

Yosemite National Park Tenaya Lake Plan

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



Public Scoping Report

June 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS SUMMARY	1
CONCERN AND COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS	2
USING THIS REPORT	3
List of Acronyms	3
How information is organized in this document:	3
SCOPING CONCERN CATEGORY	3
PLANNING PROCESS AND POLICY	4
RESOURCES	10
ECOSYSTEM	11
WATER RESOURCES	113
VEGETATION (NOT RARE, THREATENED OR ENDANGERED)	12
AIR QUALITY	12
SCENIC RESOURCES, VISUAL QUALITY	13
CULTURAL RESOURCES	14
VISITOR EXPERIENCE	15
ACCESS	16
RECREATION	17
VISITOR SERVICES	22
TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING	25
PARK OPERATIONS	28
OUT OF SCOPE CONCERNS	29
SCREENING PUBLIC CONCERNS	35

Introduction

Tenaya Lake is a magnificent High Sierra lake surrounded by granite domes, lodgepole forests, and Yosemite's vast wilderness. It is the largest lake in Yosemite's front-country. Because of its remarkable scenic qualities, its inviting blue water, and its proximity to Tioga Road, Tenaya Lake is one of the most popular destinations for summer visitors in Yosemite. Problems associated with visitor use, visitor safety, and resource impacts have been occurring for decades.

The purpose of the Tenaya Lake Area Plan is to guide management actions by the National Park Service in order to protect resources and provide opportunities for a range of quality visitor experiences at Tenaya Lake.

The Tenaya Lake Area Plan will provide for a formal, public analysis of these long-standing issues and will provide a plan to remedy these issues. After the plan is complete, the park will continue with design development and implementation of the solutions identified in the plan. These solutions may include ecological restoration, picnic area improvements, trailhead and parking improvements, comfort stations, and trails.

An environmental assessment will be completed as part of this plan. In the fall of 2008, public scoping was conducted by the National Park Service as part of the early development of the Tenaya Lake Plan for Yosemite National Park. During public scoping, the NPS sought comments from members of the public to better understand the spectrum of concerns, interests, and issues that may need to be addressed as part of this planning process. The NPS accepted comments submitted by email, U.S. mail, and fax. This report is a summary of the public comments received during the scoping period.

Public Scoping Process Summary

Members of the public were invited to submit comments on the Tenaya Lake Area Plan for a period of from September 4th to October 18th. The NPS provided information about the plan and the public scoping period through the following means:

1. A press release describing the intent to begin the public involvement process for the proposed plan was issued on 2008. The *Mariposa Gazette* published the press release on August 29, 2008.
2. The scoping announcement was included in the *Yosemite National Park Electronic Newsletter*, which has about 7000 subscribers.
3. The scoping announcement was included in the park's Daily Report throughout the public scoping period.
4. The scoping period was announced via the park's website.
5. The plan's fact sheet was made available at Visitor Centers within the park.

6. Information regarding the project was disseminated during the September and October 2008 monthly Yosemite National Park Open House held in the Yosemite Valley auditorium.
7. Invitations to the open house were included in the public scoping announcement and the plan's fact sheet. Public comments are included in this report which can be found along with copies of the public comment letters on the project website at <http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/tenaya.htm>. The plan's fact sheet is also posted on the above website.

Twenty-six scoping responses (including emails and letters) were received during the public scoping period. These responses were carefully reviewed and individual ideas were identified and assigned a code according to the subject matter addressed. These discrete individual ideas are known as public comments. The twenty-six public responses consisted of 170 discrete public comments. The public comments were then grouped into 88 concern statements. The public concern statements were used to identify common themes expressed by individuals or groups requesting particular lines of action by the NPS.

The public concerns were then screened to determine whether a concern pertained to the purpose and need for this project and the level of action required by the park's interdisciplinary team and/or park management. The plan's interdisciplinary team is composed of park specialists from a variety of backgrounds including recreation planning, resource management and science, wilderness, public information, environmental compliance, and visitor use/social science. The plan's interdisciplinary team is reviewing the concern statements and will use these concerns to aid in the development of alternatives.

Copies of public comment letters and this report can be found on the project website at: <http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/tenaya.htm>

Concern and Comment Analysis Process

The letters, emails and direct submission represented in this Public Scoping Report were analyzed using a process initially developed by the United States Forest Service, Washington Office Ecosystem Management Staff, Content Analysis Team. For the last seven years, this system has been refined by the NPS and used to analyze comments for nearly all planning efforts in Yosemite National Park.

The comment analysis is comprised of three main components: a coding structure, a comment database, and the narrative summary contained in this report. Initially, a coding structure is developed to sort comments into logical groups by topic. Code categories are derived from an analysis of the range of topics covered in relevant present and past planning documents, NPS legal guidance, and the letters themselves. The purpose of these codes is to allow for quick access to comments on specific topics. The coding structure used

was inclusive rather than restrictive—every attempt was made to accurately code all comments, including those that may not have pertained directly to the Tenaya Lake Plan.

The second phase of the analysis process involves the assignment of codes to comments made by the public in their letters, emails and direct submissions. For each comment in a piece of correspondence, codes are assigned by one reader, validated by a second reader, and then entered into a database as verbatim quotes from members of the public. The database, in turn, was used to help construct this Public Scoping Report.

The third phase includes the identification of public concern statements and the preparation of this narrative. Public concerns are identified throughout the coding process and are derived from and supported by quotes from original letters. These public concern statements present common themes identified in comments. Each statement is worded to give decision-makers a clear sense of what action is being requested.

Public concern statements are intended to help guide the reader to comments on the specific topics of interest. They do not replace the actual comments received from individuals. Rather, concern statements should be considered as an efficient and effective way of accessing information contained in original letters and the coded comment database. All comments are captured in public concern statements, whether they were presented by hundreds of people or a single individual.

Using this Report

This report presents public concerns arranged by topic, along with a representative sample of supporting quotes and the concern screening code. The following list of acronyms has been developed to assist the reader in reviewing the report.

List of Acronyms

EA – Environmental Assessment
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
FONSI – Finding of No Significant Impact
GMP – General Management Plan
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NPS – National Park Service
ROD – Record of Decision

How information is organized in this document:

Scoping Concern Category

Concern Statement (expressed as a sentence).

Letter Number(s): (i.e., 1, 2, 4)

Direct quote from a representative public comment (i.e., "Better site delineation is needed at several park trailheads.")

Type of comment and comment number: (Individual, Comment #4-1)

Planning Process and Policy

Concern #1: The NPS should preserve Yosemite unchanged for future generations.

Letter Numbers: 4, 5, 25

*"Any ideas you have to control congestion and traffic should not be addressed here in the Tenaya Lake scoping study."
(Individual, Comment #4-6)*

*"When you last negotiated DNC's contract, you arranged it so that you are now beneficiaries of some of their profits, sharing in economic growth which is relative to numbers of tourists that come to the park of course, putting you in direct conflict of interest when it comes to protecting this park for future generations. You are now in direct competition with those who want less human impacts to the park. You may be good business people, but you are not good at preserving Yosemite unchanged for future generations, which is clearly your higher calling. You now profit when DNC profits and your vision of what is right for this National Park has become obscured by your income driven focus."
(Individual, Comment #5-18)*

*"Our Center supports this plan's goal of reducing impacts to natural resources through better signage of trails and amenities."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-5)*

*"We also support any effort to protect water quality of this pristine, high-altitude lake that could be contaminated through improper disposal of human waste."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-6)*

Concern #2: The NPS should focus on park protection rather than park revenues.

Letter Number: 17

*"Finally, let's put the brakes on any new parking lots. Parking is currently sited in areas long-since developed while the draft Yosemite Valley plan suggests that we pave over huge lots in unspoiled areas of the park so diesel buses can serve expanded hotels in the valley on widened roads."
(Individual, Comment #17-5)*

Concern #3: The NPS should clarify what it wants to improve through the Tenaya Lake Plan.

Letter Number: 5

*"When you last negotiated DNC's contract, you arranged it so that you are now beneficiaries of some of their profits, sharing in economic growth which is relative to numbers of tourists that come to the park of course, putting you in direct conflict of interest when it comes to protecting this park for future generations. You are now in direct competition with those who want less human impacts to the park. You may be good business people, but you are not good at preserving Yosemite unchanged for future generations, which is clearly your higher calling. You now profit when DNC profits and your vision of what is right for this National Park has become obscured by your income driven focus.
(Individual, Comment #5-18)*

Concern #4: The NPS should develop concepts/plans that address crowding and development.

Letter Number: 1

*"Due to the YNPS planning chaos, court decision, mismanagement, I strongly disagree with any planning efforts undertaken by the YNPS or its array of lobbyist funds that supersede the public interests and protections of Yosemite and its Outstanding Remarkable Values (ORV). Your system and operation for planning is broken in need of massive overhaul. As far as those I represent at YVCC, we request you cease and desist any further planning till a clear standard for evaluation is developed in a comprehensive fashion."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #1-1)*

Concern #5: The NPS should ensure that a variety of overnight accommodations are available to an economically diverse visitor population.

Letter Number: 17

*"Maybe Olmsted can help all of us, including the National Park Service, remember what the national park idea is all about. It was probably not just to let people who can afford the Ahwahnee or Yosemite lodges to luxuriate there, but to be a place to celebrate a bit of equity in a magical place meant to be shared with the current brief tenants of the Earth, but most importantly, one held in trust for the "uncounted millions" not yet born."
(Individual, Comment #17-6)*

Concern #6: The NPS should limit facility and infrastructure development.

Letter Number: 17

"I am deeply concerned these days about Yosemite. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that national parks were not set aside to create profit centers for concessionaires nor to pad National Park Service construction budgets for park officials to shortchange the future. Large

crowds are seasonal, but new roads, hotels and parking lots despoil the park year-round."
(Individual, Comment #17-7)

Concern#7: The NPS should cease this planning process.

Letter Numbers: 1, 19

"Due to the YNPS planning chaos, court decision, mismanagement, I strongly disagree with any planning efforts undertaken by the YNPS or its array of lobbyist funds that supersede the public interests and protections of Yosemite and its Outstanding Remarkable Values (ORV). Your system and operation for planning is broken in need of massive overhaul. As far as those I represent at YVCC, we request you cease and desist any further planning till a clear standard for evaluation is developed in a comprehensive fashion."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #1-1)

"Keeps an open mind - it is possible that doing nothing really is the best plan and then the Fund money can be used where it is more needed."
(Individual, Comment #19-11)

Concern #8: The NPS should consider all internal and public scoping comments and concerns prior to any decision making for the Tenaya Lake Plan.

Letter Numbers: 10, 12, 3

"It sounds as if you already have solutions in mind before you have even conducted the "formal, public analysis of these long-standing issues [that] will provide a plan to remedy these issues" that The Yosemite Fund is prepared to pay for. This would be "putting the cart before the horse", to say the least."
(Individual, Comment #3-3)

"It's clear to me from the article that the park service already know what they are going to do, from what Ms. Dahl said in this article, but seems that you plan to go through the exercise of seeking public opinion to make it look right in these media blurbs you put out."
(Individual, Comment #10-2)

"It is very annoying when things are put up for public scoping and it seems it is simply lip service as the plan is already a done deal."
(Individual, Comment #12-1)

Concern #9: The NPS should conduct a park-wide user capacity study prior to any further planning efforts.

Letter Numbers: 15, 4

"There should be a scoping study for those quotes separate from this, and before this study is done. That study should determine how to address issues that lead up to establishing a quota, how to manage the quota, and then, lastly, how to make improvements such as these at Tenaya Lake only after the concept of less crowding and restricted traffic has been not only addressed,

Tenaya Lake Plan

but put into place. Then, and only then, would anyone be able to know how to deal with human impacts, once the level of human impacts are known.

However you determine how to address way to deal with who is allowed into the park when the park reaches capacity levels should be addressed in that scoping study, where the rules and regulations could be discussed and debated with public input in order to find the best solutions for the entire park, not individual areas such as this. Otherwise, you will get spill over from Yosemite Valley."

(Individual, Comment #4-10)

"I hope that this study will further the notion that a park-wide user carrying capacity should be what first prefaces any further planning."

(Individual, Comment #15-6)

Concern #10: The NPS should continue to develop an integrated, comprehensive plan for Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 24

"Having an integrated, comprehensive planning process for the Tenaya Lake area makes a lot of sense, rather than dealing with issues on a piecemeal basis. So I approve of this planning approach."

(Individual, Comment #24-1)

Concern #11: The NPS should suspend all planning efforts until major national and local economic, political, and emergent issues are less threatening to our basic needs.

Letter Number: 7

"My suggestion; suspend YNPS planning until after these other things are past."

(Individual, Comment #7-3)

Concern #12: The NPS should clarify what it wants to improve through the Tenaya Lake Plan.

Letter Number: 5

"Why is it that you feel a need to improve Tenaya Lake?"

(Individual, Comment #5-3)

Concern #13: The NPS should build a small walk-in and a small drive-through Campground at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 14

"I learned that there was a time when the early park service asked the Desmond Park Service Company to provide a High Sierra camping experience at Tenaya Lake, and in doing so became the beginnings of what is now the Yosemite High Sierra Camps as we know them today. Eventually the Tenaya Lake Camp closed when it moved to May Lake. The text I will quote below is an excerpt from the link above, which I think nicely outlines some objectives that the NPS felt strongly about back then, of which you may also agree with now. Rather than the High Sierra Camp, as it was then, perhaps this similar concept could apply to a very small walk-in campground, and a very small drive-in campground, as outline in my previous correspondence, as follows: Begin quote : In 1916, NPS Director Stephen Mather asked Desmond Park Service Company, the concessioner at the time, to build mountain chalets at Tenaya Lake, Tuolumne Meadows and Merced Lake. He believed this type of public service would attract people into the park's high country, thus supporting NPS management objectives to: Relieve congestion in the Valley by enabling outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy Yosemite's wilderness with relative ease and in some degree of comfort, Provide a compatible environment in which visitors could be instructed in the tenets of conservation and the objectives of the National Park Service, and Clarify the National Park Services' conservation objectives to the public."
(Individual, Comment #14-1)

Concern #14: The NPS should reduce impacts to natural resources by providing better signage for trails and amenities.

Letter Number: 25

"Our Center supports this plan's goal of reducing impacts to natural resources through better signage of trails and amenities."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-5)

Concern 15: The NPS should address overcrowding in the Park, rather than attempting to accommodate everyone.

Letter Number: 15

"Here we find that there were some, even as early as 1921, that viewed the experience as negative due to overcrowding. But, without scientific evidence to back them up, the park's ecosystem was and still is negatively impacted while we await such a study. In 1921 the park service did nothing to address overcrowding. Instead, they found ways to accommodate more people, which seems to continue to be the park service's outlook today as it relates to even this Tenaya Lake Scoping Study Plan."
(Individual, Comment #15-4)

Concern #16: The NPS should re-think planning efforts as not to violate NEPA or WSRA.

Letter Number: 17

*"He [Ansel Adams] was not successful, but neither was I successful in stopping the National Park Service from demolishing Tenaya's granite domes. I have had more than one park ranger lament how right we were to have opposed that project and how our alternative would have been better. We have seen this pattern repeated in the Merced River Canyon, where Judge Anthony Ishii confirmed the righteousness of our protest against illegal National Park Service vandalism of the river, but mostly too late. When I see the war-zone that used to be the Merced River Gorge in Yosemite, I am furious that the perpetrators, who pushed this project through in violation of the [NEPA] and the Wild and Scenic Rivers acts, are allowed to continue their shoddy planning in the rest of the park rather than taking some time out to rethink."
(Individual, Comment #17-9)*

Concern #17: The NPS should ensure that future cyclic maintenance is considered for new facilities proposed in this plan.

Letter Number: 18

*"Maintenance. Plans typically don't consider how the facilities they propose to build will be managed and maintained, and in national parks management and maintenance is often problematic, to say the least. This leads to an excessive emphasis on plans as a means to solve park problems that might not exist if well-funded, intelligent and adaptive management and maintenance was continuously carried out in the first place. Tenaya Lake is an excellent example of an area that doesn't need new facilities so much as it needs intelligent and adaptive management and maintenance, including scheduled updating and periodic replacement of worn out facilities."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-16)*

*"Because the Tenaya Lake area is popular, and fund-raising for the plan is not likely to be too difficult, the Plan presents an ideal opportunity to break the typical pattern of park development, with its reliance on special funding provided by plans and programs to construct facilities for which there is inadequate funding for maintenance, causing the facilities to become rundown, which necessitates another surge of planning and fund-raising for new facilities, and so on ad infinitum."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-17)*

Concern #18: The NPS should address user capacity (overcrowding) rather than accommodating all types and quantities of visitor use, with the use of special funds.

Letter Number: 5

"There are many good projects the Yosemite Fund has contributed to, but these infrastructure rebuilds, designed to make it so that the park can accommodate more and more people as the worlds population continues to increase, are not right... While making use of what seems to be a never-ending stream of cash from an organization that is becoming infamous for funding unnecessary projects, the Yosemite Fund continues to destroy Yosemite National Park for future generations by paving the way to overcrowding."

(Individual, Comment #5-2)

Concern #19: The NPS should extend the public scoping period to allow a full thirty days for comments.

Letter Number: 3

"I request that you immediately and publicly extend the deadline for Public Scoping Comments to close-of-business October 17th, thus providing a full 30 days for comments,"

(Individual, Comment #3-1)

Concern #20: The NPS should not extend scoping period because more comments may not be submitted.

Letter Number: 7

"Extending the comment period will likely not get any more responses..."

(Individual, Comment #7-2)

Resources

Concern #21: The NPS should provide a summary describing visitor use, visitor safety and resource impacts in the Tenaya Lake area.

Letter Number: 3

"...is there a summary available of the "problems associated with visitor use, visitor safety, and resource impacts [that] have been occurring for decades", the 'solutions for the Tenaya Lake plan [that] may include ecological restoration, picnic area improvements, trailhead and parking improvements, comfort stations, and trails,' and some hint as to what analysis has been performed to date that logically motivates those potential solutions as viable approaches to those particular problems?"

(Individual, Comment #3-2)

Concern #22: The NPS should proceed with plans to reduce visitor impacts, upgrade problematic restrooms and reroute social trails.

Letter Number: 20

"The NPS proposal to reduce visitor impacts, relocate and upgrade problematic restrooms, reroute social trails impacting sensitive resource areas, and other restoration efforts to mitigate visitor impacts are actions the Committee encourage and support."

(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-1)

Ecosystem Processes

Concern #23: The NPS should not propose changes that blast into existing rock.

Letter Number: 19

"I think we were wrong to scar the granite at Olmstead point 40 years ago and we should not do it now. Please do not propose any changes that involve blasting through surface rock."
(Individual, Comment #19-6)

Concern #24: The NPS should assign "no-park" and "no walk" boundaries around Tenaya Lake, so that areas can recover without limiting number of visitors.

Letter Number: 16

"most visitors to natural areas respect clearly defined no-park and no-walk boundaries, and damaged areas recover without any limit to the number of visitors allowed, other than those imposed by available parking"
(Individual, Comment #16-4)

Concern #25: The NPS should not establish a campground at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Numbers: 11, 20

"I write today, however, to express my strongest sentiment of disagreement and dismay at the article's mention of a study to re-open camping at the lake. As we learned the last time around, mistakes are too easily made, and too costly, with that degree of sustained impact at the lake's shore. Last time we threatened bio-diversity and habitat because we failed to control our septic waste - can we confidently predict a successful co-existence between habitat and campground at the lake this time? I don't think we can. Is believing as much the type of hubris that will lead to negative impact on the lake and its environs? The answer is a clear and resounding yes.

I urge the committee studying this proposal to reject any re-opened or new campground at Tenaya Lake."
(Individual, Comment #11-1)

"Reestablishing camping at Tenaya as called for in the 1980 GMP would exacerbate the already very difficult if not impossible parking problem at Tenaya and expands a visitor activity where none now exists."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-8)

Water Resources

Concern #26: The NPS should protect water quality that could be contaminated

through improper human waste disposal.

Letter Number: 25

"We also support any effort to protect water quality of this pristine, high-altitude lake that could be contaminated through improper disposal of human waste."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-6)

Vegetation (not rare, threatened or endangered)

Concern #27: The NPS should conduct a study to determine if the transition from meadow to lodgepole forest (east of lake) is natural or human-induced.

Letter Number: 18

"Meadow Restoration. Immediately east of the lake is a meadow area that appears to be undergoing transition to lodgepole forest. The Plan should include funding for studies to determine if this transition is natural or human-induced and funding for any appropriate restoration work."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-14)

Concern #28: The NPS should apply Yosemite Valley restoration techniques to the east end of Tenaya Lake.

Letter Numbers: 22, 23

"The same way that restoration is taking place down in Yosemite Valley you could apply those techniques to the East end of the Lake."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #22-4)

"It would seem that vegetation impacts could be effectively mitigated using the revegetation signage and cord fencing that has been so successful in Yosemite Valley."
(Individual, Comment #23-2)

Air Quality

Concern #29: The NPS should not advocate the use of diesel-fueled transportation in Yosemite Valley, or elsewhere.

Letter Number: 17

"The emphasis on diesel buses in the draft Yosemite Valley plan force me to infer that he was telling the truth the first time. With both the Environmental Protection Agency in California and Washington, D.C., currently cracking down on diesel as a carcinogen and a massive air

pollution problem, it is unconscionable for the National Park Service to advocate a dramatic increase in diesel traffic in Yosemite Valley. Yosemite gets more pollution than it needs already from the Central Valley without creating a new toxic menace locally. Until clean-fuel buses can make the grade, we are stuck with diesel buses which is far dirtier than gasoline-burning modern cars, even per passenger-mile. The Central Valley is beginning to look to rail as a solution to its air problems, and I strongly encourage the National Park Service to climb aboard this statewide effort, which can be part of the solution for Yosemite as well."
(Individual, Comment #17-11)

Scenic Resources, Visual Quality

Concern #30: The NPS should maintain the scenic quality of Tenaya Lake by keeping human development as unobtrusive as possible.

Letter Number: 24

"I believe that the scenic quality of Tenaya Lake and its surroundings is so great that maintaining the quality of that scenery is of paramount importance. That means keeping human development and activity as unobtrusive as possible. It is quite unique to have a lake of such high scenic quality so readily accessible. ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: How can access be maintained without compromising the scenic values? ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: What types of facilities can be permitted, and where, without impairing the scenery?"
(Individual, Comment #24-3)

Concern #31: The NPS should protect the Tenaya Lake scenic viewshed by reducing private vehicle access in the view shed.

Letter Numbers: 20, 25

"The Tenaya Lake view shed is one of the most impressive in the entire Park. Unpopular measures including reducing private vehicle access may be required to protect it from the sullyng impacts these vehicles present to the stunning scenic quality of the Tenaya Lake area."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-4)

"Tenaya Lake is a key destination along the Tioga Pass route. It serves as a scenic icon that grabs visitors' attention and inspires them to pull over to take photos or to stop for an extended visit."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-7)

Concern #32: The NPS should design facilities in this area that discourage high levels of use.

Letter Number: 25

"We do not believe that expanding parking lots will necessarily solve larger visitor capacity issues tied to such concentrated use at Tenaya Lake on busy weekends or during peak summer visitation periods."

(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-2)

Cultural Resources

Concern #33: The NPS should note that Chief Tenaya was an Ahwahnee Indian rather than a Miwok.

Letter Number: 8

" The word "Tenaya" means water fall, or acorn lake...If you ask the Southern Sierra Miwuks they will give you false information because they are going for federal recognition and do not know the history of Lake Tenaya.

First Tenaya was not a Miwok, but an Ahwahnee. The name Ahwahnee is an old Paiute place name that is documented in The Story of Inyo by historian W. A. Chalfant and in Ethnography of the Owens Valley Paiute, by Julian Steward.

Ahwahnee was destroyed in a catastrophe and the surviving Ahwahnees left and went different directions. Chief Tenaya's father took a handful of survivors to the other band of Paiutes at Mono Lake and they took him in. No Miwok or Yokut ever went to Mono Lake without being attacked and killed so the 'tale' of Miwoks going to live in peace with the Paiutes of Mono Lake before white men entered the area is not true and false. There are many accounts of Miwoks and Yokuts going into Mono Lake Paiute area and they were attacked and killed so it is not possible that the Ahwahnees were Miwoks. The Paiutes at Mono Lake took in Tenaya's father because they were of the same people. Tenaya's father married a Mono Lake Paiute woman and Tenaya was born at Mono Lake. Tenaya grew up at Mono Lake and when he was old enough he married a Mono Lake Paiute woman and had children. Later a medicine man advised Tenaya that it was safe to return to his father's old mountain home territory. Then Tenaya took 200 to 300 Natives and established, as Dr. Lafayette H. Bunnell wrote in his Discovery of the Yosemite, the bible of Yosemite Indian history, The Paiute Colony of Ahwahnee, not the Miwok Colony. In fact the Miwoks were afraid to enter Yosemite Valley and were the scouts for the Mariposa Battalion.

The whites encroached into the Yosemite area as they were looking for gold with their Miwok workers and they kept getting attacked and provisions stolen. So the whites decided to clear out the area and that is how Yosemite Valley was discovered. The expedition to clear out the 'troublesome' Indians in the high sierra was led by James Savage who was married to many Miwok and Yokut girls and had made alliances with several Miwok chiefs in the lower foothills. Many of them worked for Savage. Ponwatches and his brother Cowchitty were the Indian scouts that Major Savage used to locate Chief Tenaya and his band of Ahwahnees. Many of Cowchitty's own descendents are now Southern Sierra Miwuks claiming to be the original Yosemite Valley Ahwahnees, but that is not true. The Cowchitty's became the Mariposa County Lewes and Washington family.

Here is the account of the naming of Lake Tenaya, named after Chief Tenaya. Tenaya or Tenieya in the Paiute language means "Our Father" and has no meaning in Miwok. One Hundred Years in Yosemite (1947) by Carl P. Russell

CHAPTER IV - PIONEERS IN THE VALLEY

You are aware that I know this old fellow [Chief Tenaya] well enough to look out well for him, lest by some stratagem he makes his escape. I shall aim to use him to the best advantage in pursuing his people. I send down a few of my command with the pack animals for provisions; and I am satisfied if you will send me ten or twelve of old Ponwachez' best men I could catch the women and children and thereby force the men to come in. The Indians I have with me have acted in good faith and agree with me in this opinion.

On May 21, some members of the invading party discovered the fresh trail of a small party of Indians traveling in the direction of the Mono country. Immediate pursuit was made, and on May 22 the Yosemitees were discovered encamped on the shores of Tenaya Lake in a spot much of which was snow-covered. They were completely surprised and surrendered without a struggle. This was the first expedition made into the Yosemite high country from the west, and it was on this occasion that the name Lake Tenaya was applied by Bunnell. The old Indian chief, on being told of how his name was to be perpetuated, sullenly remonstrated that the lake already had a name, "Py-we-ack"— Lake of the Shining Rocks.

You can see by the account written by Carl P. Russell that Miwok Ponwachez and this band helped capture Paiute Chief Tenaya as Tenaya and his band tried to escape to Paiute Mono Lake. If Tenaya was a Miwok why did he keep escaping to Mono Lake and not to other Miwok areas? Also "Pyweack" does not mean "Lake of the Shining Rock". There are two other possible meanings in Paiute, "Pah-weah" or "Pyweack". Pah-weah means "Acorn Lake" and "Pyweack" means "Water Fall"."
(Individual, Comment #8-2)

Visitor Experience

Concern #34: The NPS should avoid designing Tenaya Lake in such a way that all visitors can be accommodated.

Letter Number: 4

"In no way should Tenaya Lake be redesigned in such a way that it could "accommodate all who want to come... it's time to turn people away if it means the Yosemite experience is one that includes crowds, fences, paved trails, more tour buses, etc."
(Individual, Comment #4-7)

Concern #35: The NPS should avoid replacing campers with day-users at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 5

"You removed Tenaya Lake campground years ago, and now you want to replace those campers with three hour day-trippers. You are manipulating the parks new demographics. You are making Yosemite National Park into the park system's version of a fast food experience."

(Individual, Comment #5-16)

Access

Concern #36: The NPS should allow climbers to park along roadsides and access routes.

Letter Number: 19

"Climbers like to park near the 5 most used routes. It will be difficult to enforce only two designated parking areas. Having those climbers walk along the road will not make things any safer."

(Individual, Comment #19-3)

Concern #37: The NPS should stringently manage vehicular traffic and foot traffic.

Letter Numbers: 16, 18

"This area requires stringent parking and foot traffic control – not so much in amount of foot traffic as in where it is allowed to occur."

(Individual, Comment #16-15)

"this can all be remedied through careful vehicular and foot traffic control, clear signage, elimination of unofficial parking areas, and installation of unmistakable barricades that discourage use trails and entry into sensitive areas. The sign at the parking area entrance should say something like "Granite Beach Scenic Viewpoint" in large, friendly letters, and no other parking for this area should be possible."

(Individual, Comment #16-22)

"Soil impacts. The three sides of the lake that are heavily used all suffer soil impacts from foot and vehicle traffic. A goal of the plan should be to reduce, control and channel vehicle and foot traffic to reduce soil impacts and to restore impacted soils so that screening and demising vegetation can return to these areas. Outside the wilderness boundary this can be accomplished by the use of boulder rows, boulder curbs, boulder-rimmed soil berms, low split-rail fences and low roped-off walkways, at least until screening and demising vegetation is re-established."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-11)

Concern #38: The NPS should consider that climbers park in Tenaya Lake area lots and road shoulders to access climbs.

Letter Number: 18

"Climbing occurs at four locations in the area of Tenaya Lake: 1) most notably on Stately Pleasure Dome above the north shore, where a wealth of moderately difficult routes attract many weekend climbers, 2) on Harlequin Dome and the boulders below it, opposite the east end parking lot, 3) on Tenaya Peak, which climbers access from the east end parking lot, and 4) to a much lesser extent on cliffs down Tenaya Canyon and in Tenaya Gorge, which some climbers access from the Sunrise trailhead at the west end of the lake (though most probably start from Olmstead Point). Climbing also occurs on Pywiak Dome, east of the lake, although that may not be in the plan area. To access these areas, climbers park at the parking lot at the east end of the lake, along the highway below Stately Pleasure Dome and opposite Pywiak Dome, and at the Sunrise trailhead parking area at the west end of the lake."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-4)

Recreation

General

Concern #39: The NPS should maintain and expand picnic opportunities, but vehicle access should be carefully controlled to reduce soil impacts.

Letter Number: 18

"Picnicking is popular along the readily-accessed areas of the lake shore, and picnic areas tend to be heavily impacted. We believe that picnic areas should be retained and expanded where possible, but that vehicle access should be carefully controlled to reduce soil impacts."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-12)

Concern #40: The NPS should consider designating the beach on the east side of the lake as a picnic area.

Letter Number: 19

"The east end beach is a far better picnic area than the actual picnic area. The sand is fun for kids, it is sunny, and the warm water tends to build up on that end due to winds out of the west...better for swimming."
(Individual, Comment #19-4)

Concern #41: The NPS should provide BBQ grills that do not allow material to litter the beach and pose a fire hazard.

Letter Number: 18

"The beach area fire pits should be replaced with raised barbeque grill stands to discourage wood fires, which litter the beach with ashes and pose a wildfire ignition hazard, especially in

the high-wind area at the east end beach. Some thought might also be given to installing very simple changing screens near the popular east end parking lot.
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-9)

Concern #42: The NPS should manage excessive impacts of picnicking close to the lake.

Letter Number: 24

"While it is nice to have picnic opportunities within sight of the lake, the present facilities are too extensive and too close to the lake. The present impacts of these day-use facilities are excessive. ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: To what extent, if any, should picnic facilities continue to be provided on the north shore?"
(Individual, Comment #24-6)

Concern #43: The NPS should create designated foot paths from parking lot to east end of lake and restore all other social trails.

Letter Number: 22

"I am also concerned about access from the parking lot to the lake at the East end of the Lake. Over the years, use trails have developed, some of which are dead ends into the mud during early season. As much as I appreciate the wilderness, this is such a heavily used section of the park that I think it would be valuable to create designated walking paths from the parking lot to the beach and restore all of the other areas that have become trampled over the years."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #22-3)

Concern #44: The NPS should not build a bridge over Tenaya Creek for Sunrise Trailhead access, because this will increase use impacts to the beach on the opposite shore.

Letter Number: 18

"Some people might propose a bridge over Tenaya Creek to serve the Sunrise Trailhead, but we believe this will just increase use impacts to the beach on the opposite shore and would prefer to see this remain a shallow ford."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-10)

Recreation

Camping

Concern #45: The NPS should limit facility and infrastructure development and allow for a limited number of walk-in campsites at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 4

"There is almost nothing whatsoever that needs fixing. You would be doing Yosemite justice and give the public more trust in you if you were to tell the Yosemite Fund that their money is not required for improvements at Tenaya Lake. At least, I would be impressed. That is, I should say, unless you might consider using some of their money to replace a few of the drive-in and walk-in campsites that were removed from the area in haste, during an ill-conceived era when the thought that the only way to improve something is to remove something. My thoughts on this as follows:

My recommendation would be for no more than 12 or 15 campsites, which should be separated by at least 75 to 100 feet between them, located on the west end of the lake in the forest, not near the lake. They should be available by way of a lottery system only. They should epitomize the essence of what a great Yosemite camping experience should be for those who car-camp. Let them bring their water in. Believe me, they won't mind if they are lucky enough to get one of the very few campsites via the lottery. The lottery could be designed around the same criteria as the High Sierra Camp lottery. All sewage would be removed, and all campsites would be at least 200 feet from any water, such as Tenaya Creek, etc. The roads should be graded rarely. They should not be paved. An initial bed of about six inches of gravel is all that is needed. After that, it should be covered with a seasonal layer of wood chips, preferably cedar. The restrooms should be modern but portable outhouses that could be removed in the winter. Or, they could be the new style of vault toilets with hand sanitizer dispensers, like in many of the Forest Service campgrounds these days."
(Individual, Comment #4-1)

Concern #46: The NPS should replace campsites that have been lost.

Letter Number: 17

"So skip the hotel expansion, replace lost camping sites instead,"
(Individual, Comment #17-14)

Concern #47: The NPS should avoid establishing camping at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 20

"Approximately 50 walk in campsites located near the west end of the lake were decommissioned in the 1990's. They were located in or very near environmentally sensitive wetland areas, were very close to the lake and in direct view of one of Yosemite's most famous view sheds, the one looking east from Olmstead point. The Committee would strongly oppose reestablishing camping at this site."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-6)

Concern #48: The NPS should avoid establishing camping at Tenaya Lake, but should consider alternative sites.

Letter Number: 24

"It is clear that the natural values of the Tenaya Lake area are in better condition now than when there were campgrounds on three sides of the lake. I do not have a problem with campgrounds per se, but there are often problems associated with them. For this reason, I do not believe that it would be appropriate to re-establish campgrounds in the vicinity of the lake, and certainly not at the west end. Perhaps there would be an opportunity in the woods at the east end of the lake, but the opportunity would probably be very limited. It probably would be more feasible to consider opportunities to expand camping in the Tuolumne Meadows campground area. ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: Is it feasible to have camping in the Tenaya Lake area, or should it be directed toward Tuolumne Meadows?"

(Individual, Comment #24-4)

Concern #49: The NPS should provide camping opportunities at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Numbers: 5, 10, 17

"Due to your removal of over half of all Yosemite Valley's campsites in 1997, when you refused to use money given to you by Congress to replace the flooded campgrounds, many average Americans can no longer appreciate Yosemite's wonders, as the costs of hotel accommodations have outstripped their budgets. There are also those of us that prefer camping for the benefits of a closer connection to nature than can be found in a hotel room."

(Individual, Comment #5-14)

"I do look forward to hearing your discussions about what kind of camping could be discussed for Tenaya Lake. That old campground was always a favorite for those who wanted something other than the congestion available in the Valley campgrounds."

(Individual, Comment #10-10)

"My earlier comments stated that a campground could be constructed at Tenaya Lake in such a way that would offer the potential of a different kind of Yosemite camping experience, in such a way that would offer the lowest of human impacts possible."

(Individual, Comment #17-2)

Recreation

Resources Impacts

Concern #50: The NPS should consider the impacts of making Tenaya Lake area trails more accessible and evident to visitors.

Letter Number: 24

"The scenic quality of this walk is so great that I believe more people should be encouraged to

Tenaya Lake Plan

experience it. That would mean that the trail needs to be better delineated and signed. (This is a different position than that which I recently articulated to your staff before I walked the trail. After walking it, I became convinced that more people should be encouraged to do the same.) One problem is that more people on the trail means that more parking space would be needed. ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: Would the disadvantages of making the trail more evident be outweighed by the advantages?"
(Individual, Comment #24-7)

Concern #51: The NPS should manage vegetation impacts on the west end of Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 16

"The Tenaya Lake west shore is in Good condition due primarily to its inaccessibility by car and the attractions of nearer vistas that divert less energetic visitors. However, its proximity to, and visibility from, Murphy Creek picnic area and the "Granite Beach" scenic area draws the attention of some visitors, with the result that some erosion and destruction of flora and habitat is apparent."
(Individual, Comment #16-5)

"The Tenaya Lake East Beach picnic area is in Very Bad condition. It has been severely impacted by uncontrolled and indiscriminate foot traffic. The decomposed granite coarse sand "beach" area, which is natural and has been caused by wind waves from the strong prevailing westerly afternoon winds that originate at the Golden Gate, has been extended over 100 feet away from the lake through the actions of uncontrolled, indiscriminate foot traffic. In the process, a number of trees have become isolated by sand, and large areas of meadow which, among other attributes, protected these tree roots, have been annihilated and the trees severely threatened or killed. Some trees have been sawed off close to ground, presumably by YNP personnel, as they presented a safety hazard of falling among sunbathing picnickers. Others have died and fallen. The original forest-beach interface has been wiped out everywhere in this area, and is discernible only by a few vestigial roots sticking out of a low berm in the sand. The sand itself extends, in the form of use paths, all the way to the picnic area parking lot ¼ mile away to the east, displacing what was once meadow and rich forest floor detritus ground cover."
(Individual, Comment #16-7)

"Where the footpath from the East Beach Picnic Area parking lot emerges from what remains of the forest, a large eroded area marks where many use paths have fanned out to the beach."
(Individual, Comment #16-9)

Concern #52: The NPS should control access to areas around the lake to prevent resource impacts.

Letter Number: 6

"1. Uncontrolled access to an area by large numbers of pedestrians results in damage to grass

and meadow areas, willows, and tree roots.

2. This damage results in turn in the loss of the soil over-layer of detritus and subsequent conversion of ground cover to bare decomposed granite gravel and coarse sand.

3. Increased uncontrolled foot traffic through these now obviously bare "use paths" (social paths) expands their size laterally and causes further ground cover & detritus destruction.

4. When expanding paths encounter trees, root exposure, root damage, and soil loss results in eventual tree destruction.

5. Tree destruction opens still more new walkable areas, which are converted in turn to bare decomposed granite "use paths".

6. Overall result: The entirety of areas 3 through 7 is more-or-less rapidly being converted to bare decomposed granite sand."

(Individual, Comment #16-1)

Visitor Services

Concern #53: The NPS should upgrade parking areas, toilets, picnic tables, and fire pits.

Letter Number: 18

"Facilities. The only developed facilities in the plan area are paved parking areas, toilets, picnic tables and fire pits, all of which need upgrading or replacement."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-8)

Concern #54: The NPS should reduce development on the north shore of Tenaya Lake

Letter Number: 24

"The north shore of the lake is overdeveloped."

(Individual, Comment #24-5)

Concern #55: The NPS should limit upgrades and trail construction around Tenaya Lake unless it is needed for environmental reasons.

Letter Number: 21

"I'm feeling quite cautious about up-grading and trails around the lake other than for environmental reasons. I just think the high country need to remain more of a wilderness experience. Urban Parks abound in our cities and towns."

(Individual, Comment #21-2)

Concern #56: The NPS should not build or develop any more infrastructure at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 4

*"No improvements please. Improvements have a tendency to draw people to a place."
(Individual, Comment #4-3)*

*"Whatever you do, please don't make the mistake of doing to Tenaya Lake what you did at the Lower Falls area, or even the Fern Springs area, where you did things only because you had too much money to spend."
(Individual, Comment #4-4)*

*"There is no need to put in any granite or concrete curbs anywhere. No cedar fences or paved walk ways. No flush toilets. No added parking areas. If there are too many cars, let them keep driving. And, absolutely NO tour bus parking."
(Individual, Comment #4-5)*

Concern #57: The NPS should build parking lots in non-riparian areas, or in areas where other structures have been removed.

Letter Number: 17

*"...and if you want parking lots, limit them to impacted non-riparian areas where other structures are being removed. As for restoring Yosemite, I'm glad the park service is at least aware of the concept, but I don't see much restoration in the plan that isn't undone by destruction elsewhere. That's not restoration, it's called mitigation, as your highway building friends can tell you."
(Individual, Comment #17-15)*

Concern #58: The NPS should ensure that interpretive signs and pamphlets contain accurate information with regard to history of the Yosemite-Mono Lake Paiute Indian Community.

Letter Numbers: 18, 8

*"The Yosemite-Mono Lake Paiute Indian Community would like to make sure that Yosemite National Park Service adds the correct history to any interpretive signs or pamphlets regarding Tenaya Lake."
(Individual, Comment #8-1)*

*"If there are to be any interpretive signs or general information to the public regarding the Indian history of Lake Tenaya, please do not disrespect the memory of Chief Tenaya by misinforming the public by claiming that Tenaya was from the Miwok scouts for the white Mariposa Battalion who helped capture him and kill his own son. The Yosemite-Mono Lake Paiute Indian Community requests that any signs or information regarding Lake Tenaya not be identified as Miwok, because not only would that be incorrect, but highly disrespectful."
(Individual, Comment #8-3)*

Tenaya Lake Plan

"Lack of funds for maintenance has left infrastructure and improvements in poor condition. Tenaya may be a beauty, but she is dressed in rags, and we welcome the opportunity this plan presents to restore her natural grace."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-3)

Concern #59: The NPS should minimize the placement of signs and interpretive displays at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 19

"Keeps the signs to a minimum."

(Individual, Comment #19-10)

Concern #60: The NPS should build a foot bridge over Tenaya Creek at the Tenaya Lake outlet.

Letter Number: 22

"I am also concerned about access from the parking lot to the lake at the East end of the Lake. Over the years, use trails have developed, some of which are dead ends into the mud during early season. As much as I appreciate the wilderness, this is such a heavily used section of the park that I think it would be valuable to create designated walking paths from the parking lot to the beach and restore all of the other areas that have become trampled over the years."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #22-3)

Concern #61: The NPS should avoid providing any commercial services at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 19

"I doubt you are considering it, but nothing should be sold or rented at Tenaya Lake. It is nice to have a slightly developed place with no concessions or money or signs."

(Individual, Comment #19-9)

Concern #62: The NPS should reduce the commercial tour bus service at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 10

"The tour bus drops them off on the east end, drives up the road a quarter mile, and picks them up again. This occurs every fifteen minutes, at least in late September, all day long. When will you say enough is enough? Commercial impacts on Yosemite are over burdening these non-front country areas now. Don't encourage it."

(Individual, Comment #10-5)

Transportation and Parking

Concern #63: The NPS should consider parking issues along Tioga Road and related visitor safety issues.

Letter Numbers: 18, 20, 25

"One note: tour buses now stop alongside the lake below Stately Pleasure Dome, disgorging dazed passengers who wander into traffic while the driver tries to herd them back to the sidewalk."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-6)

"Haphazard parking along Tioga road needs to be significantly reduced or eliminated. Especially problematic are day use vehicles, including large tour buses, continuously parked along the eastern shoreline where they present an unacceptable impact to the view shed quality of the entire area. This is perhaps the most serious problem impacting the environmental quality at Tenaya."

(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-2)

"Our Center agrees with park staff that the current parking situation for Tenaya Lake visitors can be dangerous with cars parked along Hwy 120 adjacent to traffic moving at 35 to 50 mph or more. We agree that remediation is needed for this parking-public safety issue."

(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-1)

Concern #64: The NPS should reduce the commercial tour bus activity on roadside at east end of Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 18

"We suggest that tour buses be required to proceed to the east end parking lot, and that a trail paralleling the road be developed to allow these and others to walk to the lake in an orderly fashion. Some thought should be given to installing sitting benches so that bus passengers and others who aren't spending a lot of time at the beaches could still enjoy the view from the edges of the lake near the road."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-7)

Concern #65: The NPS should create parking space in order to alleviate roadside parking at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Numbers: 16, 22, 24

"This continuing erosion and destruction of flora and habitat can be easily halted, and the damaged ground restored, through parking and traffic controls."

(Individual, Comment #16-12)

"I think it would be beneficial to have specifically designated (i.e. striped) parking spaces and also well defined no parking zones between the West end of Tenaya Lake and the trailhead to Murphy Creek. This would make it much safer for visitors to the park to drive through this area and anyone who wishes to use the picnic tables would then park in well designated and accessible spaces. Enforcing this by writing tickets to those offenders who park with their car sticking out in the road or in the no parking zones would help a lot."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #22-2)

"Demand for parking at the Sunrise trail head is often far in excess of the designated parking space capacity, resulting in parking along the shoulders of the road for great distances. ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: Can additional parking space be created in order to reduce the number of vehicles parked along the road shoulders? If not, what other actions might be available to address the problem?"
(Individual, Comment #24-8)

Concern #66: The NPS should consider the impacts to riparian habitat associated with development of new parking areas at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 25

"We question where appropriate expanded parking could be located due to environmental constraints at the lake. Directly east of the lake lies sensitive marshy, riparian habitat that remains wet throughout the summer. This riparian corridor stretches from the current parking area by the toilets all the way to the base of the granite cliffs. Avoiding this riparian habitat and associated marshy areas may preclude any new development of a parking area or other facilities that might otherwise be located to the east of the lake."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #25-3)

Concern #67: The NPS should relocate parking into the Lodgepole tree cover in limited areas outside of congressionally designated wilderness.

Letter Number: 20

"Some day-use parking could be relocated into Lodgepole tree cover in limited areas outside the congressionally designated wilderness boundary along the Tioga road. For example there might be some opportunity in this restricted area near the Sunrise trail head parking lot north of Tioga road, and there may be some others. There is NOT sufficient space available in the area to accommodate the numbers of vehicles that currently park along Tioga road. This reality will require initiating increased scheduled shuttle service from Tuolumne and Valley locations and perhaps reducing the present level of day use at Tenaya Lake."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-3)

Concern #68: The NPS should manage roadside parking for all recreational users along the 120 corridor, not only areas that are accessed by climbers.

Letter Number: 18

"Parking. We understand that a goal of park planning in the Highway 120 corridor generally is to eliminate or reduce the impact of roadside shoulder parking, -in part because of safety concerns, in part because of the visual impact of vehicles on the natural environment, and in part because it's simply untidy. Against these values must be balanced the value of convenient access to the park's stunning resources. We would support closing the base of Statelyle Pleasure Dome to climber parking if this were part of an overall plan to eliminate roadside parking along the lake shore for all recreational users. Ansel Adams has a famous photo of Tenaya Lake taken from the west end in which it is impossible to discern the road, and no cars are visible. We think the plan should strive for a vision of the lake in which vehicles areas invisible as possible."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-5)

Concern #69: The NPS should consider the environmental impacts of developing additional parking areas at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 10

"There is nothing you can do to gain parking without claiming virgin natural areas at Tenaya Lake. The idea that parking areas are not well defined, or lack signage is questionable. The parking along the road is narrow, but what are you going to do, widen the road?"
(Individual, Comment #10-6)

Concern #70: The NPS should establish a Tuolumne shuttle stop in a paved turnout for its sole use (no other parking allowed).

Letter Number: 16

"The Tuolumne Shuttle, which stops here, needs a designated, paved turnout for its sole use, with no visitor parking allowed there."
(Individual, Comment #16-17)

Concern #71: The NPS should improve egress and ingress from Tioga Road and day use areas at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 24

"Turning left (west) onto the road from the Murphy Creek day use area can be problematic, and potentially dangerous, because the curvature of the road interferes with a clear view of oncoming traffic. Perhaps a merging lane needs to be created. Or perhaps the entrance needs to be relocated. Getting traffic to slow down would help. ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED: How can the ingress/egress for the Murphy Creek day use area be made less dangerous?"
(Individual, Comment #24-9)

Concern #72: The NPS should not address management of traffic and congestion in this scoping period.

Letter Number: 4

"Any ideas you have to control congestion and traffic should not be addressed here in the Tenaya Lake scoping study."
(Individual, Comment #4-6)

Park Operations

Concern #73: The NPS should improve the infrastructure and restore the natural features at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 18

"Lack of funds for maintenance has left infrastructure and improvements in poor condition. Tenaya may be a beauty, but she is dressed in rags, and we welcome the opportunity this plan presents to restore her natural grace."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-3)

Concern #74: The NPS should improve the Tenaya Lake area by cleaning public toilets and emptying tanks more frequently.

Letter Number: 6

"A very, very simple improvement would be to clean, or empty the public toilets near the parking area in a timely fashion. I was up there the last week of August and they were horrific in the filth and smell. They were unusable."
(Individual, Comment #6-1)

Concern #75: The NPS should approach the modest facility development component of this planning effort with a sustainable perspective.

Letter Number: 18

"Because the facilities likely to be built under the plan will certainly be modest, the Plan presents the opportunity to approach facilities planning in the park from an entirely new and sustainable perspective."
(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-19)

Out of Scope Concerns

The comments in this document listed under “Concern #1” through “Concern #75” were screened as comments that fall within the reasonable scope of the Tenaya Lake Plan and will be addressed in its compliance document (EA or EIS). Listed below are comments and concerns that were screened as those public concerns that do not meet the purpose and need of the Tenaya Lake Plan planning process, and therefore, will not be addressed in this planning document, but will be considered with regard to overall park operations and practices.

Planning Process and Policy

Concern #76: The NPS should continue to develop the Yosemite Transportation Plan.

Letter Number: 7

"I was under the impression from Jen that the Yosemite Transportation Plan was next up in the planning review sequence. Why the change?"
(Individual, Comment #7-1)

Screen Category: 1-1 Out-of-Scope or unrelated to project

Ecosystem Processes

Concern #77: The NPS should continue its strategies for managing visitor use at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 19

"I have been visiting Tenaya Lake for 20 years and on most days the visitor management seems fine. There is some resource damage but I think it is at manageable levels."
(Individual, Comment #19-1)

Screen Category: 1-6 - An unsupported opinion or a simple statement of fact with no stated or implied request for action by the National Park Service.

The Sound Environment

Concern #78: The NPS should reduce road level noise (especially motorcycles) by reducing the speed limit, or by providing road-side berms.

Letter Number: 18

"Natural Quiet. The highway can be a source of unwanted vehicle noise for those enjoying the lake, beaches and surrounding cliffs. One way to reduce the noise level is to reduce the speed

level, particularly in the case of motorcycles with altered mufflers, which are inexplicably allowed free rein in the park. Another is to provide raised road-side berms to deflect tire and engine noise."

(Recreational Organization, Comment #18-15)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but this will be addressed in another planning effort.

Access

Concern #79: The NPS should address the park-wide carrying capacity and create a reservation system.

Letter Number: 5

"... Why should Yosemite suffer the burdens of an ever-growing world? The number of Yosemite's visitors doubled again from the mid 1970s, only twenty years later, to over two-million people who visited Yosemite during that era. At that time there was already an effort underway to look for ways to reduce what was then described as "overcrowding" even before two-million visitors was reached by 1976, which was a movement which started in the late 1960s. Not surprisingly, that number of four-million visitors predictably occurred by the mid 1990s, having doubled in only twenty years. Yosemite's visitation is expected to double again in about ten more years from now if history repeats itself."

(Individual, Comment #5-13)

"Why not start now to make the hard decision to set up a reservation system?"

(Individual, Comment #5-23)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but this will be addressed in another planning effort.

Concern #80: The NPS should establish user carrying capacity limits and should enforce them at the entrance gates.

Letter Numbers: 17, 4, 5

"All traffic and crowding issues should be mitigated at the gate, and only at the gate, with a strictly enforced User Carrying Capacity limit on how many people are allowed to come into the park via day-tripping, on a day when established quotas are reached."

(Individual, Comment #4-9)

"Instead, you should be finding ways to discourage traffic (i.e. "overcrowding") at some of these otherwise pristine and special places that Yosemite offers. You should be dealing with congestion at the gate with a restrictive user carrying capacity that limits the amount of people allowed to come into the park on any given day, when too many people push the park's limits of

carrying that capacity."
(Individual, Comment #5-5)

"Some of what Mr. Brower made specific reference to, as it relates to Tenaya Lake, is in regards to the changes made during the Mission 66 expansions, which offer an historic record needed at a time when you might be considering what to do next, perhaps to accommodate the next generation of park visitors. As each generation of park planners tend to feel a need to accommodate the pressure put upon the park at every specific period in history, it can sadly be assumed that in the future, park planners will continue to widen and pave roads and parking lots as impacts from ever increasing tourist populations necessitate. Until such time that someone in the park service speaks out, tourism will inevitably increase. When that time comes, perhaps the park service will determine what a park wide "user carrying capacity" study should commence, so that overflow from Yosemite Valley will some day stop impacting Yosemite's remote areas such as Tenaya Lake and Tuolumne Meadows."

(Individual, Comment #17-3)

Screen Category: 1-9 -Out-of-Scope concern but this will be addressed in another planning effort.

Concern #81 The NPS should address the park-wide carrying capacity and limit access.

Letter Numbers: 10, 5

"Park management continues to create ways to spend that money while facilitating visitation to an ever-growing number of visitors without any thought to slowing down. At this rate, if the visitation continues to double every twenty years, Yosemite will need to accommodate in excess of sixteen-million people by 2046 and thirty-two million by 2066. It is an understatement to say that there is something wrong with this. What is worse, I have never heard the park service discuss this probability, or entertain any solutions to it. On the contrary, at the User Capacity Symposium that you sponsored last year, you even came out to say you opposed turning people away and were seeking other solutions to address the User Carrying Capacity court mandate."
(Individual, Comment #5-20)

"If I am wrong, perhaps you should just create a conveyor belt up Lyell Canyon with an escalator to the top of Mount Lyell? There are those who feel that more people should be able to experience this summit experience, and see that view. It is possible that you can eventually accommodate every tourist in the world? On a clear day up there you can see Mount Diablo. There are already those who say a duplicate set of cables should be installed on Half Dome, due to overcrowding that has been in the news of late. Can't someone within your organization step up and say "no" to the concept of "accommodating all who want to come" for a change?"
(Individual, Comment #5-22)

"I've said it before, but again, visitation has historically doubled every twenty years since 1954, when the first time in history Yosemite accommodated its first million visitors per year. Since

then the park has reached four million in the mid 1990s. One day the gates will need to shut when so many people arrive that every "front country" trail is overused. I guess you see it coming, which is why you want to pave and widen the trails, build larger parking areas, build gigantic restroom facilities for sixty people flowing out of a tour bus all at once, simply because commercial tour buses converge on the place in record numbers these days."
(Individual, Comment #10-8)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but this will be addressed in another planning effort.

Concern #82: The NPS should address the park-wide carrying capacity for areas accessible by car or by bus.

Letter Number: 15

"Below are two (2) historical newspaper articles, one from 1920 and another from 1921, being provided to show how historically the view is that overcrowding in Yosemite is not a new concept. One article is from Los Angeles and the other is from Oakland, CA. That view that the park was getting overcrowded has been perpetuated by the public for a very long time. But, rather than address a park wide carrying capacity for areas accessible by car or bus, the park simply mitigates the problem by creating ways to continue the promotion of tourism, without finding out what the actual carrying capacity is. How can you manage the park if you don't know its limits?"
(Individual, Comment #15-1)

"In this 1921 article, right after the notion put forth that "...many people still think that Yosemite is crowded to such an extent that they ought to go elsewhere for their outing", the newspaper takes the liberty to promote the view that "there is no need to stay away from the park, according to ten authoritative statements".

It's my guess that perhaps at least one of those stated "authoritative" statements that the park could accommodate more people were perhaps from the park service's then public relations specialist, just as is done to promote tourism in the park today. The use of the word "still" suggests that the park was then viewed as overcrowded by some in the public even before 1921.

This is relevant because, had someone in authority then done a park-wide carrying capacity study, presuming they would have known how at that time, which could have then limited visitation to a level deemed tolerable in 1921, the park could have been preserved unchanged for our generations way back then. I can't even imagine how wonderful it could have been to see the park with so few of tourists, back when the public would have viewed a few thousand people a year in the valley as being overcrowded. If you don't act now, there will come a time when the park will have to deal with ten million visitors a year without any idea what the park-wide carrying capacity should be."
(Individual, Comment #15-2)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but Take to Management for

consideration for any reason

Concern #83: The NPS should address user capacity (overcrowding) rather than accommodating all types and quantities of visitor use, with the use of special funds.

Letter Numbers: 10, 5

"From my observations, it seems that the Yosemite Fund's donation money is burning a hole in the pocket of park planners. There are many good projects the Yosemite Fund has contributed to, but this infrastructure rebuilds, designed to make it so that the park can accommodate more and more people as the world's population continues to increase, are not right."

(Individual, Comment #5-2)

"A park wide User Carrying Capacity study should take place first, before you do anymore so-called "improvements", with all of the public comments and debates that normally go along with such a study, well before you pave the way for more and more people that are surely going to come. This needs to be addressed now, so that the park won't one day have to potentially accommodate ten times the amount of people it does currently. Show some guts and address the tough decisions of a park wide User Carry Capacity before you accept Yosemite Fund money to rebuild things that will obviously lead to more overcrowding."

(Individual, Comment #5-6)

"(NPS should not be) interested in accommodating all who want to come to Tenaya Lake, and area that shouldn't need to accommodate as many people who are daily converging on that area now."

(Individual, Comment #10-1)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but Take to Management for consideration for any reason

Socio-economic Considerations

Concern #84: The NPS should increase entrance fees for commercial buses to reduce congestion at Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 5

"By not increasing your gate fees for tour buses, you encouraged the tour bus industry to cash in on Yosemite as a profit center, while at the same time you have increased gate fees for everyone else."

(Individual, Comment #5-15)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but Take to Management for consideration for any reason

Recreation

Concern #85: The NPS should designate the southeast beach of Tenaya Lake as "clothing optional".

Letter Number: 19

"Since the NPS likes to compartmentalize visitors the area on the east beach south of the Tenaya Creek inlet (farthest from the road) should be clothing optional. It already is that way so I suppose posting signs is unnecessary."
(Individual, Comment #19-7)

Screen Category: 1-2 - Already decided by law, regulation, national policy, or an approved park plan

Transportation

Concern #86: The NPS should re-locate Tioga Road away from the Tenaya Lake.

Letter Number: 20

"The NPS proposal to reduce visitor impacts, relocate and upgrade problematic restrooms, reroute social trails impacting sensitive resource areas, and other restoration efforts to mitigate visitor impacts are actions the Committee encourage and support."
(Conservation Organization, Comment #20-1)

Screen Category: 1-9 - Out-of-Scope concern but Take to Management for consideration for any reason

Park Operations

Concern #87: The NPS should reduce speed limit in the Tenaya lake area.

Letter Number: 19

"Some speed bumps might be a good way to slow down traffic."
(Individual, Comment #19-5)

Screen Category: 1-2 - Already decided by law, regulation, national policy, or an approved park plan

Screening Public Scoping Concerns

The purpose of the screening process is to identify whether a concern pertains to the purpose and need for the project and the level of action required by the planning team. All concern statements and supporting quotes presented in this document have been analyzed by park staff and assigned screening codes according to the criteria described below. Screening codes indicate how concerns will be addressed by the proposed project. When screening a public scoping concern, each supporting quote must be examined for the presence of a rationale (the “why”) supporting the requested action. All identified public concerns, whether supported by the comments of one person or many, are considered.

Screen #1 identifies public concerns that do not meet the purpose and need of the subject planning process, or are non-substantive, and therefore, will not warrant further consideration. These public concerns do not require management consideration. Any concern for which an affirmative answer can be given to one of the following questions falls in this category:

- 1.1 Is the concern outside the scope of the proposed action? (i.e., out-of-scope)
- 1.2 Does law or policy already decide the concern? (i.e., out-of-scope)
- 1.3 Is this the wrong planning level for a decision on this concern? (i.e., out-of-scope)
- 1.4 Would acting on the concern place untenable restrictions on management, conflict with approved plans, or entail significant and reasonably foreseeable negative consequences? (i.e., effectively out-of-scope)
- 1.5 Is the concern a simple editorial correction? (i.e., no response needed)
- 1.6 Is the concern an unsupported personal opinion (i.e., a question, problem, suggestion, or interest, with no supporting “why”); or a simple statement of fact with no request for action, stated or implied? (A non-substantive concern)
- 1.9 Out-of-Scope but take to Management for consideration for any reason
Concerns that do not reasonably match the above criteria are considered within the scope of the subject plan, could be substantive, and are passed on to screen #2.

Screen #2 defines concerns and comments that fall within the reasonable scope of the project and will be addressed in its compliance document (EA or EIS):

- 2.0 Scoping concern defining an issue already to be addressed within the scope of the planning document, as initially described to the public
- 2.1 Review concern requesting a technical correction (an EA or EIS)
- 2.2 Review concern requesting an action that can be addressed in FONSI (EA), or by rewriting document text for substance or clarification (DEIS, FEIS, ROD)
- 2.3 Review concern requesting an action adequately addressed in the planning document (EA or EIS (including alternatives considered and dismissed); still may need a response in the *Response to Public Comment*)
- 2.8 Scoping concern defining an issue expanding the scope of a project, as initially defined, that now will be included in the project scope on the decision of the project manager.

- 2.9 Scoping concern defining an issue expanding the scope of a project as initially defined that will not be included in the project scope on the decision of the project manager.

Screen #3 defines concerns and comments that fall within the reasonable scope of the project and will be addressed in its compliance document (EA or EIS) and are coded using the same structure as that of Screen #2. However, these concerns may warrant further consideration by the management team:

- 3.0 Scoping concern defining an issue already to be addressed within the scope of the planning document, as initially described to the public
- 3.1 Review concern requesting a technical correction (an EA or EIS)
- 3.2 Review concern requesting an action that can be addressed in FONSI (EA), or by rewriting document text for substance or clarification (DEIS, FEIS, ROD)
- 3.3 Review concern requesting an action adequately addressed in the planning document (EA or EIS (including alternatives considered and dismissed); still may need a response in the *Response to Public Comment*)
- 3.8 Scoping concern defining an issue expanding the scope of a project, as initially defined, that now will be included in the project scope on the decision of the project manager.
- 3.9 Scoping concern defining an issue expanding the scope of a project as initially defined that will not be included in the project scope on the decision of the project manager.

Screen #4 defines substantive concerns that need to be reviewed by park management. As defined in the National Park Service Director's Order #12 Handbook (*Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making*) and Council of Environmental Quality regulations, a concern is "substantive" if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- 4.0 Scoping comment that expands, with reasonable basis, the scope of the project as initially defined to the public
- 4.1 Questions, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information presented
- 4.2 Questions, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of analysis presented
- 4.3 Questions or helps clarify, improve, or evaluate, with reasonable basis, the appropriate use or span of the park's authority (this includes appropriate scale of planning, public involvement, and legal authorities)
- 4.4 Presents a reasonable new alternative (i.e., not included or considered and dismissed)
- 4.5 Calls for, with reasonable basis, or results in a modification of the proposal
- 4.6 Calls for or would require, with reasonable basis, additional analysis
- 4.9 A substantive concern on which the project manager makes a decision without management review when an issue raised has been sufficiently discussed with the management team