir? How are wilderness users educated about disposal of wastes in the wilderness? How are through- backpackers on the Sierra Crest Trail accounted for?

Page 7-5. Can llamas be used instead of pack mules and horses?

Page 7-8. When the showers were removed at Glen Aulin did the river become an alternative?

Page 7-11. How can you take no action on road maintenance issues like culverts and pullouts when the Tioga Road has been identified as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This and the other cultural resources located within the planning area will have to be protected whether or not the Tuolumne River had been designated under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Page 7-12. How can undesignated roadside parking be allowed to continue and not pose a liability for the National Park Service from a public safety perspective? Page 7-13 When were the shuttle services established and where is the environmental documentation that approved adding this service? What is "regional public transportation" and when did it begin? What is the average density per campsite at Tuolumne Meadows during weekdays and during weekends? What percentage of the campsites are available through reservation only? Where is the "operational needs" document that specifies the number of employees required at Tuolumne Meadows?

Page 7-14. Clarify the practice of employees occupying campsites. Clarify where they park their cars. What percentage of the employees have family members staying with them?

Page 7-23. Clarify the opening and closing date policy for Tioga Road. As mentioned earlier with climate change being discussed in the TRP as the probability of a warming and drying trend for the Sierra Nevada mountains, the opportunities will increase for extended shoulder season use. When is enough, enough?

Pages 7-24-30 As commented upon earlier, I would like more precise data regarding water use by employees and visitors, and by location, as well as at commercial locations. There needs to be discussion about the capacity of the sewer treatment plant, holding ponds and spray fields, and force mains. The actions taken at Glen Aulin to reduce water use, are these the only things that can be done to reduce overload of the leach mound system or can other actions be taken to allow continuance of this facility at its current 32 bed capacity? Will a redesign of the Tuolumne Meadows campground be considered and if so will the National Park Service consider adding additional day use parking here? (As an aside, what is the inventory for oversized vehicle parking spaces, motorcycle parking spaces, handicap parking spaces, buses, and vendor parking spaces?) Overnight guests are often moving their cars to day use sites,

how does the National Park Service plan to deal with this? How is overnight user parking capacity calculated (the TRP mentions a different formula will be used but doesn't explain what it is (page 7-25))?

Page. 7-26. I repeat my concerns regarding the language pertaining to regional public transit. The TRP says the National Park Service will defer management decisions regarding the implementation of a parking reservation system until after completion of both the Tuolumne and Merced Wild and Scenic Rivers plans. Is this not piecemealing the environmental review process?

Page 7-27. If the campground is going to be rehabilitated under all alternatives I stress again the need to redesign it to de-emphasize accommodating large recreational vehicles. The freed up land area could be utilized for more day use parking.

Page 7-29. Does employee parking accommodate family members or guests?

Page 7-30. Water meters and flow meters should be installed to monitor consumptive use of the river and wastewater treatment loading from housing, camping, commercial facilities and the RV dump station.

Page 7-33. As noted in the TRP, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act "requires managers to 'protect and enhance the values which caused [the river] to be included in [the wild and scenic rivers] system.'" Clearly the National Park Service failed this objective by allowing changes to occur in the planning area since 1985 which have degraded portions of the environment and degraded visitor experience. Citing the law does not mean you are finally complying with the law. This is just another way of my raising again my concerns about the "baseline" that is being used against which the alternatives are being measured. Also on page 7-33 is a listing of the "constraints on the kinds and amounts of visitor use in the Tuolumne River." To what degree or percentage

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

does each constraint get driven by overnight guest use versus day visitor use?

Page 7-35. The reduction in informal trails is considered a key indicator for protecting the meadows and the river. To what extent is law enforcement and public education a "key" step in arresting this problem?

Page 7-36. I believe that it should be emphasized that the Tioga Road is a cultural resource to be protected.

Page 7-38. Table 7-4. How does wilderness fire management policy coordinate with the policies proposed for scenic values management? Doesn't the current forest condition reflect 100 years of fire suppression practices and is there not a pressing need to correct this?

Alternative 1 is entitled "Self-Reliant Experience" and refers to the fact that under this management proposal people going to Tuolumne Meadows will need to take their own supplies because the store and gas station will be removed. However, overnight guests will still need a water system infrastructure, a wastewater infrastructure, a solid waste disposal service and a variety of other supportive services to accommodate their needs. So "self-reliant" may be somewhat over stated.

Page 7-34. One of the bullet points for Alternative 1 states "Retain all current recreational opportunities except concessioner day rides and commercial use." Is the removal of Glen Aulin not a lost recreational opportunity?

Page 7-41. How can the trail encounter rate standard of no more than "four other groups per hour" be met without a radical reduction in day visitor use at Tuolumne Meadows? Also, please note again, the inconsistency of terminology, i.e. "groups" versus "parties."

Page 7-42. Estimated capital costs are listed regarding the proposed removal and other facility changes at Glen Aulin. The TRP is a "twenty year" plan so why are operations and maintenance costs (or savings) in relation to the No Action Alternative not listed. For that matter why are operations and maintenance cost estimates not provided for all the alternatives. Given the Federal deficit, and Federal budget imbalance, and the struggling economy, how realistic are many of the proposed actions found in the TRP (both in relation to the reported estimated capital costs and to the non-disclosed labor and maintenance costs)?

Page 7-45. As noted earlier, the campground has apparently been designed to accommodate RVs up to 35 feet in length. I cannot endorse reducing the campground size without knowing how much land could be restored with the existing 304 sites simply being reconfigured for smaller vehicles. Without real numbers regarding per capita water consumption I do not know what the water savings would be. Without clarity on the actual density use (is the average 3 people per site or is it 5 people per site) and without a discussion about setting lower occupancy limits on some campsites, I cannot comment on the merits or demerits of reducing the overall size of the campground. Finally, could not additional day visitor parking be constructed where campsites were being eliminated and still have a net benefit to the environment?

Throughout the TRP day use is identified as a maximum of 12 people for Poopenaut Valley. This is apparently based on the four parking spaces at the trailhead to Poopenaut Valley located along the Hetch Hetchy Road to O'Shaughnessy Dam using a car occupancy rate of 2.9 per car. However, this does not take into account the use of these parking spaces for overnight guests. This does not take into account that organized trips from nearby recreational camps could increase use. The phrase "below the dam" also suggests you've over looked day use in the area of the Tuolumne River that is immediately below the dam structure.

Pages 7-46-47. I again challenge the legitimacy of citing YARTS and the veracity of the parking space inventory numbers. I challenge the integrity of the environmental assessments that looks at reducing the day visitor parking inventory yet does not

address the overall increase in vehicle traffic on Tioga Road. If more people are going to be on the Tioga Road your transit schemes will not work unless you force people to go to bus staging areas and there is no environmental assessment of the impact of staging areas and increased bus traffic along the Tioga Road in the TRP or any other planning document that I know of.

Page 7-47. You propose to remove the public fuel station but retain the National Park Service administrative fuel station. Why cannot the two needs be combined into one facility at the existing historic gas station and a separate pump island be installed for administrative use only?

Page 7-51 Table 7-6. Here, and elsewhere in the TRP, statistics about "estimated water demand" are presented and as stated earlier in my letter, I raise my concern that without water meters these numbers are guesses. I fear that employee use is being understated and campground use is being overstated. When will meters be installed and what will the National Park Service do if they find their estimates are way off?

Alternative 2 is entitled "Expanding Recreational Opportunities" yet expansion of the transit service is found only under Alternative 4. The expansion of "formal" day visitor parking spaces does not keep up with projected future demand, campground expansion comes nowhere near the 600 sites that reportedly once existed at the Tuolumne Meadows campground

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

(and it is unclear how many of the added sites are for the public versus for employees), there is no expansion of wilderness use, and no expansion at Glen Aulin. So why is this alternative called expanding recreational opportunities? This underscores again that the No Action Alternative is not providing a good baseline for comparison.

Page 7-55 and following. Please clarify how many of the added campsites are for public use and how many may need to be utilized by employees.

Page 7-56. Is it "parties" per hour or "groups" per hour?

Page 7-58. The debris from Glen Aulin is to be taken to the "frontcountry dump areas." As noted earlier in my letter "frontcountry" needs to be defined. Also, the entire subject of solid waste management has not been adequately addressed in the TRP.

Page 7-61. It is unfortunate that the retention of the public fuel station is linked to the alternative that contains the controversial proposal for kayaking. This is also the alternative that conveys the idea of increased use therefore it gives the impression that the fuel station is only needed if increased use is promoted for the Tuolumne Meadows area. As I commented earlier, the public should be able to pick and choose what they like and dislike about the alternatives and suggest that a hybrid alternative be adopted. The fuel station is in an historic building and is a contributing resource to the historic values of the Tioga Road. Retaining the station is also beneficial from a public safety perspective because it reduces the probability of stranded motorists. Since climate

change is raised throughout the TRP I would think it obvious that retaining the fuel station would encourage owners of hybrid vehicles to consider taking them to Tuolumne Meadows because a fuel station would be there (hybrid vehicles have shorter driving ranges and need a supportive fuel station network).

Page 7-64. Clarify if additional campsites for employees are at Gaylor Pit and Road Camp or will there be need for campsites at the public campground? How will OSHA issues be mitigated? Has the cost and complexity of complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) been addressed?

Please see my earlier comments about the titles for Alternatives 3 & 4.

Page 7-71. Is it "parties" or "groups?"

Page 7-72. Again I ask for clarification about "50 persons per night below the reservoir" Is this in Poopenaut Valley or does this include Miguel Meadow?

Page 7-76. What is the cost estimate for increasing shuttle service within the Tuolumne Meadows area and where do I find the environmental analysis on impacts associated with increased bus traffic and increased bus stops?

Page 7-77. Again I ask that the overnight parking space inventory be clarified. Does the overnight space count take into account that the Tuolumne Meadows campsites are designed to accommodate two cars per site? If the campsite parking is consistently underutilized then the redesign of this facility could directly solve the day visitor parking space needs with relatively little adverse impact to the environment and at a cost savings over creating new parking lots or attempting to force

Correspondence ID:	407	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Hello, As a life long resident of California & Recreational Guide. I hope that you would please allow for limited boating on the Tuolumne river.As proposed in alternative 2,in the final draft of the management plan for the wild&scenic Tuolumne river.Thank you. Sincerely, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	408	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Public Comment, [REDACTED] TRP				

Please extend the public comment period for the TRP. The average person will need more time to read and digest the revised information in the narratives and appendices. Since 2006, the NPS website and information process for TR Planning was up to date. From early 2010, there was a lull in the information and the website posted obsolete dates, then in 2013 with the release of the draft TRP, the ORV language changed. This is concerning because the information, scientific studies, data, and reports

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

supporting the TRP process did not change. Additionally, it is hard to understand and information is buried, but it looks like commercial guide services in the TR corridor are being affected by decisions made for the Half Dome EIS. This will negatively impact the recreational wilderness experience for the average person and/or visitors with special needs who often seek guide service to access wilderness (via hiking guide, climbing guide, and horse). Understandably, the Half Dome experience became a negative experience for many due to excessive visitor participation; access management was needed. However, these conditions do not exist on TR corridor trails. With Yosemite's 800 miles of trails and 95% wilderness, there has to be room for visitors wanting to connect along the Tuolumne River utilizing guides or horses. And, it is unclear if Accessibility was vetted through TRP planning processes.

If you extend the comment period to 120 days, please consider releasing a one-page summary as a supplement to the Draft TRP public comment process describing Alt 4 actions that will have an effect on visitor recreation and wilderness access. The supplement could be written so that it is understandable to the 6th grade education level and clearly list the restrictions compared to the No Action alternative. I realize something like this is in various forms through-out the TRP documentation, but again, to the average reader ? is difficult to find and understand. Extending the public comment period and clearly summarizing changes affecting the river corridor will put the average visitor on an even playing field with those "public commenters" who have the education, time, and agendas to influence the final TRP.

NPS efforts to produce a WSR plan for the Tuolumne are commendable. Best of luck with the entire process.

Correspondence ID:	409	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	From: [REDACTED] Date: Mon, Mar 18, 2013 at 5:32 PM Subject: Tuolumne River DEIS To: yose_planning@nps.gov				

Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp

Although I think we can all agree that the current situation in Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp (HSC) is not ideal, I don't think the proposed reduction of the number of beds at that High Sierra Camp is an appropriate solution to these problems.

The number of beds at Glen Aulin currently matches the numbers at other nearby HSCs, allowing more opportunities for a free flowing itinerary for visitors interested in using these camps in a loop to explore a greater section of the high country.

Furthermore, early in the process, the HSCs were identified specifically as an Outstandingly Remarkable Value (ORV) which should be protected and enhanced, not reduced in scope and number of beds. Re-interpretation of the ORVs conducted later grossly mis-interprets the ORV of the area confining it to Tioga Road. The road itself is not an ORV and was not identified as such ?these activities and opportunities that take place off the road are part of what people value, not just our ability to get there via the road.

Although Glen Aulin is listed in the TRP as a "Potential Wilderness Addition", it is inappropriate to begin managing it to a standard that it does not yet have.

I'd like to see other alternatives proposed to reintroduce vegetation along the Tuolumne River where many people day-hiking also stop to get close to the river (not just those staying at the HSC). If we can be creative about that access ? fencing, rotating restoration lines, limiting the area where people can access the water ? the restoration process will improve by more than just eliminating beds at Glen Aulin. We have seen these kinds of restoration successes in Cooks Meadow in the Valley accomplished without restricting visitation.

Please reconsider options at Glen Aulin in order to retail the historic number of beds at this location. Composting toilets are an excellent option. Let's investigate other alternatives to accomplish our goals rather than simply restricting visitation.

Thank you for maintaining the number of campsites.

Stock Use

Stock create a major impact on wet trails, and I support the initiative to establish an opening date for all stock to enter the high country. This date should be flexible based on the year's conditions, and similar to the way that trails are closed or opened based on conditions.

Because the HSCs were identified early in the process as being an ORV for the Tuolumne River corridor, I also applaud the proposal to continue to allow stock support of the HSCs. These animals are an essential part of making that extraordinary

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

opportunity possible.

However, concessioner day-rides are already limited to 5 trips/day (3 2-hour trips and 2 4-hour trips). Given the many miles of trails in the Tuolumne area, this seems to be a reasonable amount, and hikers hoping to avoid contact with stock have many alternative trails to choose from.

Although I don't personally ride, I do appreciate the special connection that people form with an area by being able to explore it on a saddle ride. This is a historic use, and especially if stables in Yosemite Valley are removed through the MRP, you may see much more interest in this activity in other regions of the park including Tuolumne and Wawona.

Furthermore, having concession options available within the park for a day-ride means that the stock have been as weed-free, preventing the spread of invasive plants from stock being brought into the park. By limiting the opportunities within the park, you may inadvertently increase the number of people bringing horses and other stock in from outside the park.

Thank you for protecting the trails by establishing an open date for all stock, and for allowing continued support of the HSCs. Please reconsider and continue to allow day rides from the concession stables inside the park where the animals can be fed weed-free feed to reduce the introduction of invasive plants from outside the park.

Parking

I like the idea of moving parking options to formalized areas off the main road, however completely eliminating road-side parking, and reducing the parking capacity of an area which is already sometimes strained seems excessive. According to Table 7-11 on page 7-86, it looks like the number of parking areas would be reduced by 70 spaces. Rather than eliminating all road-side parking, a detailed review of which areas are more sensitive and creating alternative parking options (directed to less sensitive locations) seems more appropriate and also allows for more people to enjoy the region without creating a large adverse impact. If we want people to get out of their cars and explore the region, we need to give them a place to leave their cars behind. I support the increase of public transit options and capacity, but these are two different populations. People who want to spend a full day hiking or climbing in Tuolumne, but do not have overnight lodging in Tuolumne can't do that with the current public transit schedule, and they will drive their cars.

Unless I am misreading Table 7-11, the statement in the TRP stating that the preferred alternative will "increase the amount of designated parking available to visitors wishing to get out of cars to enjoy recreational experiences ?" while technically true is misleading at best.

Please consider leaving some of the road-side parking in place to maintain the current parking capacity, and thank you for committing to increasing public transit options. I'd like to see inexpensive (or free) options that would allow people to arrive in Tuolumne Meadows early and/or leave late.

Mountain Shop/School

Everyone who knows anything knows that during the summer months Tuolumne is a cooler and more comfortable option for backpacking, hiking and climbing than Yosemite Valley. Because of that I would like to see the services provided by the Mountaineering School and Shop remain in Tuolumne. Climbers looking for last minute gear aren't required to make the long drive into Yosemite Valley, reducing congestion in the Valley, and those unprepared for the cool morning and evening temperatures or afternoon thundershowers in Tuolumne have a resource for warmer clothing and gear. Similarly, people looking for a guided adventure should have a place based in the high-country to meet and rent equipment.

The Mountaineering School has been part of the Tuolumne Meadows tradition since the 1970s when modern technical rock climbing was just being established, and rock climbers tend to seek higher ground rather than spending time around the river. Why should these services be removed?

If the building and parking area behind the gas station must be removed, please allow for an alternative location that provides for the continuation of these services.

Public Fuel Station

If there is going to be a fueling station in Tuolumne Meadows to support government and concession vehicles, I'd like to see that remain open to the public. I don't understand how refueling or having a somewhat larger tank substantially impacts the river.

Correspondence ID:	410	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Dear Sir/Madam - I would like to throw my support to Alternative 1 of the options in the Tuolumne Wild & Scenic River Plan - throughout the thorough Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement there is ample evidence that I believe documents why this plan is the best for the future of the Tuolumne River & overall area surrounding it. You document well the unsure & unforeseeable impact that climate change will have on Yosemite (and sadly already has). I feel that a plan that focuses on a more self-reliant experience of the area will best be able to be ready for these future aspects which we are unable to predict or are uncertain of in scale. By lessening areas of human impact & involvement (10 - campground, 4 - removal of waster water facilities, also fewer full time residences (seasonal though the actual inhabiting may be)) and by being able to restore the land to it's natural state ahead of climate change the environment will be better able to handle the coming changes.

Perhaps I am becoming more grumpy as I get older - but I think not - my mother has Alzheimer's and I am still able to provide her with a national park experience that requires effort on our part. By lessening the use of Tuolumne by those who are not willing (though I do realize some will not be able) to be more self-reliant or simply out going - it will increase the experience of Tuolumne for everyone while better preserving this area of Yosemite National Park.

Also since we seem to be in an era where we refuse to pay for anything via the national government - I would assume that though there may be fewer park revenues from less parking, lodging, etc. - the upkeep will be less so. Thus more budget friendly.

I hope that these comments are of some use. Thank you all for the amazing work you have in re to the plan & no doubt you will continue to do so as this process nears its end. Yosemite National Park and all of us are better for it.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	411	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau Business				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Superintendent Neubacher,				

Please find the attached document which contains the comments regarding the Tuolumne River Plan from Board President [REDACTED] and CEO [REDACTED]

Thank you.

[REDACTED] n Director of PR/Communications Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau 559-683-4636 Office [REDACTED]
Find us on Facebook www.YosemiteThisYear.com

The Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau is the lead agency for Madera County tourism. The Bureau has consistently advocated for the visitor to our region. It is our goal to ensure that visitation is an experience that is memorable and rewarding. In addition, we strive to promote our region so that our local gateway economy is robust and sustainable. Madera County's tourism economy is second only to agriculture and is a primary provider of employment in the Eastern Madera County gateway communities.

With this in mind, we continue to encourage the National Park Service to remain conscious in their efforts to keep the people that desire to visit their National Park foremost in their planning efforts. We believe that a balance between the resource and a common sense approach to providing access and recreational opportunities for all is achievable. We believe that visitor diversity is extremely important and that Yosemite Park opportunities should not be reserved for only the people of means. Minorities, those of modest means and the disabled need to be encouraged to visit their public parks.

In the Tuolumne River Plan we would discourage the discontinuation of concessionaire horse- back riding. Disabled persons, as well as the general public that are not hikers or backpackers, should not be precluded from enjoying the back country of Yosemite. The gas station should be retained. Those visitors spending time in the area should not be required to drive to Lee Vining or Crane Flat and back to refuel. Managing trails near Tioga Road should be done very carefully keeping in mind that "opportunities for solitude" exist in many areas in the immediate vicinity. The wilderness area, 95% of Yosemite, provides a great many "opportunities". Dispersed parking should be retained, allowing for an "un-crowded" experience.

Thank you for providing this chance to comment. We understand the difficulty in balancing the positions of a varied constituency. We only ask that the "general public" is not ignored.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Sincerely,

Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau,

██████████ CEO

██████████ President

Correspondence ID: 412 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Planners,

Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. The preferred alternative for the management plan of the wild and scenic Merced allows paddling of the upper reaches of the Merced, a very similar segment of river.

Regards, ██████████

Correspondence ID: 413 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Alameda & Tuolumne Watershed Resources Manager County Government
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Greetings,

Please see the attached comments to the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement as submitted by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). A hard copy of the SFPUC comment letter was also sent out today.

The SFPUC wishes to thank the National Park Service (NPS) for the opportunity to comment on this very important management plan and looks forward to the continued coordination with the NPS as this process moves forward.

Thank you,

██████████

██████████

Alameda & Tuolumne Watershed Resources Manager Natural Resources and Lands Management Division

Water Enterprise 505 Paloma Way

Sunol, CA 94586 office: (925) 862-5516 | fax: (925) 862-9045

Correspondence ID: 414 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence:

As a frequent visitor to Yosemite National Park and a resident of California, I would like to voice my support for alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. This segment of river in the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne is demanding enough that only expert Whitewater Boaters would attempt to navigate it, and a "leave no trace" ethic is already standard in this user group. In addition, the management plan for the nearby Merced allows for boating on the upper reaches, thus making the two management plans consistent.

Thank you for your consideration,

██████████

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	415	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Yosemite Planning, Please consider allowing for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. I would love to have the opportunity to float in the meadows or try my luck on the grand canyon of the Tuolumne. Thank you, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	416	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear NPS,				

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne River Plan (TRP). Please consider my comments as you finalize the preferred alternative.

1. Please consider adopting the ORV descriptions that were presented to the public in 2007/2008. The ORVs that are used as a comparison in Appendix F are better written and in my opinion, better capture the values that are important in Tuolumne and the river. The recreational ORV, especially, is much better in the earlier version than currently described in the TRP as it captured the character of the range of recreational experiences available in the river corridor for people of all ages and abilities. The current description which highlights the Tioga Road really doesn't seem to capture the value of recreation in the Tuolumne River.

2. Please reconsider the elimination of the Yosemite Mountaineering School in the Tuolumne area. This school connects visitors to Tuolumne in a positive, educational and safe way. It is true that recreational activities such as climbing and mountaineering will still be available to visitors without the school; however, it will eliminate the group of visitors from that activity that are novice and require a lesson, or extra help, or those with disabilities. Even if the number of people in this group is insignificant in the overall total visitation to Tuolumne, it seems socially unjust to remove their ability to experience Tuolumne in the way they feel most comfortable. Also, the YMS is a long-standing service in Yosemite and its removal does not seem to enhance the traditional visitor experience.

3. Please reconsider the reduction to the Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. As the former manager of the High Sierra Camps, I know first hand how this reduction will affect the very popular and successful High Sierra Loop hikes. Glen Aulin is currently the smallest camp and the adjacent camps on the loop hike are able to accommodate 32 guests. Reducing the camp to 20 which is in the middle of the loop will significantly adversely affect the high sierra loop system, forcing a significant number of "loopers" to skip Glen Aulin and hike onto the next camp (this makes for a very long and strenuous hike that many people in the HSC demographic would not be able to complete in one day). This reduction will affect over 35% of loop hikers and will cause an operational inefficiency (inability to accommodate the flow of hikers on the loop circuit) that will impact visitor services and experience. The EIS minimized the overall impact of this action because it only affects 12 people per night out of all the people who visit the Tuolumne River corridor, however, I propose that the EIS look closer at the impact to the loop hike program, and compare the reduction of 12 people to the overall number of people who will be allowed in the Glen Aulin zone when the camps are open. If that analysis is done, I believe the impacts to the traditional visitor experience will be more appropriately outlined. I also believe that if composting toilets are installed, there is less need to reduce the camp capacity. Kudos to the NPS for calling for composters! It is an excellent idea.

4. Removal of the gas station will be a hardship on park operations that wasn't addressed adequately in the EIS. DNC and Park vehicles will be required to refuel at Crane Flat which is over an hour away. The retention and relocation of the above ground diesel tank will only benefit vehicles that use diesel, a minority. It seems more cost effective to retain the TM Station for both visitor and operational use rather than removing it, removing the AGT of diesel and relocating it. Why remove two fueling stations and build one, when you can just keep the current that meets all regulations?

5. I would like to see day-rides retained in the Tuolumne area. I realize stock use will always be a political issue in the National Parks and the decision to eliminate the rides is one the NPS does not make lightly. I think that if you continue to allow operational stock use for both the NPS and concessioner, that you should also offer the opportunity to the visitor. If stock was

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

being eliminated all together in the Tuolumne River corridor, the elimination of day rides would be more understandable, but that is not the case. The issues surrounding stock use will still be present with administrative and private use, so the elimination of dayrides only eliminates a traditional recreational experience for visitors, many of whom might require the service due to ability.

Overall, I believe the NPS did a good job outlining a future for Tuolumne and am happy to see the plan after several years of development. I do think the title of the preferred alternative is misleading as many traditionally offered recreational activities are being affected (elimination of day rides and YMS, reduction at Glen Aulin, eliminating recreational commercial group access to Glen Aulin and Lyell Canyon in July and August). It is unclear what is being enhanced of the Traditional Experience. I do think that the removal of roadside parking and the construction of a parking area is a great idea and will improve the scenic views in the meadows, but other than that, I see the traditional experience being maintained and in some cases eliminated, not enhanced overall. Please reconsider some of these actions so that Tuolumne stays the same!

Thank you for considering my comments and the time it takes to analyze them.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	417	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	From: [REDACTED] Date: Mon, Mar 18, 2013 at 12:29 PM Subject: Wild and Scenic Tuolumne and Merced Rivers To: yose_planning@nps.gov				

Please see the attached document for comments on the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers Plan

March 18, 2013

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

Yosemite National Park is a nationally significant, treasured resource. The plans for the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne rivers should reflect this significance. I realize the unique demands place on Yosemite National Park because of its popularity, national and historical significance, and the thousands of engaged stakeholders. However, this demand should in-no-way excuse an unbalanced and unfair approach to recreational use. Both RV and hiker recreationists have dominated the management focus of this park in a way that has left other users wanting. While climbing has become a common component of park management, river running has not been properly addressed. Kayaking in particular is a low impact recreation use that, because it has been ignored for so long, deserves protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures. In short, kayaking should not just be 'allowed,' but it should be deliberately managed for experiential and resource protection reasons. Kayakers have shown a willingness to use shuttle buses, permits, and designated put-in/take outs on rivers throughout this country. Yosemite should follow suit in practical and fair management practices for kayaking. Ideally, kayaking should be allowed within the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers whenever flows are adequate.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	418	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Sierra Mac River Trips, Inc Business				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	[REDACTED]				

Superintendent Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Fax 209 379-1294 e-mail Yose_Planning@nps.gov Tuolumne Planning

Re: Draft Tuolumne Wild & Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan EIS

3/15/2013 Draft Comments of [REDACTED]

I have been a white water boating enthusiast since 1963. I presently own and operate Sierra Mac River Trips, offering guided rafting trips to the public on the Tuolumne River. I led the first professional trips on the Tuolumne River in 1970 and pioneered the first Cherry Creek/Upper Tuolumne raft trips in 1973. I rafted the Tuolumne River from O'Shaughnessy Dam to Early Intake in 1975.

I strongly urge that the Management Plan permit white water kayakers and rafters to boat the Tuolumne River from Tuolumne Meadows to Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and a second stretch of the river from O'Shaughnessy Dam through the Poopenaut Valley to the Park boundary. These two sections of the Tuolumne River have outstanding and remarkable recreational and scenic values that should be managed for the public to experience with boats.

These two sections of river offer exceptional and rare opportunities for the highly skilled boater. Yosemite is known for being a climbers' Mecca. Why not allow the Park to also be known for having one of the most outstanding technical white water boating runs to be found anywhere?

Private boating permits should be required to ensure public safety and resource protection. Boating the approximate 2 miles of river in the Poopenaut Valley from O'Shaughnessy Dam to the trail that leads back up to the road for a one day trip or on down to the Park boundary and to Early Intake for a multi day trip would be an amazing experience that should be allowed.

The Tuolumne River from Tuolumne Meadows in the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne has been a prize to kayakers who have illegally kayaked the river in this section. The prohibition of boating this section of river should be removed and regulated by permit.

[REDACTED] President Sierra Mac River Trips, Inc.

Correspondence ID:	419	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To Whom It May Concern,				

Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	420	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	As an avid hiker and kayaker, I have often hiked this section of river wishing it was open to kayaking. The whitewater kayaking community is very conscientious and responsible and impacts on other pristine wilderness areas which are commonly kayaked are very minimum.				

Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. Thanks [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	421	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To concerned,				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. The Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne is one of the most impressive places on earth, and paddling down to Pate Valley would allow expert whitewater paddlers the opportunity to see it from the best vantage point possible.

Thanks for your consideration, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	422	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 17, 2013				

Dear Yosemite Planning Folks,

Here are my comments on the Tuolumne River Plan.

I object to parts of the preferred alternative because they conflict with the park's stated goals of protecting the natural resources.

There are also conflicts with recent legal decisions related to degradation in Wild and Scenic river corridors. The decisions call for the adoption of mandates to limit user capacity in order to protect remarkable resources.

Additionally the NPS fails to realize that its mission is not to provide lodging facilities if they negatively affect wilderness values. The NPS must not choose to be an innkeeper and instead be a strong advocate for protection of Wild and Scenic river values.

Glen Aulin

The situation at Glen Aulin poses a multitude of issues that negatively affect the W&S river regulations: ! It is a small city in the wilderness ! Too much stock travel ! Use of helicopters to administer the camp ! Water lines and storage tanks violate Wilderness Act ! Generator use must stop ! Septic upgrade is to be placed in a wetland and in Conness Creek floodplain.

If the camp is not removed alternative 2 should be selected with a limit of 20 guests.

Tuolumne Meadows Lodge

TML is not a necessary facility given that there are several private accommodations nearby. Sixteen hundred customers per week has a high impact on the river. At the very least all structures should be moved at least 150 feet away from the river.

An upgrade of the shower service should not be done without clear understanding of the water needs. Ten gallons per shower is not a realistic number. Not knowing how much water will be used will affect the need to treat the additional wastewater.

A-loop Campsites

Campsites too near the river detract from a natural river experience. Too many campers close to the river create user trails that degrade the riparian area. Finally there are enough campsites and these are not needed.

Trail Use

Choose the trail limits listed in alternative 2 to better maintain the quality of the hiking experience. I hiked the Lyell trail and counted 75 people and 12 horses in the first 5 miles. It was hardly a wilderness experience!

User Capacity Issues

There needs to be more attention to reducing traffic and parking congestion. More emphasis needs to be made on public transportation to and through the meadow. Water

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Water conservation must become a high priority so as to maintain adequate water in the river for the needs of aquatic habitat. The water infrastructure has unknown leakages. This only contributes to the need for conservation. The wastewater pond location does not protect river values.

Water supply must be considered a limiting factor when determining user capacity.

Special Status Species

The special plants near the soda springs do not get protection from stock traveling on the nearby trail.

The Yosemite Toad and the reintroduction of the Sierra Nevada Yellow Legged Frog need to be addressed now without waiting for further studies.

Native songbirds are affected by the presence of Cowbirds. Cowbirds associated with stock use and if that is reduced the songbirds population may improve. Conclusions

The Tuolumne Rive Plan will govern what happens in this meadow for decades. It is imperative for the leaders of YNP to take bold action to protect and improve the resources of the Tuolumne River. Ask yourself will future visitors to the park find an exemplary natural wonder or a collection of buildings to make the visitors more comfortable?

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	423	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern,				

I have reviewed the plans, and agree that modernizing the housing and visitor buildings should be done.

The parking along the road should not be allowed, there should be small parking lots and existing lots expanded.

The meadows should be protected better and a boardwalk trail in heavy use areas should be used.

The day use permits should be used only if they cannot get a handle on the amount of visitors. The bus system is good but needs to be expanded.

Encourage more walking, park and ride the bus, better explanation to visitors on how to use it.

The bold step would be to make the area like Zion, where everyone buses in and then walks and uses shuttle system. This may give visitors the best overall experience.

Take the time to make this right to protect one of the most unique areas in the world.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	424	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Yosemite Planning Commission Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. Thank You [REDACTED]				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 425 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: From: [REDACTED] Date: Sun, Mar 17, 2013 at 8:48 PM Subject: Yosemite:
Comments RE: Grand Canyon of Tuolumne To: yose_planning@nps.gov Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Yosemite NPS Staff, Our names are [REDACTED] We are avid whitewater kayakers based out of Reno, NV. We both have "day jobs", but paddle approximately 100 days a year after work and on the weekends. Most of our whitewater river days are logged over the hill in California's Sierra Nevada. When we're not kayaking, we're hiking and fishing in the Sierras instead. We love wilderness spaces -- for both backpacking and kayaking. Please consider updating your management policy to allow whitewater kayaking. Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River. Thank you very much for your time. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 426 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Please allow for limited whitewater boating on the Tuolumne River as proposed in alternative 2 in the final draft of the management plan for the wild and scenic Tuolumne River.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 427 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: 1. I am for keeping the small store & grill as in the preferred Alternative 4.

2. I am against removing the gas station. If it is too near the river, move it rather than remove it.

3. I am very much against using day use wilderness trailhead quotas if there are 10 encounters with other parties within an hour. When I have hiked on the High Sierra Camp Loop, I would hike for hours without encountering anyone but when hikers coming from the other direction and I met at about half-way, there were more than 10 encounters in an hour because they were coming from the HSC towards which I was hiking. I was very glad to see them. It did not lessen the wilderness experience.

4. If I understand the alternative 4 correctly, the concessioner stock day rides are being eliminated. Does this include the High Sierra Camps loop Horse option? If so, I am against that. This opens up a portion of the wilderness for those who are not able to hike it.

Please do not turn our Yosemite into a museum that can only be seen from a car or bus.

Supporters of Yosemite are people who have been able to experience & interact with the park for weeks at a time; year after year; generation after generation. Day use visitors are not those who volunteer or who support Yosemite financially with donations.

[REDACTED]

Member of Yosemite Conservatory

Wawona camper for 30 years with family; finally gave up the stress of the current reservation system. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 428 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,17,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Dear Honorable Decision Makers, I would like to voice my concern regarding the proposed changes in the reducing the capacity

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

of the High Sierra Camp lodging, particularly for the Glen Aulin camp. My husband, family, dear friends and I have cherished the opportunity and memories of lodging at each of the High Sierra Camp settings, and enjoyed the hiking and soaking in the wilderness during the days and settling in to each of the High Sierra Camp settings and all of the atmosphere of the "full, but limited" camp environment immensely during the evenings. The capacity for each of these settings seemed absolutely adequate, and I wish to advocate for maintaining the Glen Aulin capacity at its present size of 32 guests, versus reducing the capacity any further below 32. Please allow the number of visitors to these very welcoming camp stops to be maintained at a consistent number for each of the other settings, 42, if you will, with of course Merced Lake being reduced to this capacity of 42. I implore you to preserve this National Park experience for future generations!

Thank you for your consideration of this citizen's opinion on this important matter. With deep appreciation, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	429	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To Whom It May Concern, With considerable difficulty, I have been trying to make sense of the various alternatives being proposed for the TRP. I spent a week hiking through some of the high sierra camps last september; the ones I visited were: Tuolumne Meadows; Volgelsang; Merced; May Lake; Sunrise; and Glen Aulin. It was a fantastic trip, and utterly different from our subsequent trip to the Valley, which was a huge let down. I understand the delicate balance that needs to be maintained, and repeatedly recalibrated, between keeping the wilderness accessible and keeping it sufficiently wild. We loved the camps, and would never have managed the trip without them. I would hate to see them eliminated. I also had no serious beef with the manure on the trails, although it was very dry during our week, and wet weather could have made the footing more difficult, certainly. Without being able to fully understand all aspects of the plan, My vote would go with 4, the preferred plan, or 3, but definitely not with 1 or 2, both of which I think are solipsistic approaches.				

That said, I do think that all of this could be made a bit more straightforward! I can't help but wonder if it is this confusing on purpose. In any case, thank you for taking care of this wonderful national resource. It was a high point of 2013 for me, and I very much hope to return to the high sierra camps again.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID:	430	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,17,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear National Park Service, I had the opportunity to visit Yosemite's High Sierra Camps last summer. I had a wonderful time. Due to orthopedic problems that prevent me from carrying a pack over 15 pounds I would have been unable to visit these remote areas had it not been for the High Sierra Camps. I hope that you do not make any of the proposed changes to the Merced River Plan because I worry that it could limit the spots in the High Sierra Camps and/or curtail the camps all together.				

If an alternative plan is selected I hope that it will be the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative 5, because it responsibly increases visitor lodging as well as park restoration. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	431	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	I mostly support the changes in management's chosen Alternative. However, I would like it publicly noted that I call for...				

The removal of the DNC stables near Soda Springs. The removal of the social trail from the store across the meadow to Soda Springs.

The removal of roadside parking, especially near Cathedral Lakes TH, and Pothole Dome TH. Added signs and barriers to the Pothole Dome meadow restoration area would also better protect meadow health.

Removal of A loop campsites along the road near the river would protect the wild character of the river and prevent erosion along its banks.

Limits to stock use in the wilderness and along trails. 25 stock limit is ridiculous, it should be 10-12, and definitely not higher

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

than people allotments. Also limit the trails which stock can use.

More strict guidelines around dogs in the wilderness. There are some signs but very little enforcement.

Eliminate kites, frisbees, baseball, etc in Tuolumne Meadows. This is also appalling.

Thank you for your support of such a jewel in the Park Service. It is so important to prevent impact and preserve this area of Yosemite for future generations.

sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	432	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	I support the preferred alternative.				

Thank You, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	433	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,15,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Sir, I am writing to you to express my heartfelt hope that you work to keep all of the High Sierra Camps open. I think that instead of being reduced in size, they should be carefully expanded to meet the demand that currently exists. I recognize that the Tuolumne River and the Merced River need to be protected. But, surely these rivers can be protected while still maintaining these camps. Last summer, my 11 year old twins and I went on a 5 day loop hike through the High Sierras. It was one of the most amazing adventures for us and we have travelled to every continent in the world except Australia. I realize that for many experienced hikers, taking off down the trail carrying their own food, water, tent, and gear is no problem. But for the rest of us, getting into the High Sierras would not be possible without those camps. And, to my knowledge, the High Sierra Camps are the only extensive loop system of camps in the United States. As a result of that experience, my son has asked to go out again this summer. We aren't going to be able to do the High Sierras because we did not sign up for the lottery, but instead he and I are heading out closer to home--this time carrying our food, water, and tent. I would not have had the courage to go it alone with him had we not first had the experience last summer in Yosemite where we learned so much from our ranger--and where we experienced the silence, comradie, and awesomeness that one finds only in the backcountry. Please do everything in your power to keep these camps open and accessible to all. Sincerely, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	434	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,08,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	3/8/2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher

Yosemite National Park

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan

P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a California resident and a Class IV kayak paddler I have enjoyed paddling the Merced and Tuolumne rivers since 1988. I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

As I am sure you understand, our society needs the outdoors now more than ever. Grueling work schedules, traffic commutes, and urban congestion makes it all the more important that we have access to our wild and pristine places. Whitewater enthusiasts are by nature, respectful of these wild places and regard them as sacred spaces. Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	435	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,19,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	I support all the hard work you are doing and will probably be comfortable with whatever you propose, however I strongly feel you should NOT close Glen Camp. We need more facilities like that, not less. [REDACTED] whitewater rafter mountain biker backpacker [REDACTED] California				

Correspondence ID:	436	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,16,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Please protect the Tuolumne River area from being loved too much. Any plans should include reducing human impact. For instance, most plan alternatives reduce roadside parking next to Tuolumne Meadows in favor of providing more centralized parking areas within walking distance to the meadows to reduce congestion and visitor impacts on wetlands and the meadow ecosystem. Designated trails and signage to avoid compaction and erosion should be considered. Alternative 1 is helpful since it recommends reducing overall visitor capacity by removing all commercial services from the Tuolumne Meadows area, including the Tuolumne Lodge, gas station, grill, and store. Another alternative reduces the overnight capacity of Tuolumne Lodge while maintaining its capacity in the other alternatives. Alternative 1 also removes the Glen Alin Camp, which is a non-conforming development in the existing Park Wilderness and Tuolumne Wild River segment. The removal or reduction of this camp is a good recommendation. The Park Service currently prohibits all boating on the Tuolumne within Yosemite Park. This should be continued in order to protect the meadow ecosystem.				

All alternatives propose various levels of meadow, vegetation, and ecosystem restoration. However, none of the alternatives tie restoration goals to specific objectives, like re-establishing Yosemite toad, Sierra yellow-legged frog and other sensitive species that have disappeared from Tuolumne Meadows. There should be some sort of more specific proposal for this section. Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	437	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	February, 27th, 2013				

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

As a California resident and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park. In addition to the fact that banning boating on a Wild and Scenic River is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Each individual's reason for kayaking changes through the years. What begins as new, meanders self-discovery, and turns out benevolent becomes realized as the antidote to a troubled age. It's in settings full of Love and Beauty like Yosemite capable of change to the course of genetic predisposition, giving people reason why to work, a reason to raise a family, and share real moving experiences (not just links to Facebook) down the rich American timeline to the succeeding generations.

Please reconsider your Preferred Alternatives for both plans and amend them so that the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers are open to boating.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Correspondence ID:	438	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Feb,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	From: [Redacted] Date: Mon, Feb 18, 2013 at 2:26 PM Subject: Tuolumne (& Merced) River plan To: yose_planning@nps.gov				

Dear Sir: I am also attaching a pdf of this letter

Dear Superintendent Don Neubacher, Yosemite National Park: I write regarding the Merced and Tuolumne River Plan. I urge you to lift all bans on boating within the park. In 1983 I paddled and hiked the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne from Tuolumne Meadows to Hetch Hetchy with Lars Holbek, Chuck Stanley, Royal Robbins, Doug Tompkins and several others. This was the 1st time that stretch of river had been navigated with a boat, to our knowledge. It was an awe-inspiring, bonding and sometimes frightening experience for us. The beauty of floating through Tuolumne meadows in the predawn, the dust of the trail as we hiked around John Muir Gorge, the power of WaterWheel Falls, watching my friends whoop and holler, bouncing safely down 20 foot sliding falls, and the sublime beauty of entering Hetch Hetchy valley remains with me to this day. That adventure was illegal then. We had to spend a good portion of our energies avoiding rangers. That adventure continues to be illegal, despite the world-wide fame of the Canyon and its waters, and the fact that it is still frequently run. On several occasions some of these same friends paddled the main Merced within the park boundary. I skipped out on these adventures, in part just to avoid the hassles with the rangers. I have paddled the South Merced several times from the Awhanee down to the confluence with the main Merced. I believe that the National Parks were instituted for all to enjoy, including the paddling public. The standard argument against boating in parks (or anywhere) is that it is not safe. A standard counter argument begins: and climbing is? Leaving these arguments aside, let me simply say that I believe that it is not the Park Service's mission to keep us safe, or to decide the particular way in which we choose to be surrounded by the mountains. Part of the Park Service's mission is certainly to insure that those of us travelling through the park have a minimal impact on its flora, fauna and even rocks: that we do not destroy, as we pass through. Paddling is minimally invasive, leaving even less trace than climbing or hiking. Please open up the park to boaters. I also ask that the Glen Aulin camping site and cabins ought to remain open. This site is great draw for the public and beautifully maintained. I remember paddling under the bridge with all the campers there, and how happy they all seemed. I will close by saying that I was pleased to see some boating opportunities offered in some of the alternatives, particularly in alternative 2. But I strongly urge you to simply open up the park to boating. Water and paddle is as viable a means of moving through the park as as rock and rope, and even less invasive. sincerely [Redacted Signature]

Correspondence ID:	439	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	American Whitewater et al. Recreational Groups				
Received:	Mar,04,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Joint Comments?Merced and Tuolumne W&S Mgt Plans				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

1 message

[REDACTED] To: yose_planning@nps.gov Cc: [REDACTED]

Hello,

Please find attached the comments of a number of conservation organizations, paddling clubs and individual paddlers regarding the Draft Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans. These comments were delivered in person to Superintendent Neubacher on February 26th by Dave Steindorf of American Whitewater, and I submit them today to formally file them on the record. Note that this letter has one additional organization signing on when compared to the letter delivered to the Superintendent.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

-- [REDACTED]

American Whitewater Associate Stewardship Director

503-928-7711 (office) 503-358-0140 (cell) megan@americanwhitewater.org

American Whitewater's mission is to conserve and restore America's whitewater resources and enhance opportunities to enjoy them safely. Become an American Whitewater member today!

Mon, Mar 4, 2013 at 5:54 PM

March 4, 2013

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389 Sent via e-mail to: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

We appreciate having the opportunity to comment on the Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers in Yosemite National Park. Collectively, we are public interest organizations that work to protect, restore and enjoy rivers throughout California. We do this not only for the sake of people from throughout the state, but for those who travel from around the U.S. and the world to explore and enjoy the region's world-class rivers. We are also individual whitewater boaters who are pioneers in California's paddling community.

As you are aware, boating throughout most of Yosemite National Park has been prohibited for many years, denying the public the truly exceptional opportunity to directly experience the Park's waters and scenery by boat. We encourage the Park to change course and allow the public the opportunity to enjoy Yosemite from the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. We are pleased that the Park is considering a number of alternatives that would allow boating in some areas where it currently is not

allowed. However, we disagree with the Park's Preferred Alternatives for both the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers, which continue to prohibit boating on significant stretches of both rivers

We request that Yosemite National Park allow the public the opportunity to directly experience the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers by boat. Paddling is allowed and fully supported on the 200 (+) Wild and Scenic Rivers across the country, and is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience a wild landscape. Yosemite National Park should be no exception. Additionally, as river conservation organizations and conservation-oriented paddlers, we care deeply about the health of the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers, and support management actions that protect the rivers within the Park. This includes placing reasonable limits on recreational use of river corridors to ensure visitor capacities are not exceeded. A user capacity of zero aimed solely at paddling, however, is unacceptable.

While some sections of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers contain areas of technically challenging whitewater, we feel it is a

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

mistake for the Park Service to eliminate paddling based upon its own determination of the risk. The risks of paddling these rivers are not atypical of many treasured recreational experiences that are celebrated elsewhere in Yosemite and across the National Park System. Boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

Please re-consider allowing the public to experience all rivers within Yosemite National Park by boat, subject only to well-reasoned limits crafted to ensure visitor capacities are not exceeded. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

██████████ California Stewardship Director American Whitewater

██████████ California Stewardship Director American Whitewater

██████████ Director of Policy Restore Hetch Hetchy

██████████ Executive Director Friends of the River

██████████ Deputy Executive Director Tuolumne River Trust

██████████ Director, California Regional Office American Rivers

██████████ President California Outdoors

██████████ President American Packrafting Association

██████████ President, California Canoe and Kayak Oakland, CA

██████████ Chair, Friends of the Rivers of Virginia Conservation Chair, Float Fisherman of Virginia

██████████ President, Chico Paddleheads Chico, CA

██████████ Regional Paddlers North Carolina

██████████ Director, Guides House Laytonville, CA

██████████ President, Sierra Nevada Whitewater Club, Reno, NV

██████████ Gold Country Paddlers Lotus, CA

██████████ President, Iowa Whitewater Coalition Johnston, IA

██████████ Program Coordinator Dolores River Boating Advocates?Durango, CO

██████████ Individual Boater Co-Author, "A Guide to the Best Whitewater in the State of California"

██████████ Individual Boater

██████████ Individual Boater Davis, CA

██████████ Individual Boater Twain Hart, CA

██████████ Individual Boater

██████████ Individual Boater

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence ID: 440 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED]
Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: [REDACTED] To: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

I was excited to learn that Yosemite NP is considering changes to its policy of banning boating on the Tuolumne and Merced rivers. I'm writing to express my support for opening the closed reaches of both rivers to non-motorized paddling.

As an avid climber and Class V paddler, I've long been impressed with the park's approach to climbing and the respect it has shown for both the area's historical significance and the community's largely self-regulating nature.

The park should take a similar approach to paddling as it does to climbing. If anything, the whitewater paddling community is tighter knit, more self-regulating and more safety conscious than the climbing community. Furthermore, the activity itself is in many ways lower impact than climbing since it takes place on the water. There's even similar history -- many of the pioneering valley climbers (Robbins, Chouinard, etc.) were also pioneering whitewater boaters.

Some reaches of the Merced and Tuolumne would be accessible to casual recreational paddlers and offer relaxing floats and great views. Others would be accessible only to a handful of world class experts, and would instantly take their place as some of the best and hardest whitewater in North America. Still others would be unrunnable using today's equipment and techniques (and might remain so forever), just like El Capitan was considered unclimbable 80 years ago.

In any case, lifting the ban on boating on these rivers would open the park to a new environmentally conscious user group that's passionate about the outdoors. I know it would enhance my experience in the park and be very meaningful to me personally.

Thanks for considering this comment, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 1:23 PM

Correspondence ID: 441 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Please open boating on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers

1 message

[REDACTED] To: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

I'm writing in order to comment on Yosemite's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. I have recently moved to California to pursue employment in the Bay Area and to explore California's beautiful waterways through whitewater kayaking. I am a class V paddler and have been stunned by the beauty of the many rivers in California and Yosemite's beautiful valley. One great disappointment however was in discovering that boating throughout most of the Park has been banned for many years. I am in support of opening the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers to boating recreation. Boating is a low impact wilderness activity that allows participants to explore some of the most beautiful places in the world. Furthermore, boaters are an important part of the community that National Parks seek to serve; they should enjoy the same level of access that climbers, hikers and other low impact recreational groups enjoy. I understand there will be concerns about the safety of those on the river, however the boater community should be free to select rivers given an individuals skills and abilities. In addition, the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers contain an amazing range of difficulties which are suitable for novices and experts alike.

Please reconsider the Preferred Alternatives for both plans, and open the entire length of the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Scenic Rivers to boating.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 1:20 PM

Correspondence ID: 442 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED]
Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Management Plan

1 message

[REDACTED] To: "yose_planning@nps.gov" <yose_planning@nps.gov>

Dear Superintendent,

I am writing to support opening the Tuolumne and Merced rivers to limited, private boating by taxpayers who want to enjoy this beautiful scenery.

Paddling a river is a low impact activity, similar to hiking a trail or camping.

Thank you for studying this and have a great day.

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 1:05 PM

[REDACTED]

AW Member

Correspondence ID: 443 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED]
Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: From NPS.gov: Merced River Kayaking and Rafting

1 message

[REDACTED] To: yose_planning@nps.gov

Email submitted from [REDACTED] at /yose/parkmgmt/mrp_comment.htm

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

Hello Yosemite National Park Management,

I am writing to comment on the Merced Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. I am an avid whitewater kayaker from Mammoth Lakes, CA. I would like to see all rivers and creeks within Yosemite National Park open to non-motorized boating (kayaks and rafts). The Merced and Tuolumne Rivers including their tributaries contain world class whitewater which is currently closed to kayaks and rafts.

Other national parks such as Sequoia and Kings Canyon allow non-motorized boating on their rivers and lakes. These rivers are paddled by kayakers from California and worldwide every year. Non-motorized boating of rivers is low impact, presents no hazard to other park visitors, and is no more dangerous than other sports which are permitted (such as rock climbing). In

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

addition, whitewater kayakers and rafters are generally a respectful and informed user group.

Please consider the requests of American Whitewater and boaters worldwide to open Yosemite's waterways to non-motorized boating.

[REDACTED]

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 10:39 PM

Correspondence ID: 444 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: [REDACTED]
Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 11:11 AM

[REDACTED] To: yose_planning@nps.gov

Email submitted from: [REDACTED] at /yose/parkmgmt/trp.htm

Please don't shut down the horse programs and rides. The stock use is already restricted to minimal stock use. Please don't let a very historical part of our country die. We own stock and enjoy the backcountry as a family. Please fight to keep stock use apart of our future not just the past. Thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 445 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Mar,05,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Whitewater Paddling in Yosemite National Park

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 5:46 AM

[REDACTED] To: yose_planning@nps.gov

Dear Park Planner,

It's been many years now since I last visited Yosemite. Although I enjoyed the hiking and camping I was disturbed that my favorite activity, whitewater paddling, was not permitted. As an active river runner I knew that the South fork of the Merced and the Tuolumne above Hetch Hetchy were being run regularly; several runs have been made for over 30 years. Other less difficult runs are available, too. I found it disappointing that in our moist famous national park, river users have to sneak around to enjoy their sport. I could not understand what was behind the park's irrational prohibition on river running.

River paddling should be treated the same way any other outdoor sport in Yosemite National Park. It is human-powered, low-impact, non-consumptive, skill-based, and Wilderness-compliant. It is exactly the kind of activity and experience that the Park system was created to encourage. Banning boating on our public rivers seems contrary to National Park System policy, and prohibiting paddling on Wild and Scenic Rivers appears inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Boaters should be allowed the freedom to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers, limited only by their abilities. The Park has found ways to manage trail use throughout the Park, and the rivers can be treated the same way.

Thank you for your consideration. Please support fair boating access to the rivers of Yosemite National Park.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 446 **Project:** 14043 **Document:** 49369
Outside Organization: SFPUC County Government
Received: Mar,18,2013 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: San Francisco Water Power Sewer

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Operator of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System

March 18, 2013

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park Attention: Tuolumne River Plan DEIS P. O. Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Dear Superintendent Neubacher:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (TRP/EIS) for the Tuolumne River within Yosemite National Park, and congratulations on achieving this significant milestone.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) reliably serves approximately 2.6 million people in the San Francisco Bay Area with high quality drinking water from the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. Approximately 85% of the water supply provided by the system is derived from the Hetch Hetchy watershed (located within the upper Tuolumne River watershed) and is stored upstream of O'Shaughnessy Dam in Hetch Hetchy Reservoir (HHR). This portion of the SFPUC's water supply is located entirely within Yosemite National Park (YNP), which is administered by the National Park Service (NPS).

The SFPUC and NPS have a long history of cooperation in managing the Hetch Hetchy watershed and the upper Tuolumne River, and collaborate to meet federally mandated responsibilities for protecting water quality. These responsibilities were initially established under the Raker Act (38 Stat. 242) of 1913. The SFPUC and NPS presently operate under a cooperative Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which establishes a set of programs that define common goals and funding mechanisms. These programs include:

1. A Source Water Protection Program for protecting water quality in the Hetch Hetchy and Eleanor Creek watersheds (as required under the Raker Act) and maintaining "filtration avoidance" status within the Hetch Hetchy watershed;
2. An Environmental Stewardship Program supporting river ecosystem management downstream of Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System facilities within Yosemite National Park, including O'Shaughnessy Dam; and

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 2 of 17

A Security Program, for joint management of security for Hetch Hetchy facilities within Yosemite National Park.

The TRP/EIS is directly relevant to the first two programs under the MOA. The Source Water Protection Program includes annual sanitary surveys of the Hetch Hetchy watershed that are conducted by SFPUC staff and focus on watershed activities, water quality concerns, and on-site inspections within the watershed. The sanitary survey report identifies issues and presents recommendations for studies, restoration, or changes to facilities to maintain high water quality. Many of the projects and facilities are within the designated Wild and Scenic corridor, and therefore require the TRP/EIS to be adopted by NPS before work can occur. Many of the recommendations provided in the sanitary surveys are generally within the scope of the TRP, but given the programmatic level of analysis, these recommendations will need further discussion with NPS so they can be implemented at the project level within the framework established by the TRP. TRP projects to protect water quality have strong SFPUC support (e.g., collaborative scientific efforts, stock use evaluations, riparian and meadow habitat restoration, wastewater treatment plant renovations, etc.), and because TRP adoption is necessary to proceed with any projects proposed within the Wild and Scenic corridor, the SFPUC strongly supports the adoption of the TRP.

The second relevant MOA program, the Environmental Stewardship Program, is implemented primarily via the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program (UTREP). The UTREP is an overarching collaborative effort involving the SFPUC, NPS, Stanislaus National Forest, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Upper Tuolumne River Stakeholder Group to improve river ecosystem management downstream of Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System facilities in the upper Tuolumne River watershed, while continuing to meet the SFPUC's mission to provide high quality water and generate hydropower. The current focus of the UTREP is the development of a new instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam to improve river ecosystem conditions in the 12-mile long reach between O'Shaughnessy Dam and Kirkwood Powerhouse (known as the "Hetch Hetchy Reach"). The SFPUC is currently developing the draft instream flow plan.

The Yosemite National Park boundary crosses the Tuolumne River approximately 6 miles downstream of O'Shaughnessy Dam. This reach within the Park includes the ecologically significant Poopenaut Valley, which is identified in the TRP as containing Outstandingly Remarkable Biological Values for the rare low-elevation riparian and wetland habitats it contains. The NPS

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 3 of 17

has conducted several critical ecological studies in the Poopenaut Valley to provide supporting data for the instream flow plan and TRP/EIS effort. In collaboration with the SFPUC and other stakeholders, the NPS has played an important role in guiding the development of the instream flow plan, which will improve management of the Poopenaut Valley ecosystem and provide for long-term ecological monitoring.

Minimum instream flow requirements for releases from O'Shaughnessy Dam were first established via stipulated agreements (under the authority of the Raker Act) between San Francisco and the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) in 1961, and were further supplemented and amended by stipulation in 1985 and 1987. The 1985 and 1987 Stipulations govern present-day instream flow releases from O'Shaughnessy Dam. The instream flow plan is intended to modify or replace the existing stipulations, after required environmental review and input from DOI agencies (NPS and USFWS), Stanislaus National Forest, and other stakeholders. The instream flow plan will also (1) address a required mitigation measure for maintaining the Poopenaut Valley wetlands and meadows under the SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program, Program Environmental Impact Report (the WSIP PEIR), which was adopted by the SFPUC in 2008 (WSIP Mitigation Measure 5.3.7-2), and (2) resolve remaining issues associated with the implementation of the 1987 Stipulation.

Given the context described above, please consider the following comments regarding the Draft TRP/EIS (with referenced chapters and page numbers) on behalf of the SFPUC:

Tuolumne Meadows and the Tuolumne Meadows Wastewater Treatment Plant (TMWWTP)

The SFPUC believes the TMWWTP system has surpassed its service life. Failure of this system is a potential threat to water quality in the Hetch Hetchy watershed. The TRP retains the TMWWTP in its current location (page, 7-30) with possible relocation of the ponds and spray field. The SFPUC recommends that the final location of these facilities be determined through a site specific Environmental Assessment (EA) process after TRP approval. The SFPUC's preference is to relocate all facilities on one side of the Tuolumne River, eliminating the need for a force main under the river. The SFPUC looks forward to participating in the EA process for the TMWWTP when it occurs. The SFPUC offers the following comments relevant to the TRP regarding these facilities:

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 4 of 17

1. The SFPUC recommends that the TRP provide adequate latitude for co- location of the TMWWTP, ponds and sprayfield on either side of the Tuolumne River.
2. 2-7: The SFPUC is concerned about wastewater force main crossings on the Tuolumne River. The SFPUC recommends the NPS assess the risks of, and response to, potential leakage from the force main crossing the Tioga Bridge on CA 120, and the force main between the TMWWTP and the detention ponds.
3. 2-7: The SFPUC requests clarification on the proposed renovations to the TMWWTP, including size, placement, treatment level, and effluent standards.
4. 2-10: Facility Site Planning. The SFPUC supports the "Facility Site Planning" criteria regarding the existing Tuolumne Meadows Waste Water Treatment ponds and spray field specifically the options of "removal, redesign and/or relocation" of this facility.
5. 5-27: Figure 5-9 shows TMWWTP pond outside the wilderness boundary and the spray fields inside the wilderness boundary. Is this correct?
6. 7-17: The SFPUC requests clarification on the wilderness boundary in Figure 7-2 being different at the TMWWTP ponds than in Figure 5-9. Spray fields aren't shown in Figure 7-2.
7. 7-30: The SFPUC recommends minimizing and/or eliminating the current direct discharge of chlorinated water from the wastewater collection system during winterization or inflow and infiltration flow through the wastewater collection system to the meadow during winter.
8. 7-94, 95: Regarding the septic systems at Tuolumne Meadows, the SFPUC recommends NPS consider improvements to the winter ranger septic system.
9. 7-108: The SFPUC is concerned about proposed site locations that may have potential for flooding and concomitant water

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

quality impacts, specifically, the TMWWTP offices, corporation yard, and diesel fuel tanks as proposed under Alternative 3.

10. 7-108: The SFPUC requests clarification on whether studies were performed to evaluate the adequacy of the Tuolumne Meadows campground wastewater collection system capacity. If studies were not performed, the SFPUC recommends that such studies be conducted.

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 5 of 17

11. 7-115: TRP page 7-115 provides justification for not considering

relocation of the TMWWTP to the north side of the river. The following provides SFPUC responses to these items:

"Conveying the wastewater to this location would require either continuing to use the existing force main (line) under Tuolumne Meadows, or constructing a new line from the Lambert Dome parking lot west along the gravel road to the ponds..."

Constructing the line along the current access road to the ponds involves the same type of risks and opportunities as any of the other construction activities presented in the TRP. Archaeological impacts can be mitigated using various techniques (avoidance, evaluation, etc.). Mitigations can be developed for other resource values such as vegetation and springs. The SFPUC suggests that these issues be evaluated in a TRP alternative or site specific EA rather than being discounted within the TRP.

"Construction of a new wastewater plant at the site of the ponds would constitute a new visual intrusion into the area."

Views from Lambert and Pothole Domes already include development, such as HWY 120. The construction of the TMWWTP, including tanks and spray fields, on the south side of the river would also involve visual impacts that should be considered in a site specific EA.

Figure 8-7 (page 8-156) indicates that most of the area south of HWY 120 is high visibility. Keeping the spray fields and ponds on the north side meets VRM II objectives (page 8-161). Designing a new TMWWTP in the north area may not negatively affect this objective, especially considering the area is not designated as wilderness and the north area is in high- or moderate- visibility zones (page 8-163).

"The Wilderness boundary was drawn very close to the existing ponds and spray fields, thus leaving little room for new construction of any kind. The space necessary for a full treatment plant means that it could not be sited by the ponds without violating the wilderness boundary."

One purpose of the TRP, as identified on page ES-5 is to: "Review, and if necessary revise the boundaries and segment classifications (as wild, scenic, or recreational) of the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River." While

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 6 of 17

the SFPUC understands that the purpose of the TRP does not necessarily include changes to the defined wilderness boundaries, the identification of specific project needs under the TRP may provide an opportunity to consider revision of the wilderness boundary if the NPS has the authority to recommend such changes. Such changes may allow projects, such as relocating the TMWWTP, to proceed while incurring little impact on wilderness and providing high value to Wild and Scenic corridor management and water quality.

Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp

The SFPUC considers the Glen Aulin sewer system and leach mound to be a potential water contamination source in the Hetch Hetchy watershed. The potential exists for the sewer system to overflow or malfunction. The SFPUC supports compost toilets located upslope for all users and grey water use only for the septic tank and leach mound. The SFPUC provided funding to replace Glen Aulin's flush toilets and sewer system with composting toilets in 2004. NPS has been waiting for the TRP to be finalized before constructing the composting toilets.

1. The SFPUC supports the installation of compost toilets, located upslope, for all users. If the septic tank and leach mound are not removed, then the SFPUC supports using the septic system for gray water only (e.g., shower and dish water).

2. The SFPUC recommends the NPS evaluate the potential risk of the existing wastewater system entering the river from either leaching or flooding.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

3. 7-88: Alternative 4 specifies retaining flush toilets for employees. This conflicts with Environmental Consequences of Alternative 4 on page 8- 42 (last sentence) that states, "Reductions in water use would be achieved by replacing flush toilets with a composting toilet and reducing the High Sierra Camp guest and employee capacity" (page 8- 81 has similar language). The SFPUC requests clarification on whether flush toilets will be retained or be replaced by composting toilets.

4. 7-101: Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp. TRP pages 7-19, 7-21, and 7-101 provides a common practice for all alternatives, "Replace the composting toilet at the backpacker campground at Glen Aulin High Sierra Camp." The SFPUC has no preference regarding whether the existing backpacker's compost toilet is replaced or maintained and how many compost toilets are located at Glen Aulin, as long as they are sufficient to service the total planned use of guests and employees.

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 7 of 17

The compost toilet(s) should be located slightly upslope (e.g., backpacker's toilet location) rather than in the flat area with the potential to flood.

7- 115: The SFPUC recommends that the NPS consider keeping the Glen Aulin backpacker campground while eliminating the commercial campground. This would eliminate most of the stock use along the Glen Aulin trail and mitigate pollution.

8- 30: Figure 8-2: The Raker Act section 9(a) prohibits the placement of human excrement in or within 300 feet thereof of any stream in the watershed above Hetch Hetchy or Eleanor Reservoirs. Is the Glen Aulin leach mound or other wastewater facilities within 300 feet of any stream? The SFPUC has an ongoing concern with the Glen Aulin leach mound overflowing into Conness Creek. Overflow events would appear to violate section 9(a)'s prohibition against placement of human excrement into the stream itself. The TRP should discuss whether the Glen Aulin leach mound or other wastewater facilities comply with the Raker Act, and, if required, the plan must address relocation to a point beyond 300 feet of any stream.

SFPUC Hetch Hetchy Watershed Sanitary Survey Issues

1. 2-3: The last paragraph states: "Because it is a comprehensive, long- term plan, the Tuolumne River Plan does not address all the details of actions needed to manage resources and visitor use and development in the Tuolumne River corridor; rather, it provides general guidance for actions that will be further developed through a number of program- and project-specific implementation plans. However, this plan includes some implementation planning, including specific proposals for ecological restoration of subalpine meadow and riparian areas at Tuolumne Meadows and Lyell Canyon and specific proposals for site planning at Tuolumne Meadows and Glen Aulin." SFPUC recommends that the following be addressed in the TRP or be prioritized in subsequent project-level analyses or annual operations and maintenance activities if not addressed directly in the TRP:

Trails Maintenance: The SFPUC recommends continued detailed discussion with NPS regarding current sanitary surveys to ensure priority trails receive additional maintenance to improve drainage and reduce erosion. Discussions need to include assessment, improvement, and, where appropriate, rerouting of trails out of watercourses and areas that are not easily maintained by erosion control.

Pit Toilets within the Tuolumne River Watershed: The SFPUC

recommends the replacement of the Tuolumne Meadows skier toilet

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 8 of 17

with a vault toilet or other appropriate toilet system to minimize water quality impacts.

Mammoth View Portable Toilets: It remains unclear whether there will be toilet facilities at the designated pullout area at Mammoth View and day parking areas designated along the Tioga Road (page, 7-28). What does NPS plan for toilet facilities at the Mammoth View Parking and designated day parking areas?

Vault Toilets at Lembert Dome ParkinR Area: The SFPUC recommends that the NPS consider connecting the Lembert Dome vault toilets to the existing sewer system.

2. 5-80: TRP references "SFPUC 2009 HHSS". The SFPUC recommends this report refer to the 2012 HHSS instead as there are new concerns that have been reported (to NPS) since 2009.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Other Specific/General Comments by Chapter

Executive Summary:

1. ES-6: The SFPUC requests clarification that the NPS EIS will address water quality impacts due to storm water runoff from new parking areas and roads, particularly with regard to total petroleum hydrocarbons.

Chapter 2:

1. 2-11: The SFPUC proposes edits to the text: "Based on that decision the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir lies between two of the eligible designated segments of the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River within Yosemite National Park, but it is not, itself, included in the designated river corridor. Therefore, the management of the reservoir and O'Shaughnessy Dam is not addressed in the Tuolumne River Plan. Further, the designation for the Tuolumne River states:

"Nothing in the section designating the Tuolumne River is intended or shall be construed to effect any rights, obligations, privileges, or benefits granted under any prior authority of law including chapter 4 of the Act of December 19, 1913, commonly referred to as the Raker Act (38 Stat. 242) and including any agreement or administrative ruling entered into or made effective before enactment of this designation! 16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(53)"

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 9 of 17

While O'Shaughnessy Dam is an impoundment on a wild and scenic river, the issue of possibly removing it and designating an additional wild and scenic river segment is beyond the scope of this plan and environmental impact statement. Any major change in the status of the dam initiated by the federal government would require an act of Congress. Additional planning and NEPA compliance would be triggered by such congressional action. "

2. 2-13: The SFPUC proposes edits to the text: "O'Shaughnessy Dam and the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir are authorized under chapter 4 of the Act of December 19, 1913, commonly referred to as the Raker Act (38 Stat. 242) the 1913 Hetch Hetchy Reservoir Site Act, commonly known as the Raker Act, which grants the City and County of San Francisco certain lands and rights-of-way in Yosemite National Park for the purpose of building a reservoir and associated infrastructure, in order to generate a municipal water supply and hydroelectric power for the city. "

3. 2-13, third paragraph: The SFPUC proposes edits to text: which includes the entire Tuolumne River watershed within Yosemite National Park."

4. 2-13, third paragraph: It should be mentioned that the Raker Act stipulations also direct instream flow requirements for O'Shaughnessy Dam.

5. 2-16: The SFPUC proposes edits to the text: "The Hetch Hetchy Reservoir remains a drinking water source for the City and County of San Francisco is the primary source of drinking water delivered by the City and County of San Francisco to 2.6 million water users in Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco counties in the San Francisco Bay Area."

6. 2-16: "SFPUC maintains a watershed control program ...unfiltered water supplies". Correction to this text: NPS actually maintains the watershed control program under the MOA with the SFPUC. SFPUC reimburses the NPS for costs.

7. 2-16: The description of the water quality protection partnership the SFPUC has with Yosemite National Park accurately describes the Raker Act provisions protecting water quality, but should also include references to the NPS/SFPUC Memorandum of Agreement (described at the beginning of our letter) and the amount of funding provided by the SFPUC for operational support and special projects.

8. 2-17: The SFPUC proposes edits to text: "In 2006 the SFPUC adopted a policy that establishes a management direction to protect and rehabilitate ecosystems affected by dam operations, within the context

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 10 of 17

of meeting water supply, power generation, water quality, and existing minimum in-stream flow requirements that were first established in 1985. Minimum instream flow requirements for releases from O'Shaughnessy Dam were first established by stipulation between San Francisco and the Department of the Interior in 1961, and further supplemented and amended in 1985 and 1987. These flow requirements focused primarily on maintaining habitat for trout in the reach from O'Shaughnessy Dam to

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Early Intake, a species that is not believed to be native above Preston Falls on the Tuolumne River."

9. 2-17: first paragraph. The SFPUC recommends that NPS consider the following information and editing current draft text to provide greater clarification: There are at least two species of trout present in the upper Tuolumne River between O'Shaughnessy Dam and Early Intake: native rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and non-native brown trout (*Salmo trutta*). Both species were likely introduced (stocked) above Preston Falls (near the Yosemite National Park boundary), which is thought to be the post-glacial historical upstream distribution limit for all fish species on the Tuolumne prior to fish stocking.

10. 2-19: Please include the MOA objective of providing watershed protections to preserve filtration avoidance status of the Hetch Hetchy water supply.

11. 2-19: The watershed agreement with Yosemite National Park for water quality is mentioned, but not the dollar value contributed by the City or the projects funded by ratepayers. There is a complete list of water quality projects in Volume 2 at page 8-27, but no indication that the City funded any of these projects or their cost. There is a reference to an SFPUC report that may document projects undertaken for watershed protection on p. 12-29. The SFPUC recommends the identification of SFPUC funded projects and the associated cost.

Chapter 5:

1. 5-45, first paragraph: The SFPUC suggests replacing this paragraph with the following: "The ecological health of the Poopenaut Valley's unique low-elevation meadow, wetland, and riparian habitats, which provide important wildlife habitat, depends upon the hydrology of Tuolumne River, which has been regulated by O'Shaughnessy Dam since 1923. No condition assessments were conducted at or near the time of designation. However, no major changes in development or use have occurred in this area since designation; thus it is likely conditions then were similar to current conditions. Research conducted since designation (NPS, Stock et al. 2007k) (discussed below) indicates that

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 11 of 17

despite flow regulation, a diverse community of low-elevation riparian, wetland, meadow, and upland forest vegetation continues to persist, in turn supporting a diverse set of avian, bat, and other wildlife species (NPS, Stock et al. 2012)."

2. 5-45, first paragraph and other references to "NPS, Stock et al. 2007k" and "NPS, Stock et al. 2007i": The NPS report cited in the TRP was published by the NPS in 2009, and described results from fieldwork and analyses conducted in 2007. A series of "Looking Downstream Project" reports containing additional study results have been published since this initial report on the Poopenaut Valley ecosystem, including the latest final report in 2012, which describes results from the 2010 field season. Those reports should be referenced.

3. 5-46, third full paragraph, under heading "Actions NPS will Take...": The SFPUC suggests replacing this paragraph with the following: "The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) currently manages instream flow releases as required by the 1985 and 1987 Stipulations associated with the Raker Act. The NPS will continue collaboration with the SFPUC and other stakeholders to support the development and implementation of a new instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam, which the SFPUC is preparing as part of the collaborative Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program. The new instream flow plan will modify O'Shaughnessy Dam instream flow releases to better support broad river ecosystem values in the upper Tuolumne River (including Poopenaut Valley wetlands and meadows), mimic natural hydrology, and provide for long-term ecological monitoring."

4. 5-46, fourth full paragraph, consisting of one sentence, under heading "Current Findings Regarding Management Standard...": The SFPUC suggests replacing this sentence with the following: "These terms are not defined in the TRP because O'Shaughnessy Dam instream flow releases that sustain the Outstandingly Remarkable Biological Values in the Poopenaut Valley are subject to stipulations associated with the Raker Act. The existing stipulations do not include ecosystem monitoring elements. The NPS will continue collaboration with the SFPUC and other stakeholders to support the development and implementation of a new instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam, which the SFPUC is preparing as part of the collaborative Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program. The new flow plan will include monitoring and adaptive management elements linked to anticipated ecological outcomes."

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 12 of 17

5. 5-47, first full paragraph, under heading "Conclusions...": The SFPUC suggests replacing this paragraph with the following: "Since 1923, O'Shaughnessy Dam has regulated the magnitude, timing, duration, and frequency of instream flow below the dam. Despite continued flow regulation, a diverse community of low-elevation riparian, wetland, meadow, and upland forest vegetation continues to persist, in turn supporting a diverse set of avian, bat, and other wildlife species. However, NPS studies conducted as part of the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program suggest that some portions of the wetlands and meadows in the Poopenaut Valley appear to be transitioning to drier upland vegetation types, while some encroachment of riparian

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

vegetation into the river channel has taken place. These changes may be symptomatic of flow regulation by O'Shaughnessy Dam. The NPS will continue collaboration with the SFPUC and other stakeholders to support the development and implementation of a new instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam, which the SFPUC is preparing as part of the collaborative Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program. The new instream flow plan will modify O'Shaughnessy Dam instream flow releases to better support broad river ecosystem values in the upper Tuolumne River (including Poopenaut Valley wetlands and meadows), mimic natural hydrology, and provide for long-term ecological monitoring."

6. 5-79: The SFPUC proposes edits to text: "Because water quality in the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir is critical to the water supply for the City of San Francisco and its water customers, the 1913 Raker Act requires certain sanitary regulations be established for the Tuolumne watershed above Hetch Hetchy Reservoir grants the city the authority to protect the Hetch Hetchy watershed."

7. 5-82: NPS should use fecal coliform (FC) standards because of the filtration avoidance status of the Hetch Hetchy supply. Filtration avoidance is based on FC rather than E. coli (EC); this is not anticipated to change. EC is a useful supplemental monitoring tool. Not using FC disregards the Watershed Protection MOA objectives.

8. 5-82: SFPUC recommends that the management standard should track violations of Raker Act WQ provisions as incorporated into YNP Superintendent's Compendium. The 235 EC MPN/100 ml coliform standards do not reflect the objectives of the Watershed Protection Agreement between NPS and SFPUC to preserve filtration avoidance status of the HH Supply. The threshold of 20 MPN/100 ml from T22 Section 64652.5.c1 should be adhered to. Adverse impact coliform

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 13 of 17

standards reflect only recreational use and not the filtration avoidance drinking water supply use. The RWQCB basin plan standards do not reflect special requirements for filtration avoidance.

9. 5-87, second paragraph: A water year in California is typically considered to be October 1 to September 30 of the following year.

10. 5-89, first full paragraph: The SFPUC suggests replacing this paragraph with the following text: "The natural flow regime of the Tuolumne River downstream of O'Shaughnessy Dam is regulated by water and power supply operations at O'Shaughnessy Dam. Required minimum instream flow releases from O'Shaughnessy Dam are currently governed by the 1985 and 1987 Stipulations associated with the Raker Act. A new instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam is being developed by the SFPUC as part of the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program, in collaboration with the NPS, USES, USFWS, and the Upper Tuolumne River Stakeholder Group. The new instream flow plan will modify O'Shaughnessy Dam instream flow releases to better support broad river ecosystem values in the upper Tuolumne River (including Poopenaut Valley wetlands and meadows), mimic natural hydrology, and provide for long-term ecological monitoring."

Chapter 7:

1. 7-19: The SFPUC recommends that a statement that all alternatives would implement meadow readiness and meadow capacity stock controls be included into the text.

2. 7-20: The SFPUC recommends that administrative use needs to be included in zone capacity limits. Issue permits for all camping (Administrative + Visitor Use).

3. 7-57, Alternative 2: Allow limited recreational Whitewater boating. The SFPUC recommends taking into consideration the following concerns regarding recreational Whitewater boating:

? Would human waste be managed by trained concessionaires or would the general public be relied on to comply with NPS regulations?

? Will decontamination techniques be required for the boats to mitigate the introduction of aquatic nuisance and/or invasive species?

? Please clarify where recreational boating will be allowed.

4. 7-94, Alternative 4: NPS Corral. The SFPUC supports the continued practice of making diversions at the NPS corrals at Tuolumne Meadows to divert overland flow from the Tioga Road and overflow from the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 14 of 17

culvert from draining through the corral and flushing soil and manure into the river.

5. 7-94, Alternative 4: It states that the NPS corral would be co-located with the existing concessionaire's corral. The SFPUC supports this co- location to mitigate water quality concerns at the existing NPS corral. However, if the selected alternative does not co-locate the corrals or mitigate concerns, then the SFPUC recommends that the NPS consider additional mitigations at the current NPS corral location.

Chapter 8:

1. 8-2: Environmental justice: The SFPUC recommends that the NPS consider that any risk to or reduction of the protection of the drinking water supply (filtration avoidance) may present a water quality environmental justice issue for economically disadvantaged SFPUC customers because this could lead to an increase in water treatment costs and rates.

2. 8-23: The SFPUC proposes edits to text: "In 1985 and 1987, the City and County of San Francisco and the Secretary of the Interior entered into an amendment to their 1961 agreement requiring minimum in-stream flow releases below O'Shaughnessy Dam and, to adopt a minimum flow schedule pending further study of habitat conditions in the river to Early Intake. The flow requirements adopted in 1987-the amended agreement focused primarily on maintaining habitat for trout, a species that is not believed to be native to the Tuolumne River within Yosemite National Park. Current minimum flow releases vary from month to month and year to year, depending on precipitation amounts and other seasonal issues and are regularly monitored and reported on by Hetch Hetchy Water and Power (McGurk 2008a)."

3. 8-27: Several issues related to water quality are listed here. The SFPUC recommends the following be added to the list:

? 2010. The five year MOA that updated and replaced the 2005 watershed protection plan (NPS Agreement Number: G8802100109).

? 2012. Concessionaire corral modifications at Tuolumne Meadows to mitigate water quality concerns created by the corral's proximity to a watercourse leading to Dog Creek and the Tuolumne River.

4. 8-47, second paragraph: The SFPUC proposes replacing this paragraph with the following: "In the river corridor below Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, O'Shaughnessy Dam regulates the magnitude, timing, duration,

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 15 of 17

frequency, and rate of change of the hydrologic regime. While the specific impacts of flow regulation by O'Shaughnessy Dam on Poopenaut Valley wetlands and meadows are not completely understood, it is likely that observed conifer encroachment into the meadows and riparian vegetation encroachment into the Tuolumne River channel are related to flow regulation (NPS, Buhler and Santana 2007 and NPS, Stock et al 2009). The NPS is collaborating with the SFPUC and other stakeholders to develop a new instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam, which will include a long-term monitoring effort to track potential changes resulting from improved instream flow management and increase understanding of flow regulation effects on wetlands and meadows in the Poopenaut Valley."

5. 8-102, comment regarding the last paragraph, continuing on to 8-103: The NPS and SFPUC have conducted herpetofauna surveys between O'Shaughnessy Dam and Kirkwood Powerhouse (the "Hetch Hetchy Reach") annually since 2008. Lack of records within the park likely indicate limited habitat potential due to elevation and water temperatures. A small population of foothill yellow-legged frog has been detected about 5 miles downstream of the park boundary, near Early Intake. Modeling conducted as part of the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program suggests pre-dam hydrologic conditions in the Hetch Hetchy Reach were not conducive to foothill yellow-legged frog reproduction, due to naturally variable high magnitude snowmelt runoff that delayed onset of breeding and alternately scoured and desiccated egg masses. Flow regulation by O'Shaughnessy Dam has likely facilitated limited mainstem colonization due to steady summer baseflows and reductions in snowmelt flood magnitude and frequency. The forthcoming instream flow plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam includes measures to improve conditions for foothill yellow-legged frog in drier years. Herpetofauna survey findings will be included in the instream flow plan. The SFPUC recommends the TRP text be edited to clarify statements regarding the status of populations and effects of O'Shaughnessy Dam on foothill yellow-legged frog as reflected in the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program supporting documents.

6. 8-104, comment regarding the third paragraph: Western pond turtle populations are likely affected by cold water releases from O'Shaughnessy Dam, however turtle populations have been found to be in good condition (i.e. multiple age classes, good available habitat) in the areas where they occur, including perched ponds not affected by

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 16 of 17

regulated flows in the Poopenaut Valley, and in slack water habitats downstream of Preston Falls, outside the park boundary. While the forthcoming instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam does not currently include specific flow measures for western pond turtle, changes in releases to more closely mimic natural hydrology (particularly lower magnitude summer baseflows) should benefit the species. Herpetofauna survey findings will be included in the instream flow plan. The SFPUC recommends the TRP text be edited to clarify statements regarding the status of populations and effects of O'Shaughnessy Dam on western pond turtle as reflected in the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program supporting documents.

Appendix B:

1. B-2: The SFPUC proposes edits to text:: "In 1913, the Hatch Hetchy

Reservoir Site Act, commonly known as the Raker Act, granted the City and County of San Francisco certain lands in Yosemite National Park, Stanislaus National Forest, and California public lands, for the purpose of building reservoirs and associated infrastructure, in order to generate a municipal water supply and hydroelectric power for the city. ... The Raker Act also recognizes the prior rights of the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts to receive water from the Tuolumne, and specifies requires limits the amount of water that San Francisco must bypass to the Districts through Hetch Hetchy Project facilities be diverted. A certain volume of water is required to be released from the reservoir, depending on the 'natural daily flow' of the river."

Appendix M:

1. M-16: The SFPUC proposes edits to text: "The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) approved its Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) in 2008, which limits water deliveries from all water sources to Bay Area water customers caps diversions from the Tuolumne River at Hatch Hetchy to 265 million gallons per day through 2018. Before 2018, SFPUC and its wholesale customers in the San Francisco Bay Area will be required to meet additional demands by conservation and recycling. The SFPUC water supply program includes however such measures would be limited to a up to 20% reduction in water service system wide during extended droughts. While withdrawals at Hetch Hetchy have been capped at current levels until 2018, additional withdrawals resulting from extended drought conditions could affect downstream flows at Poopenaut Valley. "

Superintendent Don Neubacher Tuolumne River Plan DEIS March 18, 2013 Page 17 of 17

2. M-16: The WSIP PEIR includes an associated mitigation measure, which directs the SFPUC to study Poopenaut Valley meadow and wetland vegetation and modify spring snowmelt spill releases to provide higher magnitude and/or prolonged inundation of Poopenaut Valley wetlands. . This mitigation measure is being implemented via the instream flow management plan for O'Shaughnessy Dam, currently being prepared by the SFPUC in collaboration with the NPS and other stakeholders as part of the Upper Tuolumne River Ecosystem Program.

This concludes our comments regarding the draft TRP/EIS. Again, the SFPUC thanks the NPS for the opportunity to comment and looks forward to continued collaboration with NPS to maintain water quality and manage natural resources within the Hetch Hetchy watershed and along the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River.

Assistant General Manager, Water

Correspondence ID:	447	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar, 17, 2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Petition				
Correspondence:	Mar 17, 2013				

Yosemite National Park

Dear National Park,

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Yosemite National Park is a national treasure. The park's high country of Tuolumne Meadows and the Tuolumne River corridor are an integral part of the park. I am writing to support efforts to preserve and restore the Tuolumne River and Tuolumne Meadows. I support the parts of the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River plan which make needed changes to protect the River and the meadows.

I applaud certain measures of the Park Service's proposed actions to protect and enhance the outstanding values of the Tuolumne River in Yosemite National Park, including better management of parking and visitor use in Tuolumne Meadows. I support Alternative 4 of the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic Plan to "Improve the Traditional Tuolumne Experiences", but without any increase in maximum day visitor use, because I appreciate the relative solitude and wilderness experience of the Yosemite High Country.

I support the removal of unnecessary or potentially polluting development such as the fueling station. I also urge more public transit into and around the Park so that visitors can access and enjoy the Park without the hassle or impact of increased traffic and cars.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID:	448	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District County Government				
Received:	Feb,28,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Fax				
Correspondence:	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District				

February 28, 2013

Superintendent, Yosemite National Park ATTN: Tuolumne River Plan PO Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

Project: Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement

District CEQA Reference No: 20130033

To whom it may concern:

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (District) has reviewed the project referenced above. Although the proposed project is not located within the jurisdiction of the District and air quality in the San Joaquin Valley has improved significantly, the Valley faces many air quality challenges to meet the health-based air pollution standards. Meeting the San Joaquin Valley's ozone and particulate matter standards will require collaboration with industry leaders, private citizens, and other government agencies. The District offers the following comments:

1. The District recognizes the importance of prescribed "planned ignition" burning as a means of reducing potential fuels and longer-term quality impacts.
2. The District encourages Yosemite National Park (Park) to remove vegetative fuel materials by mechanical treatment of other means to reduce unexpected future potential emissions.
3. The District requests the Park to work closely and coordinate with air pollution control districts and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in regards to local and regional smoke and air quality impacts and how to minimize them, if and when they occur.
4. Planned and unplanned ignitions must abide by the requirements stipulated in California Code of Regulations Title 17, Subchapter 2 "Smoke Management for Agricultural and Prescribed Burning" in addition to any local Air Pollution Control District requirements.
5. The District requests the Park to mitigate fires during CARB or local air pollution control district declared "No Burn Day" and "Marginal" days.
6. During wildfires, the park needs to minimize smoke and air quality impacts by utilizing appropriate resources (limiting to

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS
Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013
Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

size), and effectively communicating impacts to the public.

7. The District disagrees with the 2nd sentence of the following statement made on Chapter 8, Page 144, where, "In addition, wildland fires in the park, managed in accordance with the 2004 Fire Management Plan, could adversely impact local and regional air quality. The adverse impacts of these activities would be local and short term in nature." This statement is incorrect in that natural "lightning" ignited fire events that are managed by the Park are not of short duration but can last several months or until the season ending rain/snow event finally puts them out. These events occur during the District's high ozone season and have adversely impacted the air quality in the past. The District requests the Park to revise the sentence to reflect the long term nature and potentially significant impact of these fires.

If you have any questions or require further information, please call Daniel Martinez or Patia Siong at (559) 230-6000

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] Director of Permit Services

[REDACTED] Permit Services Manager

Correspondence ID:	449	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,03,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	March 3, 2013				

Comment on the Tuolumne River Plan document

I have recently become aware that the comment period for the Tuolumne River Plan is now and I do have one important concern.

The Preferred Alternative calls for reduction in overnight guests at the Glen Aulin High Sierra camp to 20. I feel strongly that this number is too small. After the toilets are converted to composting toilets I feel that the impact will be significantly reduced and a larger number of guests can be accomodate.

Many of us have a long history with the high camps and we have seen the damage they can cause but the opportunity they provide does outweigh some amount of damage. The camps should be allowed to continue in a viable way into the future. It is an important part of our history.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	450	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Good Idea: composting toilet at Glen Aulin				

Bad idea: cutting down the 32 occupants of Glen Aulin! That is a Key camp on the High Camp Loop and you would be depriving 12/day at that pleasure.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	451	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	NPS Employee				
Received:	Mar,15,2012 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Planning Team,				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

I would like to add my comments to the TRP. This is my 38th year as a Ranger here in Yosemite, and my experience has made me realize that the High Sierra Camps are one of Yosemite's most important assets. My hero, Stephen Mather, thought that when he created the camps almost a century ago. The camps, as now constituted, allow a large segment of the population to experience the backcountry. Without the camps, these visitors would never have that wilderness experience. I have observed that many of these people become avid park supporters because of their High Sierra Camp experience.

The composting toilet planned for Glen Aulin is a great idea. However, with the resulting reduction in water use and waste water production, there should be no reason to reduce the guest capacity of the camp. This is especially true since the "meals only" guests are also being eliminated. Also, with all of the day horse rides being eliminated in the Tuolumne area, and with firewood no longer being packed in, the impact from horses will be greatly reduced as well. With all these changes in place, there should be no reason to reduce the guest capacity.

Glen Aulin is already the smallest camp in terms of guest capacity, and to reduce the bed count to 20 would markedly reduce the number of people able to hike the entire loop. Please keep the camp at its already small size of 32 beds.

I would suggest that as a compromise, after the composting toilet is in operation, we could monitor the water use and waste water production for a few years, and if the levels don't drop to the desired 500 gallons/day, we could then consider reducing the guest capacity. I think that we'll find that won't be necessary.

If we do this, the wild and scenic river will be protected and the public will still be able to enjoy the backcountry around Glen Aulin and throughout the entire loop.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Correspondence ID:	452	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,09,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	03/09/2013				

Response to Tuolumne Meadows Alternate Plan 4

A review of Plan 4 seems reasonable in most aspects, though areas of concern do exist.

Glen Aulin H.S. Camp: A reduction in available beds does seem to be out of alignment with the capacity of the balance of the H.S. camps. As one of the most outstanding features of Yosemite's backcountry experience is the opportunity to travel from camp to camp and have a bed available upon arrival is both special and unique to Yosemite. The ability to keep access at equal levels would be reduced below that of adjacent camps will leave one leg of the loop unable to accept the group. I refer most pointedly to the ranger lead loops that rank among the best features of Yosemite that is open to the public whereby an individual can explore the backcountry under the guidance of the experienced staff of NPS.

The use of composting toilets seems reasonable, though I was under the impression that septic systems provided a safe and environmentally compatible method to return water into the ego system after the process is completed. The deplorable situation that exists with the toilets at both the Glacier Point and Bridalveil parking lots makes most guests wonder how modern technology can fall so short of making a rest stop civilized while meeting the demands of the environment. As a friend from Norway commented, "Our ancestors did better than this" after we toured Glacier Point. This same situation should never come into use at any other location in the park including a High Sierra camp. Composting is fine when done correctly.

Tuolumne Meadows Corridor: Reducing the roadside informal parking is applauded as this will reduce congestion, increase safety and make informal paths to trailheads or points of interest less likely. The direct connection of the visitors center and the Parson's lodge trail is most desirable. The removal of the fueling facility as well as the mountaineering shop do not meet with the usage that the area experiences. An alignment of these two units with the store, grille and post office with shared parking would make for better use by all visitors and employees.

Tuolumne Lodge: relocation of the employee living facilities is a most welcome change. Though having resided in employee tent #1, I can testify that the proximity to the river is delightful, yet this same proximity is of concern for the potential for contamination of various types to the river. Relocation of this housing to the north side of the parking seems prudent.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Stables: the proposed consolidation makes sense and a reduction in the animal travel on the trails should be beneficial to the hiking experience.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	453	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,13,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Hello-				

I would like to voice my concern about the proposed changes in the capacity of the High Sierra Camp lodging, particularly for the Glen Aulin camp. I have been able to lodge at each of the High Sierra Camp settings, and enjoyed the hiking and soaking in the wilderness during the days and settling in to each of the High Sierra Camp setting and all of the atmosphere of the "full, but limited" camp environment immensely during the evening. The capacity for each of these settings seemed absolutely adequate, and I wish to advocate for maintaining the Glen Aulin capacity at its present size of 32 guests, versus reducing the capacity any further below 32. Please allow the number of visitors to these very welcoming camp stops to be maintained at a consistent number for each of the other settings, 42, if you will, with of course Merced Lake being reduced to this capacity of 42.

Thank you for your consideration of this citizen's opinion.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	454	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,19,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	My Thoughts: 1. It seems that the time has come to make some changes re the High Sierra Camps to continue. Change does not have to be bad, 2. The lottery system for them is totally corrupt and abused ----- applicants know how to work the system. Please take the time to check the folloewng website: Middle Fork of the Salmon (4 Rivers), ID ----- a great system for private permits! 3. I hope the High Sierra Camps will always remain,with the needed modifications, as they are such an historical California tradition. Thank You, [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	455	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Redwood Unit, Backcountry Horsemen of California Recreational Groups				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	[REDACTED] Chair, Public Lands Committee Redwood Unit, Backcountry Horsemen of California PO Box 792 Ferndale, CA 95536-0792				

707-786-9637

March 14, 2013 Superintendent Yosemite National Park ATTN: Tuolumne River Plan PO Box 577 Yosemite CA 95389-0577

Dear Superintendent:

I would like to offer the following comments on the Tuolumne River Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

I believe the Tuolumne River Plan and EIS are deficient in addressing the full impacts of the High Sierra Camps and their infrastructure. Though the Plan looks at some aspects of one of these facilities at Glen Aulin, Tuolumne Meadows is in fact the hub for supporting and supplying 3 and possibly 4 of the 5 High Sierra Camps. These commercial hostelry facilities located in the Yosemite wilderness require an industrial scale operation to operate. The base for these operations is the concessioner stable at Tuolumne Meadows within the Scenic River area. Although the Sunrise, Vogelsang, and May Lake camps are themselves outside the Wild and Scenic River zone, the trucking in of supplies, parking for staff and customers and pack stock delivery of supplies and removal of waste from the camps all occur within or partially within the Wild and Scenic River zone and must be addressed. Commercial horseback rides and commercial packing service in the Tuolumne River Corridor should not be eliminated! To ride horseback through Yosemite Valley, or other areas in the Park, enables people to use, see and appreciate the

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Park by a means of transportation that is historic to Yosemite. It also is less polluting than the bus or car travel methods.

Commercial packers and stock day rides are part of the concessionaire service and means of access to the wilderness that many people would never experience without this service. To own, train, supply, tack, and maintain one's own animals to make this type of trip is simply not attainable by very many people.

People with disabilities are not able to backpack into the further areas of our National Park lands. Commercial packers and stock day rides are the only Way they are able to connect with some of our heritage and get out in our public lands.

There is already a large back-log of work to be done on trails, so it does not seem reasonable to reduce Glen Aulin's capacity from 32 to 20 people per night in order to reduce supply trips. How will the needed work get done with fewer people?

Stock users are well aware of when to have stock enter the high country to protect meadow and riparian areas. Without this protection they would not have feed for their stock. Stock users also know to pack in enough feed to sustain their stock and not over-use the meadows.

The Redwood Unit, Back Country Horsemen of California does not agree with any concept or alternative that would reduce or eliminate` any of the existing commercial services provided to visitors to Yosemite National Park. The visitor levels should not be reduced. They should at least be maintained at current levels until such time as better and less biased scientific studies can be done to cover all aspects of our national parks to meet the actual needs of the public, now and in the future.

Changing the combinations of alternatives to better accommodate visitors without reducing or eliminating commercial pack and saddle stock is a far better way to help both visitors and the park.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Chair, Public Lands Committee Redwood Unit, Backcountry Horsemen of California

Correspondence ID:	456	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,14,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	3/14/2013 [Redacted]				

Superintendent, Yosemite National Park Attn: Draft Tuolumne River Plan PO Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389

The Draft Tuolumne River Plan does a good job of defining the issues concerning the outstandingly remarkable values of the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River. This river and its associated ecosystem is near and dear to my heart and my own sense of place and well being. The most important values of the river to me and for future generations, are water quality and the integrity of natural functions in the surrounding ecosystem of the river. Alternative 1 is the most in keeping with these values, while Alternative 2 is the worst of those presented.

What I appreciate most from Alternative 1 is the emphasis on restoration within the WSR corridor and on a more natural, self-reliant experience. Removal of facilities at the wastewater ponds, Tuolumne Meadows Lodge, and Glen Aulin HSC, will enhance conditions with the corridor considerably. In addition to restoring campground loop A, I recommend the same for Loop D, and for the same reasons. I would also prefer a smaller acreage devoted to new development, preferably outside of the wild and scenic corridor, perhaps south west of what is proposed. Also moving the combined use stables to the same area might allow for some mitigation of the stock wastes by the meadow-overlook area from Alternative 2 to be situated at location 12 on the existing stables. I prefer the location of the new Cathedral Lakes trail connection in Alternative 3 because it is further from the road, for a more natural experience and is less likely to result in social trails and shortcuts.

Alternative 4 is not in line with enhancing the outstandingly remarkable values of the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River. In fact, it is very much like the no action alternative, which would be a waste of a very expensive planning process. But, while I am in favor of eliminating commercial activities and shrinking the NPS footprint, I think a robust educational and interpretive visitor center could be integrated.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	457	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	American Packrafting Association Recreational Groups				
Received:	Mar,04,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	March 4, 2013				

Superintendent Don Neubacher Yosemite National Park

Attn: Merced and Tuolumne River Plan P.O. Box 577

Yosemite, CA 95389

RB: Yosemite NP Wild and Scenic River Management

Dear Superintendent Neubacher,

We appreciate having the opportunity to comment on the Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers in Yosemite National Park. The American Packrafting Association is a public interest organization representing 300 members working to protect access, conserve wild rivers and promote safe and responsible packrafting. Packrafting is a low-impact activity that does not require typical boating infrastructure such as boat launches and take-outs. Packrafters travel very lightly, carrying our small, compact boats in our packs. The packability of packrafts allows us to access remote areas far from roads and even trails, and also allows us to portage the boats up and easily portage difficult river reaches. Packrafts are stable, durable and can be used safely even on technical whitewater. Packrafting is an allowed use in nearly all other national parks, including the Grand Canyon, where some of the nation's most challenging whitewater is found.

As you are aware, boating throughout most of Yosemite National Park has been prohibited for many years, denying the public the truly exceptional opportunity to directly experience the Park's waters and scenery by boat. We encourage the Park to change course and allow the public the opportunity to enjoy Yosemite from the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. We are pleased that the Park is considering a number of alternatives that would allow boating in some areas where it currently is not allowed. However, we disagree with the Park's Preferred Alternatives for both the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers, which continue to prohibit boating on significant stretches of both rivers. We request that Yosemite National Park allow the public the opportunity to directly experience the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers by boat. Paddling is allowed and fully supported on nearly all Wild and Scenic Rivers across the country, and is a low-impact and wilderness-compliant way to experience a wild landscape. Yosemite National Park should be no exception. Additionally, as a river conservation organization, we care deeply about the health of the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers, and support management actions that protect the rivers within the Park. This includes placing reasonable limits on recreational use of river corridors to ensure visitor capacities are not exceeded. A user capacity of zero aimed solely at paddling, however, is unacceptable. 1. The District recognizes the importance of prescribed "planned ignition" burning as a means of reducing potential fuels and longer-term quality impacts. 2. The District encourages Yosemite National Park (Park) to remove vegetative fuel materials by mechanical treatment of other means to reduce unexpected future potential emissions. 3. The District requests the Park to work closely and coordinate with air pollution control districts and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in regards to local and regional smoke and air quality impacts and how to minimize them, if and when they occur. 4. Planned and unplanned ignitions must abide by the requirements stipulated in California Code of Regulations Title 17, Subchapter 2 "Smoke Management for Agricultural and Prescribed Burning" in addition to any local Air Pollution Control District requirements. 5. The District requests the Park to mitigate fires during CARB or local air pollution control district declared "No Burn Day" and "Marginal" days. 6. During wildfires, the park needs to minimize smoke and air quality impacts by utilizing appropriate resources (limiting to size), and effectively communicating impacts to the public. 7. The District disagrees with the 2nd sentence of the following statement made on Chapter 8, Page 144, where, "In addition, wildland fires in the park, managed in accordance with the 2004 Fire Management Plan, could adversely impact local and regional air quality. The adverse impacts of these activities would be local and short term in nature." This statement is incorrect in that natural "lightning" ignited fire events that are managed by the Park are not of short duration but can last several months or until the season ending rain/snow event finally puts them out. These events occur during the District's high ozone season and have adversely impacted the air quality in the past. The District requests the Park to revise the sentence to reflect the long term nature and potentially significant impact of these fires.

Currently, the plan essentially treats boating as its own activity. We'd like to see boating treated as any other activity within the Park. The river is essentially a trail, and should be treated as such when making management decisions about user capacities. The Park already has a protocol for the number of encounters that hikers should have with other hikers-this methodology can be used for determining boating numbers as well. We think that boating should be managed as one of many allowed uses within

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Yosemite NP, not singled out for special discrimination.

While some sections of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers contain areas of technically challenging whitewater, we feel it is a mistake for the Park Service to eliminate paddling based upon its own determination of the risk. The risks of paddling these rivers are not atypical of many treasured recreational experiences that are celebrated elsewhere in Yosemite and across the National Park System. Boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities. Please re-consider allowing the public to experience all rivers within Yosemite National Park by boat, subject only to well-reasoned limits crafted to ensure visitor capacities are not exceeded. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

President American Packrafting Association

Correspondence ID:	458	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,06,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Yosemite National Park Superintendent Don Neubacher, March 6, 2013 Hi Don, I am sending an email to submit comments on the Yosemite Park's Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.				

I am a paddler who has longed to paddle in National Parks around the country. I have been saddened to find that for the most part I cannot enjoy my passion in most United States National Parks. The two exceptions would be rafting through Canyonlands National Park in southern Utah and Dinosaur National Monument (now a park?) in northeastern Utah. They remain great memories. We drew a permit one year and floated Stillwater and Cataract Canyons. We drew another permit to float the Gates of Lodore on the Green River thru Dinosaur in an earlier year. I believe that rivers within Yosemite National Park should be open to paddling while protecting the values of the Valley and the river with appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other use in Yosemite. The Park has an established method for managing trails throughout the Park, and the rivers should be treated the same. Canyonlands and Dinosaur both limit the amount of rafting with permits, I would think you could do the same with the paddling public in Yosemite. I manage rivers on the Klamath National Forest. Our experience ranges from steep headwaters waterfall runs (Bridge Creek) to the gentle giant of the Klamath River. We do not have the budget to limit use and encourage all facets of the paddling community to come sample our rich river heritage on the forest. We have found that the river themselves can be the limiting factor, difficult stretches of whitewater usually attract only those prepared and skilled to meet the challenges that await them. Paddling is human-powered, place-based, low-impact, quiet, non-consumptive, skill-based, and Wilderness-compliant. In short, it is exactly the kind of activity and experience that the Park system was created to foster. Banning boating on our public rivers doesn't line up with National Park System policy, and prohibiting paddling on Wild and Scenic Rivers is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their individual skills and abilities. Paddling brings much needed tourist dollars to rural towns, opening Yosemite's rivers to controlled use will create demand and help add more tourist dollars to your local towns such as Groveland, Ca or maybe Lee Vining, Ca on the east side. Please give serious consideration to opening the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers in Yosemite National Park to qualified paddlers on a limited basis. Thanks for reading my comments. Sincerely,

Correspondence ID:	459	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Neubacher,				

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 7:05 AM

As a United States Citizen and a Class V paddler who enjoys experiencing wilderness and natural landscapes by river, I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on Yosemite National Park's Draft Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers. As you are aware, boating throughout most of the Park has been prohibited for many years, and I am pleased to see that numerous boating opportunities are being offered in many of the alternatives that are considered in the plan. Unfortunately, Alternatives 1-5 in the Merced River CMP/EIS continue the policy of banning boating between Sentinel Beach and Pohono Bridge on the Merced River. This reach has a low degree of difficulty and offers some of the most spectacular views in the Valley. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative for the Tuolumne River also continues the ban on boating for the entire reach. I write to express support for opening all segments of the Wild and Scenic Merced and Tuolumne Rivers to boating.

Boating is a low-impact and Wilderness-compliant way to experience the beauty of Yosemite National Park, and the values of the Valley and these rivers can be protected through appropriate and relevant use numbers. Boating should be treated as any other activity in the Park, and the river can be treated as a trail. Additionally, boaters should be allowed the freedom to choose whether or not to experience all of the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers given their skills and abilities.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Finally, as an individual whom has had the pleasure of spending time in Yosemite and Tuolumne Meadows, I would love nothing more than to have the opportunity to float these rivers and explore their beauty and splendor from another vantage point. As mentioned previously, boating is a recreational activity that has minimal impact on the resource. The impact is much less than rock climbing that is currently permitted in the park, and therefore should be permitted to be conducted to ensure all recreationalist have the same opportunity to enjoy the national park resource.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	460	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern,				

From snowmobiles to snow skis, our natural parks have allowed for Americans to access these pristine areas in a variety of ways. I am writing you to encourage the usage of whitewater kayaks within the boundaries of Yosemite National Park. Kayakers are minimally invasive, educated and responsible stewards of the land.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 12:54 PM

Correspondence ID:	461	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Ranger-guided trips to the High Sierra Camps provide the best way to educate our citizens regarding the value of wilderness and of Yosemite in particular. If we are to have more influence in this direction, we need more trips, not fewer. Please upgrade and preserve the High Sierra Camps as a ways to provide ranger-guided trips into Yosemite back country where people will learn to preserve and protect wilderness areas. Thank you. [REDACTED]				

[REDACTED]

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 12:44 PM

Correspondence ID:	462	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,04,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Mailing Address: [REDACTED]				

Please keep the old bridges along the river in Yosemite. They are great to walk across. :-) What harm do they do at this point? Keep the as part of a walking and biking system of trails. Thank you. Erik

Mon, Mar 4, 2013 at 8:55 PM

Correspondence ID:	463	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2012 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	Sir: I strongly support the opening of all Yosemite rivers to private non motorized recreational boating. Private recreational boating is entirely compatible with the mission of the NPS and with environmental protection as all but two national parks have realized. The current prohibition is inconsistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the NPS mandate. [REDACTED]				

Correspondence ID:	464	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,05,2013 00:00:00				

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: I would like to write in support of allowing recreational boating on the tuolumne river. If managed this use should have minimal impact while allowing the public a way to experience the river.

Thank you for your consideration. [REDACTED]

Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 5:46 PM

Correspondence ID:	465	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Back Country Horsemen et al. Unaffiliated Individual				
Received:	Mar,18,2013 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Superintendent Yosemite National Park Attn: Tuolumne River Plan PO Box 577 Yosemite, CA 95389				

Dear Mr. Neubacher:

On behalf of the Backcountry Horsemen of California ("BCHC"), Backcountry Horsemen of America ("BCHA")? Frontier Pack Train ("Frontier") and the National Forest Recreation Association ("NFRA"), I am submitting the below comments on the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft EIS"). BCHC, BCHA, Frontier and NFRA very much appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS, and in particular, on those aspects of the draft plan and EIS which seek to reduce stock use in Yosemite National Park.

BCHC and BCHA consist of dedicated men and women working to preserve the historic use of trails with recreational pack and saddle stock. BCHC and BCHA members perform public service activities for numerous land management agencies and are continually working to educate other members and the general public on how to be "Gentle Users." The use of livestock has played an important role in the American culture. There is a long tradition of using pack and saddle stock not only in Yosemite National Park but all over the West and BCHC as well as BCHA carry on this tradition in modern times. With this use comes the responsibility and obligation to care for our public lands in order to ensure their use For Future generations. BCHC and BCHA work in cooperation with government agencies to help clear trails, maintain historic sites, construct new facilities, sponsor educational seminars and clinics, and assist with service projects as requested. BCHC and BCHA put in thousands of volunteer hours helping maintain trails on federal, state and private lands. Members also strive to stay current on relevant issues and to provide input on management plans, access and activities that pertain to trails on public lands with pack; and saddle stock.

Frontier Pack Train is a family-owned pack station operating pursuant to permits issued by NPS as well as the Forest Service. Frontier is owned and operated by Dave and Kent Dohnel, who have a combined 35 years of packing experience. Frontier introduces people to the stock-experience and provides the same wilderness experience to guests who do not own their own stock as the experience enjoyed by members of BCHC and BCIIA. Founded in 1948, NFRA represents and serves as an advocate for outdoor recreation businesses offering quality opportunities to visitors on public lands and waters across the United States. NFRA works to forge strong partnerships with federal and state land management agencies, and to ensure recreation opportunities, services and facilities are available to the public for new and the future, NFRA provides services to the lodges, resorts, marinas, and pack stations who are operating on public lands, including those administered by the USDA Forest Service, USDI National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Army Corps of Engineers and on state park lands. The National Park Service (NPS) states in the Draft EIS that it believes that it is Congress's intent, and therefore it is NPS's preference, to reduce stock use by guides in Yosemite National Park. See Draft DEIS at C-16 ("The Wilderness Act evinces a congressional intent to limit commercialization of wilderness"); id. at 8-223 (NPS's preferred Alternative 4 would result in "a reduction in commercial stock use")¹ Frontier, BCHC, BCHA and NFRA do not agree with this assertion or how NPS has applied it to limit stock services provided by guides in the Draft EIS It is not Congress' intent to "limit" any commercial activity or services provided by professional guides in Yosemite National Park; rather, it is Congress' intent that all commercial services and guide services needed for guests to realize the recreational or other Wilderness purposes of the Park be allowed. 16 U.S.C. ' 1133(d)(5)("commercial services may be performed within the wilderness areas designated by this chapter to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purposes for the areas"). Stock use is clearly part of the recreational purpose of Yosemite National Park and has been for over 100 years. NPS's statement evidences an unjustified bias against guides who provide stock services which is unfortunately further demonstrated by the restrictions imposed in NPS's preferred Alternative 4.

Moreover, there is no scientific difference between the physical impact of a horse ridden by a visitor using a guide service to enjoy a wilderness experience in the Park as compared to a horse ridden by an individual who owns that horse. Therefore, the purportedly scientific basis for NPS's preference to reduce Stock use in Yosemite National Park applies equally to all equestrians who enjoy Yosemite National Park. It is for that reason that BCHC and BCHC join in these comments.

¹ NPS incorrectly concludes that the presence of outfitter guides in an area increases the "commercialization" of that area. However, guides are typically the most knowledgeable and best stewards of our natural areas. To state that the presence of guides in a wilderness area result in the "commercialization" of that area is an improper and disparaging statement.

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

A. NPS'S omission of key underlying scientific studies supporting the proposed 192 grazing-nights limit prevents meaningful public comments. A critical restriction set out in preferred alternative imposes an annual limit 192 grazing-nights for stock in Lyell Canyon. Draft EIS at 7-19; 701. This limit may seem innocuous to someone unfamiliar with stock activity in the Park. However, this proposal is in reality a very effective way to reduce Outfitter guide services in the Park. Just as "wilderness zone capacities are enforced by controlling overnight access to the wilderness through a trailhead permit system" (Draft EIS at 8-1 96), stock use by guides is similarly controlled by the amount of "stock grazing-nights" in Lyell Canyon. This is because NPS has prohibited guides from hauling in stock to Yosemite National Park by trailer. As a result, they must access it by coming over the mountains on horseback. However, due to the mountain pass many guides must use to access the Park, Lyell Canyon is where many guides must stop upon entering the Park to rest their stock. Draft EIS at 7-19. By regulating Lyell Canyon, NPS is regulating most of the guides' abilities to bring groups into the Park on horseback.

This very critical restriction is purportedly justified by certain meadow condition assessments and past research. However, none of those assessments or research was included in the Draft EIS. Notably, a recent study completed by Sage Associates arrived at exactly the opposite conclusions. (A copy of this study is attached as Attachment I.)² These facts (or the lack thereof) demonstrate that the proposed 192 grazing-nights limit at Canyon was not based on scientific data or the actual condition of Lyell Canyon. Not only has NPS Failed to include any of the studies it allegedly relied upon to reach its conclusions, NPS has also failed to make the public aware of evidence that directly contradicts NPS's conclusions. This conduct misleads the public and completely prevents anyone from evaluating whether the 192 grazing-nights restriction was merited or, as shown by the Sage Associates study, whether any restriction at all was even necessary. Thus, NPS has not provided a proper opportunity for the public to comment as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

At page 7-19 of the Draft EIS, NPS states that the following restriction is common to all the Alternatives³:

Manage stock use to not exceed 192 grazing-nights per year. This target grazing capacity for meadows in the Lyell Fork was based on recent meadow condition assessments and past research (Cole et al. 2004) to estimate the grazing levels that can be sustained without undesirable effects on meadow habitat (NPS,

² The report was prepared by Dr. Orrin Sage, a principal with Sage Associates. Dr. Sage has a BA., MA., and PhD. in geological sciences from the University of California Santa Barbara with emphasis in sedimentology.

³ Actually, as shown at page 7-101 of the Draft EIS, the restriction is not part of Alternative I, the No Action alternative. Ballenger 2010H). Meadows receiving high use would be monitored annually to ensure that the target grazing capacity was protective of river values (NPS, Ballenger et al. 2010j). This management action would apply only to stock grazing-nights; additional stock use nights could be accommodated and still be protective of river values if users packed in their own feed. (Additional limitations on commercial use in wilderness, including commercial overnight stock use, are described under "Management of Visitor Use and User Capacity," below.)

(Emphasis added.) As set out above, NPS states that the 192 grazing-nights limit "was based on recent meadow condition assessments and past research (Cole et al. 2004) to estimate the grazing levels that can be sustained without undesirable effects on meadow habitat (NPS, Ballenger 2010h)." However, these studies are not included as part of the Draft DEIS. Nor does NPS anywhere provide an explanation for how it arrived at the 192 grazing-nights limit based on these studies. As a result, BCHC, BCHA, Frontier, NFRA and the rest of the public have absolutely no way of evaluating the legitimacy of these proposed restrictions. This omission effectively precludes any substantive comments on this highly critical part of the Draft DEIS.

In stark contrast to the image created by the Draft EIS, the Sage Associates report contains actual photographs which show that Lyell Canyon is in excellent condition and is not being detrimentally impacted by current stock activity. For example, below is a photograph taken in 2011 of the Lyell Fork pack stock crossing:

Photo 2 in the Lyell Canyon Pack Stock Grazing Assessment (Att. I). The crossing is set up so as to minimize any sedimentation from stock activity, as shown by the photograph below which was taken immediately stier a pook string crossed.

Photo 4 in the Lyell Canyon Pack Stock Grazing Assessment (Att. I). Furthermore, the meadows which are designated For grazing are in excellent condition, as shown by the photographs below, which are of the designated grazing meadows northwest and south, respectively, of a "stock camp only."

Photos 7, 9 in the Lyell Canyon Pack. Stock Grazing Assessment (the above photo includes a clipboard set out for scale)(Att. 1) addition, the grazing does not have any measurable impact on the stream bank or the natural sloughing, as clearly shown by the two photographs below, the first of which is the stream bank in the grazing area and the second one is an area not grazed by stock. Photos 14, 21 in the Lyell Canyon Pack Stock Grazing Assessment (Att. I). The two areas (the stock use area and no stock use area) are indistinguishable.

The Draft DEIS also States:

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

Recent studies also show higher levels of bare ground in subalpine meadows with high levels of current pack stock use (such as meadows along the Lyell Fork), when compared with those with lower pack Stock use (NPS Ballenger et al, 2010j). Hoof punching was highest in meadows with more area dominated by wetland species suggesting that meadows are receiving stock use while soils are still wet and more susceptible to impacts. Draft DEIS 5-26. However, not only are these studies not included in the Draft DEIS, but the Sage Associates analysis clearly shows that the "higher level of bare ground" is likely due to rodent activity. Set out below is a photograph of bare ground in a stock grazing area caused by rodent activity, not stock.

Photo 6 in the Lyell Canyon Pack Stock Grazing Assessment (Att. I). Notably, when read carefully, the above-referenced paragraph from the Draft DEIS does not state that the "higher levels of bare ground" are due to stock activity, but strongly suggests this conclusion to the reader. These statements raise very serious Concerns that NPS has predetermined that it wants to reduce stock use in Yosemite National Park and, as was the case at Point Reyes National Seashore, it is manipulating the public through misleading "scientific" statements. The study referenced above needs to be made available to the public and NPS must describe how it arrived at its conclusions from the information set out in that study. Moreover, because of the cost to Outfitter guides (and thus their guests) of packing in their own feed, the fact that the grazing-nights limit does not apply when a guide brings his own feed is a meaningless exception. B. NPS's omission of key underlying scientific studies supporting the proposed limit of 2 overnight groups per zone/per night and no more than 2 day groups per trail per day prevents meaningful public comments.

In the preferred Alternative 4, NPS states that it wants to "restrict commercial use to no more than 2 overnight groups per zone per night and no more than 2 day groups per trail per day." Draft EIS at 7-102. NPS states that there are three reasons for this proposal all of which appear to be essentially variations on the same reason. Id. at C-16 (Appendix C). However, as discussed below, each of these reasons is entirely invalid. The first reason is that, because guides and the visitors traveling with them have been banned from many areas under the proposed restrictions, they may congregate in other areas and cause physical harm. Id. at C-16. However, no such evidence is provided to support this wholly speculative conclusion. Nor is there any basis to conclude that the restrictions already in place would not prevent any such outcome. The second reason is that, because guides and the visitors traveling with them have been banned from many areas under the proposed restrictions, they may congregate in other areas which could result in "crowding" Id. This potential "crowding" might then "detract [] from the wilderness experience of other visitors sharing a zone with such groups." Id. Again, no such evidence is provided to support this wholly speculative conclusion. Nor is there any basis to conclude that the restrictions already in place would not prevent any such outcome.⁴ The third reason is that, because guides and the visitors traveling with them have been banned from many areas under the proposed restrictions, they may dominate other, less desirable areas, NPS concludes that, if this were to occur, having guides and the visitors traveling with them in these less desirable areas will result in the "excessive commercialization of wilderness." Id. at C-17. However, given that these visitors are doing the exact same things as visitors who are present without guides (camping, hiking, fishing, etc.), it is nonsensical to assert that these visitors will somehow "commercialize" the Park. Visitors who rely upon guides to visit and enjoy a National Park should not be treated as second-class citizens; however, that is exactly what NPS is doing in its preferred alternative. ⁴ The Draft EIS repeatedly states that restrictions on stock activity and stock group sizes are necessary to promote solitude of other visitors. The definition of wilderness includes areas that have "outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation. 16 U.S.C. ' 1131(c) (emphasis added). The definition of "solitude" is "the quality or state of being alone or remote from society." However, the vast majority of hikers in Yosemite National Park are not traveling alone. Thus, these individuals cannot be pursuing "solitude" in the sense of seeking to be alone. Therefore, stock activity will not interfere with these visitors' quests for solitude because, by traveling with others, they clearly are not seeking solitude. When carefully analyzed, this reason for restricting stock use appears to be specious. C. NPS's omission of key underlying scientific studies supporting the proposed limit of 4,569 total visitors overnight and day use people at one time prevents meaningful public comments. In its preferred Alternative 4, NPS proposes that the maximum number of overnight visitors will be 4,569. Draft EIS at 7-105. However, as with many of its other proposed restrictions, NPS provides no support for this proposed number. In addition, there currently is not enough parking areas for private equestrians with horse trailers, and the Draft EIS makes no mention of this or of any intention to increase this type of parking.

BCHC, BCHA, Frontier and NFRA oppose this proposed restriction.

D. The Draft EIS improperly asserts that disabled visitors have "separate but equal areas" that they can visit within Yosemite, therefore it is proper to exclude them from the more desirable locations. Contrary to its assertions, NPS has failed to "make available equal opportunities for people with disabilities in all programs and activities," as is otherwise required by NPS's Management Policies. See Draft EIS at C-16. NPS acknowledges that outfitter guides provide the only means of access for people who are mobility impaired and rely on outfitters to visit Yosemite National Park. Id. NPS also admits that, as a result of its proposed alternatives, mobility impaired visitors will be prevented from accessing preferable destinations due to the restrictions imposed on outfitter guides. Id. NPS asserts that excluding disabled visitors from these preferable areas is not problematic because there are separate but "equal opportunities" for disabled visitors to visit other parts of Yosemite National Park. Id. However, NPS's attempt to claim that there are "separate but equal" areas for disabled users is not valid. As NPS admits, the areas which disabled visitors are excluded from are the more desirable areas of Yosemite National Park. The fact that these are the more desirable areas shows that they provide a better and potentially unique experience. NPS asserts that because "Yosemite has many other areas where visitors can take stock-assisted trips," there are "equal opportunities' mobility impaired individuals to use guides on stock trips to visit the Yosemite Wilderness." Draft EIS at C-16 (emphasis added). This assertion is simply not true and relegates disabled visitors to only the less desirable parts of Yosemite.

E. None of the proposed restrictions on stock use in Yosemite National Park are justified. As demonstrated above, while the Draft EIS proposes various restrictions on stock use, it also sets forth none of the alleged underlying studies which are the purported basis for these restrictions. As a result, BCHC, BCHA, Frontier and NFRA, as well as the rest of the public, are

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS

Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted
Form letters posted separately

effectively precluded from asserting further comments as to whether these proposed restrictions are justified and reserve their right to challenge all such restrictions.

F. NPS must include as a part of the Administrative Record the specific analyses by Tim Kuhn and Laura Jones conducted in 2011 and/or 2012 regarding the conditions in Lyell Canyon.

NPS employees Tim Kuhn and Laura Jones, along with outside consultants, conducted assessments of Lyell Canyon in 2011 and/or 2012. These assessments reportedly concluded that the conditions in Lyell Canyon were favorable, that the turnout dates for grazing in place at that time were achieving their goals and that there was no evidence that grazing had created any bare ground issues. These conclusions are supported by the Sage Associates report attached as Attachment 1. However, the assessments by these NPS employees, and any input they received from other consultants, were not referenced in or attached to the Draft EIS and have apparently been suppressed. These assessments likely directly contradict the conclusions reached by NPS in the Draft EIS regarding the past impacts of stock grazing in Lyell Canyon and show that there is no need for any additional restrictions to be imposed.

BCHC, BCHA, Frontier and NFRA request that NPS issue a revised DEIS with these assessments attached to it and address these assessments in that draft environmental impact statement so that the public can comment based on all of the relevant information.

G. NPS's proposal to eliminate day rides is improper.

As stated in the plan, stock use has a long and varied history in the Tuolumne River corridor and stock animals continue to be used to day to explore the backcountry, supply food and materials to backcountry trail crews and High Sierra Camps, and assist with search and rescue missions. Throughout the Park's history, thousands of visitors have been able to access and enjoy the trails of Yosemite that they otherwise would never have the opportunity to experience. Visitors have been able to see the Park ? and take part in an actual historic activity ? in the same way as John Muir did (who is credited for helping to advocate to preserve the area as a national park); as well as the Buffalo Soldiers (who were directed to help protect the Park and its resources). Seeing the Park on horseback is an experience that cannot be replicated by any other means. For the vast majority of visitors, that opportunity is provided to them through the services of commercial guides. Many visitors are unable to hike the trails due to their disabilities, and many are concerned for their safety, and are unwilling to venture out on their own.

The preferred alternative would forever eliminate the opportunity for the public to enjoy a step back in history to see the Park via horseback for a few hours by eliminating the day rides from the Tuolumne Meadows and River area. Although this plan is released to the public for comment, the majority of the millions of visitors to Yosemite are not aware these changes are looming. In addition, there are thousands of international tourists who cherish the opportunity to have a real life 'western' experience. If these visitors were given the chance to directly respond when they are actually at the stable for a ride, chances are the Park Service planners would get a very different viewpoint of what the public actually thinks, and they would have an accurate account of the extent these services are needed for the public. The worst part of the rationale for eliminating the day rides is that NPS wants to 'reduce hiker-stock conflicts on trails.' However, NPS does not propose eliminating any of the other commercial and institutional hiking and climbing trips, which contribute significantly to the numbers of hikers on the trails. What will change under the Alternatives? Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4): *Concessioner stock day rides into the wilderness would be discontinued to reduce hiker-stock conflicts on trails. *Glen Aulin's capacity would be reduced from 32 to 20 people per night, reducing the number of re-supply trips. Alternative 1: *All concessioner stock day rides and overnight stock trips would be discontinued to enhance opportunities for self-reliance and solitude. Alternative 2: *This alternative is comparable to the preferred alternative in establishing an opening date and reducing stock use levels to 192 grazing-nights per year. A reduction in concessioner day rides into the wilderness would accommodate a maximum of 24 people per day (2 two-hour rides with up to 12 visitors per ride). Alternative 3: *Management actions would be implemented similar to those in the preferred alternative with 2 campsites designated for stock use and access to grazing areas and routes directed to resilient areas. As in Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would also include similar reductions in concessioner day rides and the reduction in stock use levels to 192 grazing-nights per year.

NPS has failed to provide a reasonable range of alternative. There is no alternative (other than the No Action alternative) that allows for the continuation of day rides as currently allowed, nor is there an opportunity to increase the number of rides to accommodate the number of visitors who enjoy the experience to see and learn about Yosemite.

NPS has also failed to adequately address the direct and indirect economic impacts that the elimination of day rides, and reduction of other commercial stock activities will have on the companies providing those services and the hundreds of vendors with whom they conduct business. However, with the recent sequestration, NPS Director Jon Jarvis was quick to point out the tremendous impacts that occur to local areas when the Parks ? and associated activities are reduced. In Director Jarvis's February 26 memo to employees he addressed the economic impacts of the sequestration, as well as the impacts on employees. "Reduced services and access will make families planning summer vacations think twice about coming to a nation park," he said. "A drop in visitation could have devastating effects on the economics of gateway communities who depend on visitor spending and shut down park lodging, food, and other services provided by concessioners who support 25,000 jobs."

There is not an adequate depiction of the loss of jobs and revenue to surrounding communities. The following is an excerpt from

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

a second generation guide working in Yosemite that conveys how important their job is to the public: "Being a guide can build A LOT of character in just one summer?It is great to be a part of something that has been around since before Yosemite was a National Park. Also, from a customer point of view it is a way to get around the park if you are not physically able. I took a paraplegic to Quarter Dome this summer so that he could accomplish his dream of aid climbing Half Dome. That was an amazing experience for both parties. Some people have never seen a mule/horse and when they step up to the rail the look in their eyes is one of wonderment. It is a fun activity for families. Children learn a lot and usually bond well with the stock. All in all the day rides really make people truly happy."

H. Conclusion BCHC, BCHA, Frontier and NFRA very much appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments on the Draft EIS.

Very Truly yours, The Garden Law Firm, P.C. [REDACTED] Enclosure (Lyell Canyon Pack Stock Grazing Assessment) cc:
[REDACTED] Back Country Horsemen

Correspondence ID:	466	Project:	14043	Document:	49369
Outside Organization:	Sage Business				
Received:	Oct,04,2011 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Other				
Correspondence:	October 4, 2011 Frontier Pack Train Star Rt. 3, Box 18 June Lake, CA 93529 Attention: Mr. Dave Dohnel, Owner ? Frontier Pack Station Subject: Frontier Pack station Lyell Canyon Pack Stock Grazing Assessment				

Dear Dave:

Thank you for the opportunity to review, and comment on, your pack stock grazing management practices within the National Park Service designated pack stock grazing meadows in the upper portion of Lyell Canyon: A report on my observations is included below. Sincerely: Orrin Sage, Ph.D. Principal Sage Associates

Introduction A pack stock grazing assessment of the two NPS designated pack stock grazing meadows in the upper portion of Lyell Canyon was conducted on September 27th and 28th, 2011 at the request of Mr. Dave Dohnel, owner of Frontier Pack Station. Two wranglers, three mules, and four horses, provided transportation and equipment. Figure 1, the Vicinity Map shows the general location of the designated "pack stock only" camp adjacent to the meadows located to the northwest and southwest of the camp. Figure 2, the Topographical Map shows the general location of the camp and the meadow areas. The large green dots bracket the areas photographed within the camp and pack stock grazed meadows. The small green dots show the general location of photos taken outside of the grazed pack stock meadows. Eighteen photos were taken to illustrate conditions in the pack stock grazed meadow areas. For comparison, for photos were taken in meadows that are ungrazed by pack stock. Text reference to the photos is included in the accompanying management observations. Management Observations Horseback access into and out of, Lyell Canyon provided an opportunity to observe meadow and streambank conditions of areas that are ungrazed by pack stock. The two wranglers, that have together worked for Frontier pack station for over ten years, provided valuable insight into the uses of the two pack stock grazed meadow areas and the designated camp. Entry and exit to the designated "stock camp only" area is shown in Photos 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Photo 1 shows the pack stock crossing at the designated ford of the Lyell Fork. Pack stock are encouraged to drink at this location as a management practice.

Photo 2 shows the designated crossing without pack stock. Photo 3 shows the pack stock exiting the "stock camp only" area. Note the cobble, gravel, and sand substrate at the crossing, which reduces sediment disturbance by the pack stock. Photo 4 shows an area downstream of the crossing shortly after crossing with no sediment dispersal and clear water clarity conditions. Photo 5 shows the "stock camp only" signage and some of the pack stock being unloaded. Pack stock are picketed until turned out into the two designated meadow areas. The camp was well maintained and clear of trash. Photos 6 through 18 shows the designated pack stock grazing meadows condition and Lyell Fork streambank conditions. Photo 6 shows the designated pack stock grazing meadow northwest of the :stock camp only:. Meadow forage biodiversity and height are high with the only bare ground areas due to rodent activity. Photo 7 shows the Lyell Fork within the designated pack stock grazing meadow with streambank stability and no pack stock trailing. Photo 8 shows the pack stock access trail to the southern designated pack stock grazing meadow. Pack stock use this trail from the "stock camp only" and then disperse into the meadow for grazing. Photo 9 shows the southern pack stock designated grazing meadow. The 11-inch high clipboard is used as scale to show the tall relative forage height at the end of the grazing season. Note the lodgepole pine seedlings within the meadow. The meadow lodgepole pines and willows showed no evidence of horse or mule browsing. Photo 10 shows a stable streambank area of the Lyell Fork in the designated southern pack stock grazing meadow. Photo 11 shows a depositional/erosional channel bar on the Lyell Fork within the southern meadow designated pack stock grazing area. Deer tracks were evident on the bar. Vegetative amounts will vary primarily due to channel flow dynamics causing sediment erosion and deposition. Photo12 shows where pack stock can cross Kuna Creek at the southern portion of the designated pack stock grazing meadow. Note the well-vegetated streambanks and rocky channel substrate. Photo 13 is taken at the southern end of the designated pack stock grazing meadow looking to the north. Photo 14 is illustrative of the Lyell Fork natural stream sloughing at the outside meander curve due to higher stream flow energy. No trailing or pack stock access is evident. In fact, most Lyell Fork streambanks are too high, or too soft, for pack stock to traverse down to the water. The Lyell Fork consists of extensive active meanders as shown on Figure 2 that are a result of a higher energy flow regime that undercuts the sandy to loamy erosion prone soils of the streambank meander resulting in sloughing. Historic abandoned stream meanders due to sloughing and deposition were also observed in this part of the canyon, which have revegetated and partially filled in, and probably pre-date current pack stock grazing. Photo 15 gives a nose-eye view

2013 Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and EIS Public Comments Received – April 1, 2013

Personal Information Redacted

Form letters posted separately

of a grazing pack stock horse. Common pack stock management practices include the following: *Allow pack stock animals to drink at the designated trail stream crossings. *Picket pack stock for unloading, rest, and loading within designated forest areas. Tethered pack stock do not graze in the meadow areas. *The wranglers allow free range grazing of the wrangler horses in the afternoon, and allow free range grazing of the remaining pack stock from later afternoon to early morning. Grazing of pack stock were observed whereby the stock does not appear to selectively graze but rather, they disperse into upland or meadow areas and forage on plants that are available within their free range path without showing any particular forage favoritism.

Photo 16 shows a secondary pack stock crossing of the Lyell Fork within the pack stock designated southern grazing meadow. The crossing is vegetated except in the sand and gravels of the channel bar and stream bottom. Photo 17 is another example of streambank sloughing along an outside meander curve of the Lyell Fork in the pack stock designated southern grazing meadow. No trailing and high vegetation growth are apparent. Photo 18 shows an area along the Lyell Fork streambank within the pack stock designated southern grazing meadow that were grazed overnight by the pack stock. About 75 feet were grazed that illustrates the only area near the channel that was grazed overnight. Observations of the entire reaches of the Lyell Fork streambanks were made within the two designated pack stock grazing meadows in the afternoon before grazing and in the morning after pack stock turn out. Photo 19 (first small green dot north of the grazed meadow) shows a meadow ungrazed by pack stock with the 11" clipboard for scale. Meadow moisture conditions are similar between the grazed and ungrazed meadows yet forage vegetation heights appear higher in the pack stock grazed meadow. Photo 20 (second small green dot north of the grazed meadow) shows the Lyell Fork passing through a meadow ungrazed by pack stock with natural streambank sloughing at the outside of the meander on the left and a barren high energy depositional point bar on the right. Photo 21 (second small green dot to the north) shows a close up of the natural streambank sloughing shown on Photo 20. Compare to Photo 14 in the pack stock grazed meadow. Photo 22 (third green dot to the north) shows the Lyell Fork passing through a meadow ungrazed by pack stock with natural streambank sloughing along outside and top point of a meander and unvegetated depositional point bar on the downstream side of the meander. Due to heavy snowfall access limitations, the meadows were lightly grazed this year, had light utilization, and abundant residual forage, which is corroborated by the above photographs. Forage vegetation heights and composition appear to be influenced by soil moisture conditions, soil type, and available sunlight. However, it is crucial to note that the overall pack stock grazed meadow conditions are excellent and comparable in condition to the overall pack stock ungrazed meadows within upper Lyell Canyon. A rangeland health checklist was completed with methodology further described in the annotated references section. The checklist shows normal rangeland health for the two pack stock grazed meadow areas. The biodiversity and plant composition of the two pack stock grazed meadows are very high for meadow elevations just below 9,000 feet. The sedges, rushes, and grasses, include numerous native perennial species that are well adapted to moderate grazing levels. Past recent grazing stewardship is evident by the forage compositions of the meadows and would not be as high if not well managed for pack stock grazing. Conclusions Frontier pack station pack stock and campsite management is exemplary and meets or exceeds management and performance standards for meadow grazing and wilderness camping. The assessment of the two meadows that are grazed by pack stock showed similar rangeland health and long-term grazing management stewardship with conditions comparable to the meadows in Lyell Canyon that are ungrazed by pack stock. The streambank conditions of the Lyell fork of the Tuolumne River within the pack stock grazed meadows are comparable to the streambank conditions within the meadows of Lyell Canyon that are ungrazed by pack stock. Therefore, the recent past usage allocation of the two meadows should remain the same and not be reduced. Qualifications Dr. Orrin Sage, a principal with Sage Associates, prepared this pack stock grazing assessment. Dr. Sage has a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in geological sciences from the University of California Santa Barbara with emphasis in sedimentology. For 40 years he has prepared agricultural studies for public agencies, educational institutions, and private landowners, on over 3,000,000 acres in California and western Nevada, including watershed management plans, range management studies, and ranch operational planning for conservation easement land. He is a California Certified Rangeland Manager, A Certified Erosion and Sediment Control Professional, and is certified by the BLM, USFS, and NRCS in determining Stream Proper Functioning Conditions. The checklist included in this pack stock grazing assessment indicates that the designated meadow pack stock grazing areas are considered to be in the normal range for rangeland health. The above indicators are evaluated in categories that range from normal with none to slight deviations from normal, to not normal with extreme deviations from normal.

Observed Frontier pack station grazing practices leave higher residual stubble heights than suggested in this publication.
