

3.6 Open House

Letter OH1 **No Name**

August 15, 2019

Comment OH1-1

Who wants this –

The citizens don't want the fire danger or the heavy traffic

Give us a Q & A Forum with a microphone at your next session please!

Response OH1-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 2, Public Engagement, in Section 3.2.2 of this Final EIR/EIS, which summarizes the timeline and opportunities for public involvement. Master Response 3, Wildfire, addresses efforts that would be implemented with the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, addresses traffic concerns.

Letter OH2 **Mary Gorden**

August 15, 2019

Comment OH2-1

What would the people who come to the expanded area do. The area only supports a limited number of hiking trails and the proposed in flux of people would over run them

Whatever is done in going fire maintenance needs to be upgraded. Adding campsites w/ fire pits is an open invitation to fire and this in a populated area even if it is urban this will encourage more people to go to the (see page 2)

Continued from page 1

Confluence. Which is already the deadliest area for drowning deaths in California. You want to bring in more people???

Why don't we take the money and improve existing state parks including historical sites being closed for lack of money

How can you insure that if such an expansion has done that it will be properly maintained.

Response OH2-1

As described in more detail in Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, in Section 3.2.1 of this Final EIR/EIS, visitation to ASRA/APL has increased over the last several decades and is expected to continue to steadily increase, regardless of whether a GP/RMP is adopted. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP acknowledges this reality and includes strategies to manage the increased visitation, while reducing wildfire risk, protecting natural and cultural resources, and providing high-quality recreation opportunities consistent with the purpose of a State Recreation Area. To this end, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes new and expanded parking areas, day use facilities, campgrounds, and other visitor-serving facilities. Additionally, the GP/RMP includes Guideline V 2.1 and

Guideline FAC 6.I that require preparation of a Road and Trail Management Plan to construct new trails as well as make other trail improvements. If every facility allowed by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was constructed at the maximum size, the capacity for visitation would increase by approximately 33 percent over the next 20 or more years. In this scenario, visitor capacity would result in a minor increase over the level of visitation that is expected without adoption of a GP/RMP.

See Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, in Section 3.2.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, which addresses wildfire risks, including from new campgrounds, and describes efforts of the GP/RMP to reduce those risks.

The comment's suggestion to improve existing state parks, including historical sites, was considered by Reclamation and CSP but has not been made at this time. The GP/RMP does include goals and guidelines that support protecting and preserving cultural resources in ASRA/APL; documenting and evaluating all cultural resources (archaeological, historical, and tribal cultural resources); and working with Native American groups to protect tribal cultural resources.

Refer to response to comment I151-2, which addresses a number of concerns raised by commenters regarding drowning risk in ASRA/APL. This response includes a discussion of the relationship between implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and drowning risk. This response also describes efforts that are taken by CSP to reduce that risk and provide public safety measures, and identifies outreach efforts supported by the goals and guidelines of the GP/RMP to educate the public about drowning hazards in ASRA/APL.

Letter OH3 Austin Patty
August 15, 2019

Comment OH3-1
49 Hwy is maxed out!

Build a Bridge first!

Response OH3-1

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. This comment was considered by Reclamation and CSP but is not made to the GP/RMP at this time. Refer to Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS, which summarizes the measures to alleviate congestion on SR 49 near the Confluence.

Letter OH4 Bonnie Grimm
August 15, 2019

Comment OH4-1

Traffic on Hwy 49 is already heavy, & parking & foot traffic is hazardous & of great concern to local residents. Accidents & oversized rigs on 49 thru the canyon greatly impact local residents. I don't see any way to improve traffic flow & congestion if more vehicles/RVs are added to the already marginal traffic flow.

Parking at the Confluence on weekends & holidays is a nightmare, with many accidents & illegally parked vehicles already.

Response OH4-1

The comment expresses concern regarding traffic, parking, and roadway safety related to the vehicular traffic that the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP could add to the area. The comment is an expression of opposition to the addition of new project-generated trips. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses concerns related to traffic.

Comment OH4-2

The increased risk of fire in this area is of great concern. We already have difficulty getting home insurance. Adding careless campfires & attracting homeless camps to this area greatly increased danger of wildfire.

Response OH4-2

Please see Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which discusses the risk of wildfire associated with the GP/RMP. It describes proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk. Many of the strategies in the GP/RMP would not only reduce risks associated with implementation of the plan but would also reduce the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL more broadly. Master Response 3 further addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH4-3

Also – what will be the source of water & how will waste water be disposed of? Will it be taken from local groundwater & will it affect our local water tables?

Response OH4-3

See responses to comments A6-1 and O12-19, which clarify potential needs for new water supplies at ASRA/APL and addresses water supply concerns and effects of water demand in ASRA/APL on other nearby water users.

A septic tank could be installed at the Cool Staging Facility. However, most new restrooms that would be constructed in ASRA/APL would be vault toilets. As described under Impact 4.13-2 on pages 4.13-5 and 4.13-6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, vault and septic systems must be pumped out by a septic tank service truck, which hauls the waste offsite to a certified location (e.g., wastewater treatment plant). Treatment of wastewater through these systems occurs through contracts between the treatment facility and the septic tank service provider. Thus, wastewater would be accepted by wastewater treatment facilities only when capacity is available and the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would not substantially affect capacity at a municipal wastewater treatment plant. Water demands, if any, from proposed facilities may be met by a variety of sources, including potentially GDPUD surface supply and local groundwater.

Comment OH4-4

Is there an evacuation plan? There are a limited number of evacuation routes – I am concerned about large numbers of local residents trying to evacuate during a wildfire, & being blocked by campers & RVs not familiar with routes of blocking evacuation routes.

And with only one road out behind the firehouse if the fire cuts off that route, many people would not make it out of the fire zone.

Response OH4-4

Master Response 3 provides information regarding proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk associated with the GP/RMP, including coordination for emergency and evacuation response planning among various agencies responsible for wildfire emergency response, and other

actions to improve emergency access, evacuation, and fire suppression in the event of a wildfire or other emergency. Several emergency response guidelines have also been expanded, as described in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS. Taken together, these measures would result in substantial emergency response improvements over existing conditions.

Letter OH5 Richard Grimm

August 15, 2019

Comment OH5-1

My concerns are with the increased traffic congestion and increased fire danger. Public agencies have a history of being reactive rather than being practical. It does no resident any good to respond to fires once they start.

Out of area visitors are not going to be concerned with fire danger. The devastation of the Camp Fire could very easily happen here.

Traffic is heavy now without adding to the burden of the canyon!

We have been asked to vote on increasing our taxes because the local fire houses are understaffed.

Increasing the burden on the local fire houses is unconscionable.

Evacuation would be very difficult in a out of control wild fire; Adding to the traffic congestion is unacceptable.

Response OH5-1

The comment expresses concern regarding traffic and emergency evacuation of the vehicular traffic that the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP could add to the area. See Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, in Section 3.2.3 of this Final EIR/EIS for a description of the proposed GP/RMP strategies to reduce wildfire fuels, reduce the risk of human-caused ignitions, and improve wildfire suppression and emergency evacuation readiness. Additionally, Master Response 3 discusses the relationship between wildfire risk and visitation.

The comment expresses opposition to the addition of new project-generated trips. This comment was considered by Reclamation and CSP in finalizing the GP/RMP. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, that discusses concerns related to traffic.

Letter OH6 William Kirby, MD

August 15, 2019

Comment OH6-1

I. Stop all smoking

Response OH6-1

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. This comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP, which includes Guideline RES 9.2, which identifies the potential to prohibit smoking in ASRA/APL as a precautionary safety measure. Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, in Section 3.2.1 of this Final EIR/EIS, which clarifies the process through which planning of future facilities would involve site-specific planning and design, project-level environmental review, and public engagement.

Comment OH6-2

2. Trail from uptown Auburn to the Robie Point Trail

Response OH6-2

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, which is not made at this time but is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes Guideline V 2.1 and Guideline FAC 6.1 that require preparation of a Road and Trail Management Plan to construct new trails as well as make other trail improvements and would include a public engagement process to obtain input for preparation of the plan.

Letter OH7 Dorothy Rohrer

August 15, 2019

Comment OH7-1

I think it would be nice to have more camping opportunities around here. It would be nice to also have camping for RVs.

Response OH7-1

The comment's expression of support for camping opportunities was considered by Reclamation and CSP.

Comment OH7-2

I would also like to see more "flat" type trails that disabled people like myself could use with my mobility scooter.

I am not that familiar with the area yet since I have only lived for a year & a half, but would enjoy being about to take some walks without having to go straight up or down.

Response OH7-2

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding trails, which is not incorporated into the GP/RMP at this time. This comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP. Refer to Guidelines FAC 2.7 and OP 5.1, which address improvements to existing facilities to provide increased access for users with mobility difficulties.

Letter OH8 Biff Brethour

August 15, 2019

Comment OH8-1

I am totally opposed to the expansion of the camp sites because of increased traffic, the extreme fire hazard, the lack of water and fire resources, the remoteness and the lack of the ability to monitor and enforce order – Don't kid yourself, the roads, canyons & river make it impossible for the park rangers to be effective. This will also create an environment to draw more homeless which will bring more crime. Just last year a fire started on the Foresthill side by the river and quickly jumped the river & headed for Georgetown! If the wind blew the other way – to Cool! Auburn Lake Trails.

Response OH8-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response I).

Letter OH9 No Name

August 15, 2019

Comment OH9-1

Please no campsites anywhere in this area! Seriously consider fire & equestrian safety. Enhancing day use at station 72 ok. Please do not allow motorized vehicles in this area.

Response OH9-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites and motorized vehicles in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

The comment's expression of opposition to opening some roads in the Knickerbocker and Auburn Interface Management Zone to public vehicle access was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Consistent with revised Guideline MZ 3.1 included in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS, alternate trail routes would be constructed where necessary for public safety and resource conservation prior to opening the road to public vehicle use. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which discusses the rationale providing new public vehicle access along Knickerbocker and Salt Creek/Rocky Island Bar Roads.

Comment OH9-2

Please offer our communities the opportunity to voice their concerns in a meeting/forum format

Include CALFIRE, Divide Horseman's Assoc and others in these conversations. Listen to our voices – folks feel like they have been blindsided

Response OH9-2

Refer to Master Response 2, Public Engagement, in Section 3.2.2 of this Final EIR/EIS, which summarizes the timeline and opportunities for public involvement. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH9-3

Trail maintenance would be welcome

No new roads and no motorized vehicles please

Consider wildlife

Response OH9-3

The comment's expression of support for trail maintenance and opposition to new roads and motorized vehicles was considered by Reclamation and CSP. See response to comment OH9-1, above. The comment's suggestion for no new roads and no motorized vehicles is not made to the GP/RMP at this time.

Section 4.17, Wildlife, of the Draft EIR/EIS considers wildfire as requested by the commenter. Refer also to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, in Section 3.2.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, which addresses wildfire risks and describes efforts of the GP/RMP to reduce those risks.

Letter OH10 Linnea Marengo

August 15, 2019

Comment OH10-1

Don't put more traffic on Highway 49. Especially improve the traffic area on the bridge from Auburn up to Cool.

Already unsafe – people w/children, dogs vs. autos/trucks.

Very dangerous.

Do not increase that traffic including pedestrian traffic.

Stop dangerous parking on Highway 49. Unsafe.

Make traffic & pedestrian shared areas safe.

Do not increase traffic on Highway 49.

Response OH10-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding traffic, which is not made to the GP/RMP at this time. Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, in Section 3.2.1 of this Final EIR, which outlines the GP/RMP's intent to manage expected increases in visitation to provide quality recreation and protect public safety.

Comment OH10-2

Fire safety big issue – especially newbies to the area say as tourists who do not know or care abt [sic] fires & fire safety.

Response OH10-2

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, in Section 3.2.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, which addresses strategies to reduce wildfire risk. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Letter OH11 Maureen Wilson

August 15, 2019

Comment OH11-1

As a South Auburn resident and frequent canyon hiker I am much in favor of the Auburn-Cool trail bridge.

Response OH11-1

This comment is consistent with the GP/RMP, which includes guidelines that support development of a trail bridge across the lower North Fork of the American River and providing a trail system that connects Auburn and Cool (Guidelines MZ 4.1 and MZ 4.2)

Comment OH11-2

I am also in favor of the Guided Mine Tours, having been an active member of the steering committee that worked for several years on developing tours of the Mtn Quarry Mine. There is huge public interest in the mine and it would be a big draw and possible revenue source.

Response OH11-2

This comment is consistent with the GP/RMP, which includes Guideline MZ 11.3 that supports providing guided mine tours at Mountain Quarries Mine.

Letter OH12 Carol Timonerman

August 15, 2019

Comment OH12-1

I visited Pennisula [sic] Campground off Rattlesnake bar 3 times in July on a Tues, Wed, & Thurs. of 100 sites 4 were occupied on Tues, 2 occupied Wed and 1 occupied Thurs. I talked to the Ranger on duty and asked if the campground was ever over full. He said only a few sites are occupied during the week but on weekends, the campground was full.

Why build more campsites for close to Pennisula [sic] when Pennisula [sic] is under used. A POOR use of state and federal lands and a huge maintenance nightmare for something not used but on weekends.

Response OH12-1

As described in more detail in Master Response 1, visitation to ASRA/APL has increased over the last several decades and is expected to continue to steadily increase, regardless of whether a GP/RMP is adopted. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP acknowledges this reality and includes strategies to manage that increased visitation, while reducing wildfire risk, protecting natural and cultural resources, and providing high-quality recreation opportunities consistent with the purpose of a State Recreation Area. To this end, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes new and expanded parking areas, day use facilities, campgrounds, and other visitor-serving facilities to expand visitor capacity and help reduce congestion in more heavily used areas of ASRA/APL and during heavy use periods, such a summer weekends. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP identifies appropriate camping opportunities, that could help to reduce congestion at existing campgrounds in ASRA/APL and reduce the potential for unauthorized camping. This component of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP is also intended to respond to a substantial unmet demand for camping opportunities in the region, consistent with the purpose of ASRA/APL as an SRA. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH13 Dave Fujiyama

August 15, 2019

Comment OH13-1

Establishing campsites that require access through the town of Cool will create traffic hazards and congestion on Hwy 49 between Auburn and Cool. It's already congested and visitors who walk along parked cars at the Confluence know the traffic hazards already – imagine the increased risk that will arise from even MORE vehicular traffic that would be caused by the installation of campsites.

Response OH13-1

The comment expresses concern regarding traffic, parking, and roadway safety related to the vehicular traffic that the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP could add to the area. The comment expresses opposition to the addition of new project-generated trips. This comment was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1). This comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH13-2

I'm concerned also about fire. We all know that visitors' campfires – legal or not – have been implicated in numerous wildfires in the American River Canyon. I'm against the construction of more campsites!

Response OH13-2

The comment expresses opposition to the addition of new campsites. This comment was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH14 Chris & Michele Turney

August 15, 2019

Comment OH14-1

We cannot handle the traffic or the lack of water or infrastructure for fire suppression.

High fire danger

NO!

Response OH14-1

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS, which discusses concerns about traffic.

See response to comment O12-19 regarding concerns related to water supply and infrastructure for fire suppression.

Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, provides a detailed discussion of wildfire risks and the efforts that would be taken with the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce wildfire risks.

Letter OH15 Margi Dunlop

August 15, 2019

Comment OH15-1

Not enough water

Response OH15-1

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses water supply concerns.

Comment OH15-2

Fire danger – enhanced by campsites and more people

Response OH15-2

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH15-3

Additional trash – campsites might be used by homeless and people less cautions [sic] about fire.

Response OH15-3

See response to comment I50-1, which addresses concerns related to homeless people in ASRA/APL. See response to comment I68-1, which addresses how trash would be handled with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Comment OH15-4

Money would be better used maintain existing parks, trails, etc.

Response OH15-4

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding use of funding. This comment was considered by Reclamation and but has not been made to the GP/RMP at this time.

Letter OH16 Jerome Prideaux

August 15, 2019

Comment OH16-1

Too much traffic in this area already – especially on weekends with tourists passing through.

Response OH16-1

See Master Response 4, which discusses traffic concerns associated with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

Comment OH16-2

Campsites are not compatible with this residential area. Campsites with restrooms will attract the homeless to the area who will be a nuisance, hanging around the Cool shopping center. This is just too close to residences/Auburn Lake Trails!

Response OH16-2

The campsites are proposed within a state park located on federal and state lands within a rural area. Campsites are a compatible use on these lands. Compatibility of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP with adopted plans and policies are assessed in Impact 4.11-1 in Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Reclamation and CSP would continue to coordinate with local agencies throughout project implementation to maintain consistency with local land use policies to the extent feasible while recognizing that state and federal lands are exempt from city or county land use and zoning regulations. Also, see response to comment I50-1, which addresses concerns related to homeless people in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH16-3

Fire concern – with many campsites added to this area our fire risk will be increased dramatically. Already insurance companies are either cancelling policies or raising rates substantially.

Response OH16-3

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. Master Response 3 further addresses concerns related to homeowner’s insurance.

Letter OH17 Linda Prideaux

August 15, 2019

Comment OH17-1

Traffic would be a problem as there are only 3 exit routes from our community (Auburn Lake Trails.

Response OH17-1

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Comment OH17-2

People camping might not be as careful with fires-especially if it is a large number of campers.

Response OH17-2

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Letter OH18 Margo Glendenning

August 15, 2019

Comment OH18-1

Fire Risk

Septic + water issues

Traffic and road issues

Parking is a problem

We do not want campgrounds of any kind –

Too risky for fire

Also concerns with septic issues and water issues

Also

Too much traffic on our roads now

So concerns are:

Fire

Traffic

Septic + water issues

We do not want campgrounds do [sic] to fire issues

Also traffic/road issues

Also water + septic issues

We already have parking issues at Confluence.

Response OH18-1

Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, provides a detailed discussion of wildfire risks and the efforts that would be implemented with the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce wildfire risks.

See response to comment OH4-3, which addresses concerns related to restrooms, including restrooms that might rely on a septic system.

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which discusses concerns about traffic and parking.

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply.

The comment's expression of opposition to new campgrounds was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH19 Ann Yoshimura

August 15, 2019

Comment OH19-1

I don't want any more development in this area.

Fires are started by people 90% of the time. We do not need more people here as it increases potential fires in this area.

I also do not want our water source impacted. Water is already costly, if we run out as a result of population we cannot get more, also we would likely have to pay more as we run out of water.

No new development.

Reasons against:

Response OH19-1

The comment's expression of opposition to more development in ASRA/APL was considered by Reclamation and CSP. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

See Master Response 3, which discusses the potential wildfire risk associated with the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and actions that would be taken to reduce wildfire risk with implementation of the GP/RMP. Master Response 3 also addresses ignition sources of wildfire.

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply.

Comment OH19-2

1. Fire danger increases 90% are started by people

Response OH19-2

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Comment OH19-3

2. Decreases water access for people already here
3. Likely to increase water taxes as well as fire taxes

Response OH19-3

See response to comment O12-19 that addresses concerns related to water supply. The comment about increasing taxes does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH19-4

4. Unable to get fire insurance as it is this will make it even more difficult if not impossible to get fire insurance.

Response OH19-4

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. Master Response 3 further addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH19-5

5. Road parking & traffic increases impact our commute

Response OH19-5

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses parking and traffic impacts of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

Comment OH19-6

No proper notification prior to planning – this meeting is insufficient as it is all self study – no one is generating a conversation to people living here, not sufficient notification

This meeting is insufficient

We did not get notified until you were already in implementation phase

Individual meeting instead of an open discussion that everyone could hear and respond.

This is a divide & conquer approach & is not a fair representation of the facts

Response OH19-6

Refer to Master Response 2, Public Engagement, which summarizes the timeline and opportunities for public involvement. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Letter OH20 Monte Kruger

August 15, 2019

Comment OH20-1

*The general plan fails to address the impact the development of the Knickerbocker campsite development will have on the traffic on Hwy 49 on the health & safety of the local residences. Hwy 49 is already choked with traffic causing unsafe conditions. Adding 250+ campsites would increase an already dangerous situation.

Response OH20-1

See Master Response 4, which addresses traffic concerns related to implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, including new campsites. The Draft EIR/EIS analyzed traffic impacts from development in ASRA/APL related to intersection operations, roadway segment operations, emergency access, and short-term traffic impacts in Impacts 4.12-1, 4.12-2, 4.12-5, and 4.12-6 in Section 4.12, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

As discussed in Master Response 1, the maximum number of additional new campsites that could be built with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would be up to 142 sites (135 individual sites and seven group sites), which is reduced from the maximum number of new campsites identified in the original GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS .

Comment OH20-2

Adding 250+ campsites also increases the potential of wild fire! We residents already pay exorbitant costs in fire insurance & live with the threat of wild fire every season. Adding camping fires is irresponsible -

Response OH20-2

See response to comment OH20-1, which addresses the number of new campsites that could be developed at ASRA/APL. Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, discusses the risk of wildfire including that which might result from development of campgrounds and campsites proposed under the GP/RMP. It provides background information on the risk of wildfire from campsites within ASRA/APL, and a description of proposed GP/RMP strategies designed to reduce that risk. As described in response to comment OH20-1, the maximum number of new campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL has been reduced. The evaluation provided in this Final EIR/EIS, which includes this document and the Draft EIR/EIS, found that the measures proposed by the GP/RMP to reduce the wildfire risk associated with the GP/RMP would be sufficiently protective. Master Response 3 further addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH20-3

Cost & where is the funding coming from – cont – to fund this project? Where is the budget prospective?

Response OH20-3

See Master Response I, which describes the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and explains the programmatic nature of the GP/RMP. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP is a broad-based policy document that provides management goals and guidelines and identifies facility improvements for a park unit. Goals are set for management of the area, establishment of desirable use levels, and identification of types of development and land uses. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP is sufficiently detailed to direct future development, but remains flexible enough to allow resolution of day-to-day problems. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP does not approve any new facilities, which would each require a separate planning, design, and approval process. With implementation of new Guideline FAC 9.1, comprehensive project-level planning would include evaluation of and provision for funding and the level of staffing needed to operate and manage the facility. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes goals and guidelines to seek funding to support implementation of the GP/RMP and opportunities to increase revenues at ASRA/APL through opportunities such as paid parking (Goals OP 6 and OP 7 and Guidelines OP 6.1 through OP 6.4 and OP 7.1 through OP 7.4). Other potential funding sources could be provided by CSP.

Comment OH20-4

Enforcement – How is added enforcement going to be budgeted? Adding 250+ campsites cannot be managed without added enforcement – In fact improvements, if any and need added enforcement. There isn't enough enforcement currently how do you expect to keep the environment protected without added enforcement?

Response OH20-4

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing needs based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guidelines OP 2.2 and OP 3.3 support development of partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, including related to law enforcement and emergency response that could help augment CSP law enforcement. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers to prevent and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance. As described in Master Response I, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of additional campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL to 142 campsites, which is reduced from the maximum number of new campsites identified in the original GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS (224 sites [220 individual sites and four group sites]).

Letter OH21 Steve Sheldon

August 15, 2019

Comment OH21-1

General: Please continue with recreation enhancement option district wide except for new campgrounds. I use ASRA facilities 75 times per week in most resource areas and it is apparent existing resource areas and it is apparent existing resources are spread too thin as it is. Trails are overgrown with star thistle & poison oak, erosion not controlled. Rare staffing of rangers at Clementine Lake. Also, severe consequences on increased fire hazards.

Response OH21-1

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding recreation enhancements. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response I). Refer to Master Response I,

Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which summarizes the GP/RMP's intent to manage the expected increase in visitation to provide quality recreation and protect resources and public safety.

Comment OH21-2

Knickerbocker: MZ 1.1 & MZ 6.2 – Advise no campground due to fire hazard resource limitations, and poor location (arid, minimal shade)

Response OH21-2

The comment's expression of opposition to Guidelines MZ 1.1 and MZ 6.2 of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses risk of wildfire associated with campsites. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH21-3

MZ 2.2 Auburn to Cool trail connection should include bike access, not currently available.

Improve and expand Auburn Interface trails with bike access prior to any bridge construction.

Response OH21-3

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding bike access, which is not made to the GP/RMP at this time but could be incorporated into the Road and Trail Management Plan required by Guideline RES V 2.1.

Comment OH21-4

MZ 13 – Agreed. Maintain and improve Lower Lake Clementine power boat facilities. Ramp, marine, etc.

Response OH21-4

The comment expresses support for Goal MZ 13 of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, which was considered by Reclamation and CSP.

Comment OH21-5

MZ 19 – Agreed. Improve water recreation options but need some way to limit parking by hikers which disallow water recreation w/ low parking count.

Response OH21-5

The comment expresses support for Goal MZ 19. The comment also requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP concerning water recreation options and parking, which is not made to the GP/RMP at this time.

Comment OH21-6

MZ 20 – Additional trails are great, should be multi-use.

Response OH21-6

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding the nature of trails, which is not made to the GP/RMP at this time but could be incorporated into the Road and Trail Management Plan required by Guideline RES V 2.1. Refer to Goal MZ 20 of the GP/RMP, which discusses the development of a multi-use trail.

Comment OH21-7

MZ 22.2 Expand OHV use to 6x/week and improve trails & track

Response OH21-7

The comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP, including Guidelines MZ 22.1 and MZ 22.3 that support making improvements to trails and the track in the Mammoth Bar Management Zone.

Comment OH21-8

MZ 27.4: Any new bridge funding and construction should be for multi-use trails. IE bike should be allowed on new bridge and adjoining trails if existing users cannot tolerate multi-use on WS trail, additional public expenses for a new bridge should benefit all user groups.

Response OH21-8

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding multi-use trails which is not made to the GP/RMP at this time but could be incorporated into the Road and Trail Management Plan required by Guideline RES V 2.1.

Comment OH21-9

Mammoth Bar: Allow additional access and trail facilities for cyclists, and allow cycling groups to contribute to the trail improvements. This has proven very successful in Downieville, South Lake Tahoe, and North Lake Tahoe (Prosser OHV Park)

Response OH21-9

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding Mammoth Bar. This comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP. This activity is not precluded from occurring in the future as the GP/RMP includes guidelines that support volunteer work in ASRA/APL (Guidelines OP 2.4, OP 2.5, OP 2.6, and OP 6.2).

Comment OH21-10

Last thought: build multi-use trail from Clementine to Ponderosa

Response OH21-10

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding trail connections. This comment is not inconsistent with GP/RMP Guideline MZ 12.3, which supports improving the Lake Clementine Trail in the Confluence View Activity Node as the first segment of a multi-use trail from the Confluence to Ponderosa Road Crossing.

Letter OH22 Jaci Crowley

August 15, 2019

Comment OH22-1

I just want to voice my opinion on developing the Olmstead & Knickerbocker area. The roads are not conducive [sic] to massive amounts of people coming there. Hidden Falls should serve as a reminder of what started as a great idea – turned into needing reservations to park and the homeowners on Mt Vernon and Mears Rd experiencing nightmare traffic conditions.

It doesn't seem logical to spend the amount needed for amenities such as power and bathroom facilities.

We are short CHP and Sheriff protection in our area now. A friend got yelled at by CHP coming out for car crash at parking lot at Cronin – stating they were taking them away for more importation things

Just not a good idea!

Response OH22-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. See Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which describes one of the purposes of the GP/RMP is to increase visitor capacity in ASRA/APL by increasing access and facilities, such as parking, day-use facilities, and campgrounds in addition to improved public information and wayfinding that would disperse the visitors to areas outside of the areas that are currently heavily used.

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing, including law enforcement (i.e., rangers), that would patrol and manage new and existing facilities in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing needs based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers that would patrol the facilities in ASRA/APL and respond to incidents.

Letter OH23 Laura Odabashian

August 15, 2019

Comment OH23-1

Sliger Mine Rd is way to [sic] narrow and very dangerous to drive on. Also huge fire hazard.

NO

Dont [sic] put this plan together. Sliger Mine Rd. cant [sic] handle any more traffic!

Response OH23-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was provided to Reclamation and CSP. At the time that comprehensive project-level planning occurs for new campgrounds and campsites, as required by new Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to evaluate, identify, and develop adequate public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; would identify and implement fire fuel clearance and defensible space around the facility and access routes, and interagency coordination regarding facility development would include the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies. CSP and Reclamation would coordinate with other agencies, as appropriate, to improve Sliger Mine Road prior to campground development (Guidelines MZ 26.2 and MZ 27.3).

See Master Response 3, which discusses wildfire risk, GP/RMP approaches to reducing wildfire risk, effectiveness of fire fuel reduction treatments, and ongoing implementation of the Fire Management Plan in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH23-2

No more congestion

No more traffic

Fire hazard!

Fire hazard

To [sic] much traffic

To [sic] much congestion

Please don't proceed with this.

*Worried about people doing the wrong thing.

*if these proposed plans will keep our land and country safer than I would support.

Response OH23-2

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. See Master Response 1, which describes one of the purposes of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reconcile current human needs and desires with protection of natural and cultural resource values, and respond to current conditions and issues. This includes responding to increases in the number of visitors to ASRA/APL, which have, and are projected to continue to, increase as a result of local and regional population growth.

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns related to wildfire hazard and summarizes the actions that would be implemented with the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce wildfire hazards in ASRA/APL.

See Master Response 4, which addresses concerns related to traffic associated with the GP/RMP.

Letter OH24 Pam Asai

August 15, 2019

Comment OH24-1

This area is heavily used by the equestrian population. Equestrians are increasingly being "edged out" by bicyclists and off Road motorized vehicles. Please do not let this happen on your watch.

Please include campsites for equestrian campers.

Please remember the need for equestrian – only trails to ensure the safety of hikers, bikers, recreational equestrians and their animals.

Please do not allow yet another area to be made unsafe and/or inaccessible to horses

Please add trails for horse-only designation

Please add trailhead staging areas

This area is heavily depended on and used by the equestrian population. Equestrians are increasingly being "edged out" by bicyclists and off road motorized vehicles. Please do not let even more trails be made. Unsafe or inaccessible for horses and their riders.

As an equestrian who rides this area regularly I come upon many persons who appreciate the horses. Many children are exposed to horses for the first time in their lives when out on the trails. They are delighted and in awe with these beautiful animals. Hopefully some will grow to own horses one day.

Please include equestrian campsites.

Please add trailhead staging areas

Please add trails for horse-only designation – in the same manner that you are adding “technical trails” for bicyclists. Remember the need for equestrian-only trails to ensure the safety of recreational equestrians, their animals, hikers and bikers.

Please do not edge us out.

This area is heavily used by recreational equestrians.

Equestrians are increasingly being “edged out” by bicyclists and off road motorized vehicles.

Please do not allow this to continue on your watch.

Please include “equestrian only” designated trails to ensure the safety of hikers, bikers, and recreational equestrians.

Please add trailhead staging areas for recreational equestrians.

As an equestrian who rides this area regularly I come upon many persons who appreciate the horses. Many children are exposed to horses for the first time in their lives when out on the trails. They are delighted and in awe with these beautiful animals. Hopefully some will grow to own horses one day.

Please do not edge us out

Don't allow yet another area to be made unsafe or unaccessible [sic] to equestrians.

Response OH24-1

Changes have been made to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to clarify opportunities for equestrian recreation opportunities, such as equestrian camping. The following change has been made to Guideline MZ 1.1, which supports equestrian camping in the Knickerbocker Management Zone, and is included in Chapter 2, Revisions to the Preliminary GP and Draft RMP, of this Final EIR/EIS:

Guideline MZ 1.1: Provide a campground in the Knickerbocker Road Corridor Activity Node with a total camping capacity equivalent up to 50 individual campsites and 3 group campsites, including alternative camping options such as cabins or yurts or other similar structures. Consider the needs of trail users, including equestrians, mountain bikers and pedestrians, in developing and designing camping facilities in the Knickerbocker Management Zone. Design and planning for these camping facilities should be cognizant of demand for those participating in trail special events at ASRA/APL and those uses within the Knickerbocker Management Zone.

See response to comment OH9-1, which discusses opening up a road in the Knickerbocker Management Zone to public vehicle access.

Letter OH25 Denise Sand

August 15, 2019

Comment OH25-1

I spoke with M. Howard tonight of the State Parks. He informed me that they do not have enough manpower currently to manage all the people & traffic at the Confluence. I live in Greenwood for the past 43 years. We currently drive by after everyone is supposed to be gone & there are still cars parking & people down at the river w/lights or fire. If you can't manage it now how are you going to manage it when you have more.

If you have 20 campsites you need 24 hr 365 park rangers / law enforcement.

Set an example of what you can do now.

Response OH25-1

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guidelines OP 2.2 and OP 3.3 support development of partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, including related to law enforcement and emergency response that could help augment CSP law enforcement. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers to prevent and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance. Additionally, implementation of new Guideline FAC 9.1 would require evaluation of and provisions for funding and the level of staffing needed to operate and manage any new facilities that would be developed with implementation of the GP/RMP, which would be determined at the project-level planning stage for new or expanded facilities.

Comment OH25-2

Sliger Mine Road should be fixed in cooperation with the county prior to adding 30 additional campsites. Again plan ahead.

Response OH25-2

The comment is directed towards implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, no further response is warranted.

Comment OH25-3

Currently we have to [sic] fire department proposals to add add'l [sic] annual fees

El Dorado County fire Dept – add'l [sic] \$100 (roughly) so they can increase the fire personnel on their trucks to 3, currently is 2.

Garden Valley has proposed a \$186 – assessment on improved parcels & %70 + unimproved so they can afford to keep the current 2 personnel on their fire trucks.

Please get our fire department ready with qualified personnel before increasing the need for paramedics & fire department personnel

Response OH25-3

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Letter OH26 Susan Wirgler

August 15, 2019

Comment OH26-1

1. Fire danger (additional camping, trucks + trailers = added risk)

Response OH26-1

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. Additionally, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH26-2

2. Parking – horse trailers separate from cars – cars sometimes block larger spots for horse trailers – trailers need more room!

Response OH26-2

Refer to response to comment OH24-1, which discusses revisions to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to include equestrian recreation.

Comment OH26-3

3. If you have camping overnight – be fair! Include horse camping.

Response OH26-3

Refer to response to comment OH24-1, which discusses revisions to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to include equestrian recreation.

Comment OH26-4

4. Improvements for equestrians – water, hitch rails, large parking spots – round pen (warm up area)

Response OH26-4

Refer to response to comment OH24-1, which discusses revisions to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to include equestrian recreation.

Letter OH27 Peggy Christensen

August 15, 2019

Comment OH27-1

Please consider equestrians when you develop these plans.

We are an important part of the West – a part of history.

Parking is a big issue: We need a large area to load and unload and to enter and exit safely. Gravel or dust preferred

Response OH27-1

Refer to response to comment OH24-1, which discusses revisions to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to include equestrian recreation.

Comment OH27-2

Water troughs & hoses

Hitching rails

Horse pens

Safe trails – no bikes on horse trails!

Horse campgrounds

Mounting block

Round pen

Response OH27-2

Refer to response to comment OH24-1, which discusses revisions to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to include equestrian recreation.

Letter OH28 Christine McCaleb

August 15, 2019

Comment OH28-1

For campgrounds – want horse camping horse trailer parking & trails for hikers + horses. Also horse water

No fires!!!

Response OH28-1

Refer to response to comment OH24-1, which discusses revisions to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to include equestrian recreation.

Comment OH28-2

Mammoth Bar – Finish repairing / replacing existing trails for dirt motorcycles OHV funs [sic] available

Horse pens

Hitching Rails

Water

Round Pen

Response OH28-2

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP regarding Mammoth Bar, which is not inconsistent with Guidelines MZ 22.1, MZ 22.3, and MZ 22.4. No change to the GP/RMP has been made in response to this comment.

Letter OH29 **Becky Morris**

August 15, 2019

Comment OH29-1All Areas

No Rocky Point vehicle access

No camping at rocky point

We can't get fire insurance now, and you want to allow camping?

Response OH29-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites and vehicle access at Rocky Point was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which clarifies the process through which planning of future facilities would involve site-specific planning and design, project-level environmental review, and public engagement. Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed at Rocky Point (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH29-2

No smoking!!

No bridge

Response OH29-2

The comment's expression of opposition to smoking and the construction of a bridge proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. The comment's suggestion for no bridge has not been made to the GP/RMP. This comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP, which includes Guideline RES 9.2, which identifies the potential to prohibit smoking in ASRA/APL as a precautionary safety measure.

Comment OH29-3

No camping at mammoth bar – fire, fire, fire

Response OH29-3

The comment's expression of opposition to campsites at Mammoth Bar proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed at Mammoth Bar (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH29-4

Our roads in and out are highly impacted now. Would need major changes to roads because they are narrow & winding.

Response OH29-4

At the time that comprehensive project-level planning would occur for new campgrounds and campsites, as required by new Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to evaluate, identify, and develop adequate public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; identify and implement fire fuel clearance and defensible space around the facility and access routes; and conduct interagency coordination regarding facility development, which would include the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies.

Additionally, refer to Master Response 4, which addresses concerns related to traffic congestion.

Comment OH29-5

Rucky Chucky – No bridge. People who live along Sliger Mine Road won't be able to get out in case of emergency. Too much traffic.

Response OH29-5

At the time that comprehensive project-level planning would occur for a new campground or new campsites in the Cherokee Bar/Ruck-a-Chucky Management Zone, as required by Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to evaluate, identify, and develop adequate public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; identify and implement fire fuel clearance and defensible space around the facility and access routes; develop an emergency evacuation plan for the proposed facility; and coordinate with the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies regarding facility development. Additionally, Guideline RES 10.1 requires CSP and Reclamation to prepare and maintain an emergency access and evacuation plan for ASRA/APL. Guideline RES 10.2 requires coordination with applicable fire agencies in the planning of new or expanded recreation facilities and incorporation of feasible emergency access recommendations prior to constructing or expanding facilities.

Letter OH30 Bill Ray

August 15, 2019

Comment OH30-1

The proposed plan and facilities, especially in the Auburn/Cool areas are in direct conflict with current wildfire management and prevention. The American River canyon is a high risk fire area and has already seen a major wildfire in the recent past which threatened the city of Auburn. Many local residents are already losing fire insurance and/or paying high premiums. Reclamation and State Parks are being irresponsible by even considering the development of the canyon arid surrounding areas. We are in a new era of wildfire management/prevention. This plan puts Auburn and surrounding communities at risk of events similar to Paradise, Santa Rosa, Sonoma, etc.

Response OH30-1

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. Master Response 3 addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH30-2

Other issues include:

1. High traffic in local neighborhoods

Response OH30-2

See Master Response 4, which addresses concerns related to traffic related to implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

Comment OH30-3

2. Crime prevention
3. Litter

Response OH30-3

Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which outlines the Plan's intent to manage the expected increase in visitation to provide quality recreation and protect resources and public safety. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Comment OH30-4

4. Financial Burden → who pays for it! Less than 4 years ago the State Parks was reducing park staffs and closing parks.

What happens to this project during lean budget zones?

Response OH30-4

Refer to Guidelines OP 6.1 through OP 6.4, which discuss strategies for revenue enhancements. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Comment OH30-5

5. Facilities already exist for hiking, horseback riding, and low use recreation, and seem under used.

Why not simply improve whats [sic] there and sensibly manage a low use recreational area.

6. We do not need rafting and kayak companies invading our residential areas!

Response OH30-5

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, but has not been made to the GP/RMP.

Letter OH31 Kathleen Ray

August 15, 2019

Comment OH31-1

We live in a city of Auburn in a neighborhood off of Maidu Dr. We are not in favor of more camping in the canyon – period. The existing campgrounds are adequate!

I am especially against adding a campground along the Knickerbocker and Auburn Interface zones. It is very dangerous to add camping in the canyon below the City of Auburn and neighborhoods of So. Auburn. People are already losing their fire insurance. Insureors [sic] recognize the risk of fire in the area – why add more risk?? Please recognize the risks of camping below our homes and city. Do we need to live through another [sic] Paradise experience?!

Response OH31-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with campsites and concerns related to homeowner's insurance. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH32 Roger Grogham

August 15, 2019

Comment OH32-1

The debrec [sic] at the 49 bridge is a safety [sic] hazard for boaters and swimmers particularly at the low water

Response OH32-1

See response to comment O10-19, which describes efforts by CSP and Reclamation to make visitors aware of hazards in the river and existing agency policies to remove such hazards.

Comment OH32-2

We need a bridge at the China bar

Response OH32-2

The comment is consistent with Guidelines FAC 6.3 and MZ 4.1, which promote development of a trail bridge in the China Bar area.

Letter OH33 Dave Fujiyama

August 15, 2019

Comment OH33-1

1. Fire prevention & management with increase campsites. Day use ok. Love to see people use & enjoy their public land.

Response OH33-1

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including from campsites, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH33-2

2. Can we make an effective plan without input & agreements re public roads? Increasing safety issues at Confluence. People, kids & dogs walking next to Hwy 49.

Response OH33-2

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a goal and guidelines that support actions to provide safe and convenient visitor parking and access in the Confluence Management Zone, which includes improving and formalizing parking along SR 49 in the Highway 49 Activity Node and installing pedestrian safety improvements, such as crosswalks, on the SR 49 Bridge, Old Auburn-Forest Hill Road, and at roadside parking areas. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP also includes actions that include developing transit opportunities that provide access to the Confluence (Goal MZ 10 and Guidelines MZ 10.1 and MZ 10.2).

Comment OH33-3

3. Not enough detail regarding proposed development within Knickerbocker area.

Will groups still be able to use seasonally use areas? Runners grps, endurance rides, dog trainers -

Response OH33-3

Specific detail regarding future development of facilities, such as additional parking, a campground, and access, would be determined in the future through comprehensive project-level planning that would include specific design details, public engagement to inform the plans, and other efforts to meet recreation and public safety needs associated with the facility in compliance with new Guideline FAC 9.1. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP is intended to serve as a guiding document that allows for more specific planning within the guidelines of the plan. See Master Response 1, which further describes the purpose of the GP/RMP.

Continued use of the Knickerbocker area for special events and use of trails in this area is supported by GP/RMP Goals MZ 1 and MZ 2 and Guidelines MZ 1.2, MZ 1.5, MZ 2.1, and MZ 2.2.

Comment OH33-4

Please forward enough detail so that you can receive useful feedback

Response OH33-4

See Master Response 1, which explains that the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP does not approve the development of any individual facilities because those facilities would be required to undergo a project-level planning process, including project design, public input, and environmental review.

Letter OH34 Catherine Goodwin

August 15, 2019

Comment OH34-1

The information provided does not seem to give details for protecting the use for equestrian activities. Adding infrastructure that allows for the proper space for horse – trailers to be pulled in & parked is essential to protecting the current use of the trails by horses.

More parking? Does this mean “painted spaces” for compacts? Does it mean those in conventional autos & bike racks will have an unfair advantage to a large rural area that is currently one of the few riding areas that can accommodate horses?

Please be fair in how these spaces are designed.

Parking is one topic. Trail use is another:

If there are increase parking & facilities there will be an increase in incidents of horse vs. bikes. Please consider hiking & horse only trails especially for areas near parking & camping. As the trails leave the more populated areas, the incidents for problems will be as the experience riders (both horses & bike) increases. I am assuming that all trails have adequate like of site. Thank you.

Response OH34-1

The comment expresses concern related to infrastructure to support equestrian activities.

Implementation of new Guideline FAC 9.1 as part of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP provides an opportunity for public engagement as part of the project-level planning process for new or expanded facilities, including campground, day use facilities, and parking. Additionally, Guideline MZ 1.1 related to providing a campground in the Knickerbocker Management Zone has been revised to require consideration of the needs of trail users, such as equestrians, in developing and designing camping facilities (see Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS).

See response to comment O12-21, which addresses concerns related to trail user conflicts and associated hazards.

This comment does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Letter OH35 Patrick Godwin

August 15, 2019

Comment OH35-1

The plan does not appear to reflect the needs of the equestrian community. If parking is added it needs to provide for horse trailers. If camping is increased/added it should reflect camping for horse owners. Horse camping would be a welcome addition but must be planned well. Horses need a place to be stabled or “high lines” at night. Hitching posts, water and mounting areas need to be included. Riders need a different access to trails and some trails should be designated as horse/hiker only with no bike use. And rules such as leesh [sic] laws and no bikes on designated trails need to be enforced.

If parking stalls are added without providing ingress/egress for horse trailers it defeats excluding horse owners/riders. Frankly at times, that almost seems to be intentional.

I am not opposed to providing more resources to allow more and varied group to use the area, but it must be planned well and must include input from individuals knowledgeable about the needs/wishes on the equestrian community.

Response OH35-1

See response to comment OH35-1, which addresses similar concerns related to provisions for equestrians in planning new or expanded facilities.

Letter OH36 Wendy Lumbert

August 15, 2019

Comment OH36-1

Knickerbocker – regarding the proposed campsites – we are totally opposed!

1. No one is taking care/managing the existing trails. They are rotted and rocky and totally overgrown with star thistle. Who is going to maintain trails/campsites?
2. The quality of life on the Divide will be 100% ruined with the influx of more cars and traffic.
3. The fire danger from campsites is extreme!!
4. Campsites bring crime/vagrants/drugs to a rural community.

Response OH36-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites to the Knickerbocker area proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which outlines the GP/RMP's intent to manage expected increases in visitation to provide quality recreation and protect resources and public safety. Also refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with campsites. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH36-2

The constant increase in traffic and people in these areas is ruining it for everyone.

People come to these areas to be in nature. What's there now? Traffic, people, loose dogs, TRASH. It's not natural, it's not good for the environment or for the people who live here.

No more parking, no more campsites!! Work with what exists and make it better.

-Fix the trails on Knickerbocker

-Spray for star thistle.

-cut weeds!!

Please do not invite vagrants, fire danger and traffic into these areas!

Response OH36-2

As described in more detail in Master Response 1, visitation to ASRA/APL has increased over the last several decades and is expected to continue to steadily increase, regardless of whether a GP/RMP is adopted. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP acknowledges this reality and includes strategies to manage that increased visitation, while reducing wildfire risk, protecting natural and cultural resources, and providing high-quality recreation opportunities consistent with the purpose of a State Recreation Area. To this end, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes new and expanded parking areas, day use facilities, campgrounds, and other visitor-serving facilities. If every facility allowed by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was constructed at the maximum size, the capacity for visitation would increase by approximately 33 percent over the next 20 or more years. In this scenario, visitor capacity would result in a minor increase over the level of visitation that is expected without adoption of a GP/RMP.

Guideline V 2.1 requires preparation and implementation of a Road and Trail Management Plan that would include specific enhancements to existing trail facilities, including minor facility expansion, maintenance projects, programming, and signage.

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a goal and guidelines to prevent introduction or spread of invasive plants throughout ASRA/APL, and treat, control, and eradicate invasive species, such as star thistle (Goal RES 2 and Guidelines RES 2.1 through RES 2.6).

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns related to wildfire hazards. See Master Response 4, which addresses concerns related to traffic. See response to comment 150-1, which addresses concerns related to homeless people.

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and expresses opposition to more parking and campsites. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH37 Donna Seaman

August 15, 2019

Comment OH37-1

-EIR/EIS not available for review prior to meeting 4 for the Cool Piolet [sic] Hill area – extend comment period

Response OH37-1

The Draft EIR/EIS was released on July 19, 2019 for a 47-day comment period scheduled to end on September 3. On August 27, 2019, a notice of public comment period extension was released extending the comment period to September 17, 2019 for a 61-day comment period. The document was available online at the general plan website: www.parks.ca.gov/PlanASRA/ and hard copies were available at numerous libraries and public buildings throughout the duration of the comment period.

Comment OH37-2

-EIR/EIS does not give a modeled alternative to remove sections of park areas to protect the public & residents

Response OH37-2

The Draft EIR/EIS assesses a range of alternatives, which are described in Chapter 2, Project Description and Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS. This comment does not provide specific evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH37-3

-Fires/BBQ & stores are still being allowed w/in park during fire season.

-no alternative for fire protection for the canyon or residents.

Response OH37-3

See Master Response 3, which discusses wildfire hazards and actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire hazards, including increased enforcement and restrictions related to campfires and the use of camp stoves.

Comment OH37-4

-Purpose & need does not give a true need. The document outlines a wish but does not address “need”

Response OH37-4

See response to comment I208-2 and Master Response 1, which address the purpose and need for the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

Comment OH37-5

-No acceptable fire protection plan on increased fire services w/in the Knickerbocker area

Response OH37-5

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including concerns regarding emergency evacuation, and a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Comment OH37-6

4.4-4 This area has a high potential for resources. This area should be protected & preserved since it will cause an adverse effect to cultural resources which cannot be replaced

Any construction or public in this area would cause significant effects that cannot be mitigated.

Our resources should be preserved. NEPA requires consultation w/ACHP & will not allow for tribal disruption.

Not all tribes were consulted. Only 2. Many more have reasons to be concerned

Response OH37-6

The comment expresses concern for cultural resources, as well as preservation and protection of such resources, within the ASRA/APL area. As described in Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS and pages 4-16 through 4-19 of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, goals and guidelines related to the identification, protection, and preservation of archaeological, historical, and tribal cultural resources have been established for ASRA/APL. Further, implementation of subsequent projects under the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would occur in compliance with federal and state regulations, including tribal consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and AB 52, as well as the CSP Standard Project Requirements and the goals and guidelines set forth in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

The comment also states that construction efforts resulting from the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would create unmitigable significant effects. Due to the programmatic nature of the Draft EIS/EIR, the exact location of resources that could be affected by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP cannot be known at this time due to the lack of survey data within the GP/RMP. Individual projects would undergo further evaluation on a project-level basis to determine impacts to archaeological, historical, and tribal cultural resources. Further, existing and revised guidelines are established to preserve and protect known resources, and avoid known resources, where feasible.

The comment states that NEPA consultation should occur to preserve resources and reduce disruption of tribal cultural resources. Further, the comment states that not all tribes were consulted with. As described on page 4.4-12 of the EIR/EIS, CSP sent 13 notification letters to representatives of five Native American tribes. In response to these notification letters, both Shingle Springs Rancheria and United Auburn Indian Community have requested consultation during the planning and design of individual projects occurring under the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. Therefore, project-level consultation, including Section 106 and AB52 consultation, would occur as individual GP/RMP projects are implemented. No further response is required.

Comment OH37-7

*This type of land use plan should come before the voters effected by the proposal

*normally the effected public receives mailings, postings

This project has been published in out of area librarys [sic], public has not been allowed to fully understand the ramifications of such a project.

CAL Parks & BOR has gone around the local residents and failed under CEQA & NEPA to fully inform affected public.

This type of public outreach clearly shows lack of concern for public comments & concerns.

Response OH37-7

See Master Response 2, which discusses the extensive public engagement process that was undertaken in the planning process for the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and environmental review process for the EIR/EIS. Throughout the planning process, public comments helped inform development of key issues that are addressed in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, identify and refine alternatives for the GP/RMP, identify the types and amounts of new or expanded facilities, and the management actions needed for ASRA/APL.

Comment OH37-8

CAL Parks currently cannot manage Confluence traffic, this proposed plan & additional traffic will effect our current under staffed traffic will effect our current understaffed fire & police protection services

Response OH37-8

The comment is an expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses concerns related to traffic. This comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH37-9

ES-II statement of installing traffic signals does not address parking on grass, backed up traffic, accidents caused by over used roadways

CALTRANS currently does not maintains roads, culverts, parking is a priority.

Excess of 12,900 vehicles/day w/no CHP or Sherrif [sic] & County understaffed fire stretched resources

Response OH37-9

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS for additional details related to the traffic signals referenced in the comment.

Comment OH37-10

Pp 1-2 Questionnaires [sic] were provides [sic] when & where besides online

Response OH37-10

In addition to online questionnaires that were available online in December 2017 and January 2018 to receive input on the draft alternatives for the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and in June and July 2018 to receive input on the draft preferred alternative for the GP/RMP, questionnaires were made available at

the June 2018 public workshop and August 2019 public workshop. See Master Response 2, which provides additional information about the public engagement process for the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and EIR/EIS.

Letter OH38 Jan Dunn

August 15, 2019

Comment OH38-1

The Hwy 49 corridor will not safely support the proposed additional recreational upgrades & facilities.

With current wildfire dangers couples with inadequate resources to enforce, control and respond, the proposed camping and associated traffic for ingress/egress will be disastrous! While the ability to recreate in our parks is a cherished priviledge [sic], it should never be at the expense of a community and its residents!

How can an EIR support this increase from the road (49) prospective alone!

Response OH38-1

The comment expresses concern regarding emergency evacuation and wildfire. See Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, in Section 3.2.3 of this Final EIR/EIS. This master response describes the proposed GP/RMP strategies to reduce wildfire fuels, reduce the risk of human-caused ignitions, and improve wildfire suppression and emergency evacuation readiness. Additionally, it discusses the relationship between wildfire risk and visitation. See also Master Response 4, which addresses traffic and vehicle access along SR 49.

Letter OH39 Curtis Kruger

August 15, 2019

Comment OH39-1

Highway 49 at the Confluence is unsafe on summer weekends now. Adding hundreds of additional visitors and vehicles creates an unacceptable hazard to residents and visitors alike. There is no hospital or ER in Cool. As planned this project will result in emergency care delays that will kill people.

Response OH39-1

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses concerns related to traffic. The Draft EIR/EIS evaluates the effects of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP on emergency services in Section 4.13, Public Services and Utilities. This comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH39-2

Olmstead is a well used ASRA facility enjoyed by hikers, mountain bikes and equestrians. Additional density of users, especially mountain bikes, will displace local hikers and equestrians.

Response OH39-2

See Master Response 1, which describes the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to help manage visitation, protect natural and cultural resources, and address congestion in heavily used areas of ASRA/APL by providing appropriate facilities, access improvements, and parking to expand visitor capacity throughout ASRA/APL. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP also includes Guideline V 2.1, which requires development and implementation of a Road and Trail Management Plan that would help

improve trail conditions throughout ASRA/APL and preparation of this plan would be informed with input from the public. The effects of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP on recreation are evaluated in Section 4.14, Recreation, in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comment provides no evidence to indicate that this analysis is inadequate or incomplete.

Comment OH39-3

BTW – The presence of a helicopter evacuation service at the community meeting speaks volumes!!

Response OH39-3

No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a guideline that directs CSP and Reclamation to prepare an emergency access and evacuation plan for ASRA/APL, including mapping emergency helicopter landing sites.

Letter OH40 Debbie Delisle

August 15, 2019

Comment OH40-1

Since moving here in 2018, I have enjoyed the many equestrian trails in the area. They are well kept and beautiful rides. I would love to see that continue throughout the area. I will do what is needed to fight to keep them for years to come. Would love to see more trail signs, water troughs [sic], mounting blocks, etc. for fun safe rides. I would love to see more camping facilities for horses with trails for horses and hikers.

Response OH40-1

Implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would include development and implementation of a Road and Trail Management Plan that would include opportunities for identifying new trail facilities, extensions, connections; specific enhancements to existing facilities, including minor facility expansion, maintenance projects and programming and signage; and establishing a consistent wayfinding and sign program among other components to consider needs of all trail users (Guideline V 2.1). Development of the Road and Trail Management Plan would be informed by a public engagement process. Guideline V 1.4 supports providing a range of opportunities for all trail users, including equestrians. Additionally, implementation of the GP/RMP includes compliance with Guideline V 2.3, which requires following established CSP policies and processes to designate allowable trail uses, to make any changes from established use designations with the goal of accommodating access for all user groups while limiting potential safety conflicts between user groups and providing a variety of trail experiences. Goal MZ 2 and associated guidelines support providing opportunities for equestrians and all other trail users in the Knickerbocker Management Zone. Additionally, Guideline MZ 1.1 related to providing a campground in the Knickerbocker Management Zone has been revised to require consideration of the needs of trail users, such as equestrians, in developing and designing camping facilities (see Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS).

Letter OH41 Delna Ramirez

August 15, 2019

Comment OH41-1

I'd love to see lots of safe horse trails. My family of 6 and all my equestrian students agree we need more safe trails, not campgrounds, water troughs, hitching rails, mounting blocks, round pen, trail signs. If there is camping, please include the ability for equestrian camp grounds.

It would be great to have equestrian trails on every trail w/ a separate trail for equestrians and a separate trail for hikers & bikers.

Response OH41-1

See response to comment OH 40-1, which addresses similar concerns related to the provision of facilities and improvements for equestrians.

Letter OH42 Janet Kampfweldy

August 15, 2019

Comment OH42-1

My 2 main concerns are:

1. The affect these proposed projects would have on fire danger. I live in an area with 1 way in and 1 way out. We are also surrounded by 100 acres of BLB Land that is unmanaged, not maintained and a huge threat if a fire was started anywhere in the ASRA. More campfires, more people, and the lack of government funds is huge. This danger will hugely affect our homeowner's insurance

Response OH42-1

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns about wildfire risk, including elements such as evacuation, emergency response, and the risk of wildfire associated with campsites; it includes a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH42-2

2. The impact of more cars on Highway 49 on and near the Confluence. Many times this winter we have been delayed in our attempt to get home by jack knifed semi trucks or other motor vehicle accidents. Highway 49 on the Cool side is not able to handle an increase in traffic. We would be hugely inconvenienced [sic] by the traffic or road construction that would have to be done.

Response OH42-2

The comment is an expression of opposition to the addition of new vehicular trips to the area. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses concerns related to traffic. This comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH42-3

I am also concerned for the environment and the wild life that would be affected by this proposal. Our air smells good and is fresh and healthy. Please do not allow that to be ruined.

Response OH42-3

The potential effects of implementing the GP/RMP on wildlife and other environmental resources and issues are addressed in Sections 4.2 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The goals and guidelines in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, in combination with applicable federal and state laws, Reclamation directives and standards, and CSP policies provide the overall framework for the management and protection of natural resources in ASRA/APL, such as wildlife. Protection of biological resources in ASRA/APL would be supported with implementation of Goals RES 1 through RES 4 and their associated guidelines in the GP/RMP.

Letter OH43 Chris Weldy

August 15, 2019

Comment OH43-1

First I think your [sic] being deceitful in not providing a “simple” map showing proposed building sights. In other words make a map of the whole area and have circles and arrows showing sight [sic] of proposed camping and picnicking areas etc...Easily legible very basic so even I can understand it. Showing roads of present and proposed new roads.

Response OH43-1

The figures included in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and Draft EIR/EIS provide a general location of facilities that could be developed in the future, which utilize arrows and symbols to represent the general locations and types of facilities. These figures are included in Chapter 4, The Plan, of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and include Figures 4.4-1 through 4.4-11. The Draft EIR/EIS presents the future potential facilities and their general locations consolidated into fewer figures than in the figures of the GP/RMP and these figures for the proposed action consist of Figures 2.6-1a through 2.6-1d in Chapter 2, Project Description and Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment OH43-2

Second I think this from what I gather would bring a lot more younger people around, drinking and gun fire. We live up here to get away from all the problems of a congested area and this will bring more congestion and problems, theft, car accidents etc...

Response OH43-2

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guidelines OP 2.2 and OP 3.3 support development of partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, including related to law enforcement and emergency response that could help augment CSP law enforcement. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers (i.e., rangers) to patrol and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance. Additionally, implementation of new Guideline FAC 9.1 would require evaluation of and provisions for funding and the level of staffing needed to operate and manage any new facilities that would be developed with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, which would be determined at the project-level planning stage for new or expanded facilities.

The comment related to drinking, gun fire, and theft does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH43-3

This area is extremely dry and I believe it will be very dangerous to have a lot of people in this dry area camping. There is some potential here but I think maybe on a much smaller scale

Response OH43-3

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply and fire suppression water supply infrastructure. As discussed in Master Response 1 and shown in Chapter 2, Revisions to the Preliminary GP and Draft RMP, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised so that there would be no new campground in the Foresthill Divide Management Zone, which would

remove potential for campsites in a dry area away from the river or other water sources. Additionally, see Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire risk and describes actions that would be taken to reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH43-4

It is very hard to pinpoint problems when your plan maps are made to be so confusing to everyone that doesn't do this all day. Sure I could take them home and figure it out but I think you should make it more clear to the commoner. Just to be clear about me, I have lived here most of my life (born Sacto) and I know most of this country well. My extended family sold the state 1100 acres to eminent domain for the dam project back in the 70's it was part of the Foresthill Ranch. I know the area well and it isn't very forgiving to fire. Not a safe idea for us that live here. Our Inc [sic] will go up along with our houses and quality of life.

Response OH43-4

See response to comment OH43-1, which addresses the comment's concerns related to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP maps.

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns related to wildfire and describes actions that would be taken with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL.

The comment also describes family history in the ASRA/APL area. This comment does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH43-5

What about poaching, river pollution, trash and impact on the wild life. I think this is a bad proposal and it is going to ruin this area if not burn it down. Its [sic] to [sic] dry and there is to [sic] much fuel, just not a good idea.

Response OH43-5

Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers (i.e., rangers) to patrol and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance, which could help reduce potential for poaching. See response to comment OI-1, which discusses the hunting program at ASRA/APL.

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would include implementation of Guideline FAC 2.1, which supports providing facilities for public health and safety, such as trash receptacles. Additionally, in compliance with new Guideline FAC 9.1, project planning for new facilities would include evaluation of and provision for the level of staffing and funding needed to operate and manage the facility, including trash collection and removal. Additionally, implementation of Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing based on ongoing management needs and use patterns.

The potential effects of implementing the GP/RMP on wildlife and other environmental resources and issues are addressed in Sections 4.2 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The goals and guidelines in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, in combination with applicable federal and state laws, Reclamation directives and standards, and CSP policies provide the overall framework for the management and protection of natural resources in ASRA/APL, such as wildlife. Protection of biological resources in ASRA/APL would be supported with implementation of Goals RES 1 through RES 4 and their associated guidelines in the GP/RMP.

See Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire risk and describes actions that would be taken to reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH43-6

Also the traffic will increase and it is already overloaded. We have accidents constantly on the road from Aub-Cool (49). What would you do with that. Also Foresthill Road is overloaded as well.

Response OH43-6

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses concerns related to traffic. This comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Letter OH44 Sheila Toner

August 15, 2019

Comment OH44-1

Excess camp facilities at Folsom. Do not need here!

No campgrounds

No maintenance facilities

Response OH44-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites and maintenance facilities proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH44-2

DO NOT open road to traffic

Leave as is – except for trail maintenance – sign & forest thinning

Road is heavily used as a trail by dog walkers – mom's with stroller – handicapped & bikes + hikers.

Keep closed.

Do not divide area by road. Only area w/o conflict between hikers – bikers – equestrian – good sight lines – wide trails & unbroken space. Also lots of wildlife.

Response OH44-2

The comment expresses opposition to opening the road in the Knickerbocker Management Zone and retaining the facilities there as is, but supports trail maintenance, signage, and fire fuels maintenance. The comment's expression of opposition to the components of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP in the Knickerbocker Management Zone was considered by Reclamation and CSP. The comment requests not dividing the area by a road; however, the GP/RMP does not propose to construct any new roads.

See Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire risk and actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP that would reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL.

Letter OH45 No Name

August 15, 2019

Comment OH45-1

Do not open road to traffic

Currently a great handicapped trail

Road serves as trail in wet weather. Also used for parents with young children & strollers

Response OH45-1

The comment expresses opposition to opening the road in the Knickerbocker Management Zone to public vehicle traffic. The comment's expression of opposition to some components of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP in the Knickerbocker Management Zone was considered by Reclamation and CSP but a change related to this opposition has not been made to the GP/RMP at this time.

With implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, improvements in ASRA/APL would be made to increase facilities that provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) trail access consistent with existing accessibility policy, plans and programs (Guideline V 2.1). Also, Guideline FAC 2.7 requires CSP to work with the CSP Accessibility Section to evaluate existing facilities for improvements to provide increased access for users with mobility difficulties by removing access barriers consistent with the CSP Transition Plan, ADA, and Architectural Barriers Act requirements.

Comment OH45-2

No to bridge

No to camping

No changes

Just do trail maintenance

Forest clearing

Area between WST – Pig Farm – river is tinder box

Response OH45-2

The comment expresses opposition to new facilities in the Knickerbocker Management Zone and retaining the facilities there as is, but supports trail and fire fuels maintenance. No changes are made to the GP/RMP in response to this comment. However, as described in Master Response 1, the maximum number of campsites that could be developed has been reduced.

See Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire risk and actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP that would reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL.

Letter OH46 Carolyn Loomis

August 15, 2019

Comment OH46-1

I live in Cool. I enjoy the wide, open space behind Northside School up to the top of the canyon by Aaron Cool Dr. people hike, ride horses & pick blackberries.

I am seriously opposed to this development plan for more campsites in the Knickerbocker Zone and near the Confluence for the following reasons:

Response OH46-1

In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH46-2

1. People living here are terrified of the further risk of fire. They are also very anxious about homeowner's insurance being dropped or rates being doubled & tripled.

Response OH46-2

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with campsites. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Comment OH46-3

2. Traffic down the canyon from Cool to Auburn is already a dangerous mess. We have lumber trucks, gravel trucks, and semis that can't fit. We have tourists who park & walk on the hiway [sic]. There are accidents often. Bicycles try to squeeze by. Slowdowns create nightmarish back-ups. I haven't included yet the road work & tree-cutting projects.

We cannot increase this current disaster.

Response OH46-3

Refer to Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which describes how the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP addresses existing traffic congestion.

Comment OH46-4

3. Cool does not want transients & druggies taking up residences in these proposed camps.

Response OH46-4

See response to comment 150-1, which addresses concerns related to homeless people in ASRA/APL.

Implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines that would result in providing additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guidelines OP 2.2 and OP 3.3 support development of partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, including related to law enforcement and emergency response that could help augment CSP law enforcement. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers (i.e., rangers) to patrol and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance. Additionally, implementation of new

Guideline FAC 9.1 would require evaluation of and provisions for funding and the level of staffing needed to operate and manage any new facilities that would be developed with implementation of the GP/RMP, which would be determined at the project-level planning stage for new or expanded facilities.

Comment OH46-5

4. We also don't need to increase the number of river rescues!

Response OH46-5

See response to comment I151-2, which addresses concerns related to drowning hazards.

Comment OH46-6

I hate to think what it would be like in Cool during an evacuation. Don't do this!!!

Response OH46-6

Refer to Guideline RES 10.1, which describes the preparation of an emergency access and evacuation plan for ASRA/APL. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Letter OH47 Frank Robertson

August 15, 2019

Comment OH47-1

You propose increased traffic with no near road or bridges. Hwy 49 is already over used. We need a new bridge to help with already over taxed road ways in and out. By you adding 250 camp sites on already over taxed infrastructure is not going to help.

Response OH47-1

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS regarding the number of proposed campsites and the transportation impacts of the project. Additionally, as described in Master Response 1, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of additional campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL to 142 campsites, which is reduced from the maximum number of new campsites identified in the original GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS (224 sites).

Letter OH48 Russel T. Sevret

August 15, 2019

Comment OH48-1

My comment are on road access Sliger Mine Rd to Ruck-a-Chucky Sliger Mine Rd is not wide enough to support traffic to campgrounds. Also the fire danger from campers in the terrane of the camp grounds is horrific. I don't care how much fuel reduction one does if a fire crowns our houses are gone, our fire insurance will go up or be canceled [sic] do [sic] to a campground. I have done mastication work for 9 years & the fuel reduction on the terrane [sic] going to the campground is unmanageable by machine. In some places. Hand crows will be the only sorse [sic]. It will take years, plus having people from out of the area will only promote theft & problems for Sliger Mine neighbors. Station 64 on Sliger Mine was my station for 15. I have responded to fires on Sliger Mine do [sic] to people flicking cigarettes. How much of this is going to go on by some people that don't live in our area that alone care.

You don't have a water source [sic] for the camp ground [sic] & past sanitation efforts [sic] have failed.

Sliger Mine neighbors DO NOT WANT A CAMP GROUND OR CAMPERS in our neighborhood.

We will be writing our state representatives to give us support in fight against all the camp grounds [sic] proposed in these areas.

GOOD LUCK IN FAILING

Response OH48-1

See Master Response 3, which discusses wildfire risk, the GP/RMP's approaches to reducing wildfire risk, effectiveness of fire fuel reduction treatments, and ongoing implementation of the Fire Management Plan in ASRA/APL. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

The comment related to increased theft and problems for Sliger Mine neighbors does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS as inadequate. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

See response to comment O12-19, which discusses water supply issues, including providing water supply infrastructure for fire suppression at campgrounds. See response to comment OH4-3, which discusses how wastewater generated at restroom facilities would be handled with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. See response to comment I68-1, which addresses how trash would be handled with implementation of the GP/RMP.

At the time that comprehensive project-level planning occurs for new campgrounds and campsites, as required by new Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to evaluate, identify, and develop adequate public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; identify and implement fire fuel clearance and defensible space around the facility and access routes; develop an emergency evacuation plan for the proposed facility; and coordinate with the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies regarding facility development.

In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH49 Bill McClusleey

August 15, 2019

Comment OH49-1

Major concern about greatly increased fire damage caused by increased development.

Response OH49-1

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with expected increases in visitation. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Letter OH50 Raymond & Marlene Lenz

August 15, 2019

Comment OH50-1

As 18 year residents of Cool, Auburn Lake Trails, we are not in favor of the ASRA plan for the areas of Knickerbocker and Sliger Mine Road proposals. Our very first concern is fire!! We already reside in a high risk area and according to our insurance company (homeowners) we do not have an adequate number of manned fire houses to cover such a high risk area. We have had our homeowners' policy increase over 120% in 5 years, for many of our neighbors they are suffering from insurance cancellations or having to sell their homes due to the high cost of coverage. Our home will become "un-sellable" without the ability to secure affordable insurance.

The recent "County Fire" of Sept. 3, 2019 @ 193 & Lou Allen Lane that burned 85 acres in an hour should be a wake up call to you of just how vulnerable we are in the Cool, Greenwood area.

This tragic event, loss of a Garden Valley fire engine and injuries to two firefighters proved to use that fire shows us how isolated we can become from evacuation. The roads on the Divide, are already crowded with residents, we do not need "visitors" to our area who have no clue how to exit this area in a safe fashion.

Response OH50-1

Master Response 3 provides information regarding Preliminary GP/Draft RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk associated with the GP/RMP, including coordination for emergency and evacuation response planning among various agencies responsible for wildfire emergency response, and other actions to improve emergency access, evacuation, and fire suppression in the event of a wildfire. Several emergency response guidelines have also been expanded, as described in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS. Taken together, these measures would result in substantial emergency response improvements. Master Response 3 also describes other proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk associated with the GP/RMP. Many of the strategies in the GP/RMP would not only reduce risks associated with implementation of the plan but would also reduce the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL more broadly. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH50-2

Hiway [sic] 49 can quickly become a "parking lot" with a "minor" auto or truck event. Such as a flat tire, stuck in a turn with a truck that did not read the sign! We have to contend with logging trucks, rock haulers from the Quarry, bicyclists, jeepers to the Rubicon Trail, motorcycles, trucks with horse trailers, trucks with fishing boats, RV's with tow cars, all with no knowledge of how difficult and dangerous Hiway [sic] 49 can be to a "visitor" with hairpin turns and switchbacks with uphill turns to negotiate.

Response OH50-2

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS regarding the number of proposed campsites and the transportation impacts of the project.

Comment OH50-3

The current (no pun intended) situation at the Confluence is only increased with hot weather, "visitors" drinking alcohol or using drugs in our area. How many more people do we have to see drowned in the river to prove this point? The "visitors" see a nice place to cool off, not a swift moving river that is in itself a hazardous place.

Response OH50-3

Refer to response to comment I151-2, which addresses a number of concerns raised by commenters regarding drowning risk in ASRA/APL. This response includes a discussion of the relationship between implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and drowning risk. This response also describes efforts that are taken by CSP to reduce that risk and provide public safety measures, and identifies outreach efforts supported by the goals and guidelines of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to educate the public about drowning hazards in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH50-4

We are completely 100% against the addition of the 245 campsites in the ASRA areas. Your plan is not welcome in our areas of the Divide.

“Visitors” want to come here for recreation.

“residents” need a safe place to live.

This area is not conducive [sic] to this plan!

Response OH50-4

The comment’s expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and new campsites was considered by Reclamation and CSP. As discussed in Master Response 1, the maximum number of new campsites that could be built with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would be up to 142 sites (135 individual site and seven group sites), which is reduced from the maximum number of new campsites identified in the original GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS (224 sites [220 individual sites and four group sites]).

The comment about visitors’ and residents’ needs does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS as inadequate. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH50-5

Hiway 49 is our lifeline to medical/health care services, everyday services such as banking, grocery stores, etc. Increased traffic is insane and a true safety concern!

Please, please, no more risk to the residents and tax payers of the Divide.

We say “Do Nothing” to the Divide! Please listen to us.

Response OH50-5

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which addresses concerns related to traffic. This comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH50-6

P.S. 1. You could have at least held a meeting on the Divide

2. On your “map” on the website you could have at least showed the town of Cool and Greenwood. Very poor planning:(

Response OH50-6

See Master Response 2, which describes the extensive public engagement process conducted for the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and EIR/EIS planning processes. This master response also explains the rationale for how locations of the public workshops were chosen. Additionally, the master response describes the range of locations from which commenters reside, which includes the small communities in the Divide.

Regarding the comment about identifying the towns of Cool and Greenwood on the map on the general plan website (www.parks.ca.gov/PlanASRA/), this comment was considered by CSP and Reclamation. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and Draft EIR/EIS, identify the town of Cool on applicable maps.

Letter OH51 Andrew C. Brost

August 15, 2019

Comment OH51-1

We moved from the Los Gatos to Cool area in 1999 partly because the ASRA was an unspoiled natural resource in close proximity to work opportunities. The belief was this natural preserve would remain unspoiled for family generations to come. With all the other state and federal land available for park land development I am perplexed why this area has been selected for development. This is truly saddening, as this undeveloped area has become the hiking, mountain biking, equestrian, rafting Mecca of California. Furthermore, my daughter's annual fund raiser for Northside School (Heart of Cool) would be impacted by the proposed plan. This event and countless others established in this area would be subject to change by the proposed ASRA plan. Not good.

Why would the California State Parks commission change such an established recreational area that benefits hundreds of thousands of people annually with an invasive development plan? This is certainly counterproductive for the wellbeing of the community and visitors to this natural resource that we have all come to love.

My earnest hope is that a decision of "do nothing" will prevail. Though tens of thousands of dollars have likely been spent doing this behind the scenes plan, my hope is a less utilized area on government land will be where our tax dollars parkland development money is spent. Please "STOP" any further promotion of development plans in the ASRA area, as there are many other prime, non-established, less utilized opportunities for this type development.

Response OH51-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which describes the need for the GP/RMP and clarifies the process through which planning of future facilities would involve site-specific planning and design, project-level environmental review, and public engagement.

Letter OH52 Frances Todd

August 15, 2019

Comment OH52-1

Emergence [sic] medical services need to approve this plan. At present, there are questionable services to evacuate users along current & proposed roads. The amount of time needed to meet Trauma Center Criteria of 1 hour to surgery. Helicopter landing pads is only at the Cool Fire Station

The roads in the current & proposed areas are narrow with sharp turns. This slows the ability for emergency vehicles to pass in both directions & travel at acceptable speed.

Response OH52-1

See response to comment I100-3, which addresses the comment's concerns related to impacts on emergency services.

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes actions that would be implemented consistent with new Guideline FAC 9.1 at the time of comprehensive project-level planning for new or modified facilities that would address emergency access; ingress/egress; development of an emergency evacuation plan; and interagency coordination with the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies.

Letter OH53 Mae Harms

August 15, 2019

Comment OH53-1

I am not totally against allowing for camping and use. However, I am not sure that this is the best plan. Where can I find info about the pros for making these changes.

A number of years ago we were saved from a dam which would have made this wonderful area for all kinds of outdoor recreation a by lake. We must keep it as near to possible to a native growth and water flow. This is why people come to it. They come from city & towns to be in the raw nature and natural environment.

Response OH53-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and new campsites was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response I).

See Master Response I, which addresses the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to address visitation to ASRA/APL. As described in more detail in Master Response I, visitation to ASRA/APL has increased over the last several decades and is expected to continue to steadily increase, regardless of whether a GP/RMP is adopted. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP acknowledges this reality and includes strategies to manage that increased visitation, while reducing wildfire risk, protecting natural and cultural resources, and providing high-quality recreation opportunities consistent with the purpose of a State Recreation Area. As described under "Purpose and Need" in the "Executive Summary" chapter of the Draft EIR/EIS, one of the purposes of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP is to reconcile current human needs and desires with protection of natural and cultural resource values, and respond to current conditions and issues. Chapter 4, The Plan, of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP consists of goals and guidelines that provide a framework for management and operations in ASRA/APL as well as identifying facility improvements and new facilities to meet the anticipated needs of increasing visitation. To this end, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes new and expanded parking areas, day use facilities, campgrounds, and other visitor-serving facilities. If every facility allowed by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was constructed at the maximum size, the capacity for visitation would increase by approximately 33 percent over the next 20 or more years. In this scenario, visitor capacity would result in a minor increase over the level of visitation that is expected without adoption of a GP/RMP.

Additional benefits of implementing the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP are summarized in Master Response 3, which includes a description of actions that would be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk.

Letter OH54 Diane Dixon-Janna

August 15, 2019

Comment OH54-1

ASRA is my home and my Park. And it is in dire need of care, a direction and a remodel. I can't begin to list my concerns and my suggestions on one page, but in general:

*our canyon roads cannot handle the 45% increase in tourism that the GP has projected,

Response OH54-1

The comment inaccurately claims that the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would result in a 45 percent increase in tourism. See Master Response 1, regarding the purpose of the GP/RMP in addressing future recreation demand that is driven by local and regional population growth. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section of 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS, which elaborates on the traffic analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS. This comment does not provide specific evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH54-2

*Cal Fire has listed our Divide as a High Hazard Zone, the most at risk for fire that they use in assessing communities. The GP wants to add over 245 campsites WITH FIRE RINGS! there is no fire plan except to 'develop a fire plan' or outsource it to BOR - illegal. Where are evacuation routes listed? Our fire history has caused many home owners' fire insurance to be cancelled thereby making our property values to decline.

Response OH54-2

See Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which discusses the risk of wildfire including that which might result from development of campgrounds and campsites proposed under the GP/RMP. It provides background information on the risk of wildfire from campsites within ASRA/APL, and a description of proposed GP/RMP strategies designed to reduce that risk.

In response to comments like this one that express concern regarding wildfire risk associated with new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of additional campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL to no more than 142 campsites (see Table 3-3 in Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan) from 224 (220 individual and four group sites). In addition, the GP/RMP has been revised to add a new Guideline RES 9.7 to address the risk of wildfire from campfires at new sites. This guideline requires that prior to developing a new campground or expanding an existing campground, an assessment would be carried out to determine if campfires would be allowed and potential site-specific campfire restrictions would be identified.

Additionally, Master Response 3 describes that Reclamation has adopted the FMP for ASRA/APL since publication of the Draft EIR/EIS. It also provides a description of the emergency response and evacuation strategies that would improve emergency planning within ASRA/APL.

The evaluation provided in this Final EIR/EIS, which includes this document and the Draft EIR/EIS, found that the measures proposed by the GP/RMP to reduce the wildfire risk associated with the GP/RMP would be sufficiently protective. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH54-3

*the drownings and other obscure fatalities has this Park considered dangerous, I've even read the most dangerous Park; nowhere is 'drowning' mentioned in the GP. Where are the safety and/or preventative measures. With 1 million visitors yearly, and going up by 45%, how do you intend to manage all these extra outsiders? Nowhere is mentioned adding new rangers to patrol our Park.

Response OH54-3

Refer to response to comment I151-2, which addresses a number of concerns raised by commenters regarding drowning risk in ASRA/APL. This response includes a discussion of the relationship between implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and drowning risk. This response also describes efforts that are taken by CSP to reduce that risk and provide public safety measures, and identifies outreach efforts supported by the goals and guidelines of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to educate the public about drowning hazards in ASRA/APL. As described in Master Response 1, the comment's reference to a 45 percent increase in visitation is inaccurate and the estimated increase in visitor capacity as a result of the Proposed Action (i.e., the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP) would be approximately 33 percent, a minor increase over visitation that would be expected to occur from population growth alone. Master Response 1 explains that visitation growth at ASRA/APL is closely linked to changes in demand for outdoor recreation resulting from local and regional population growth and not simply proposals like those in the GP/RMP. Additionally, ASRA/APL is consistent with the definition of an SRA to provide multiple recreational opportunities as described in PRC Section 5019.56(a) (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH54-4

Covers over 30,000 acres with only 2 to 4 Rangers to patrol it's [sic] entirety - really?

Response OH54-4

Refer to Guidelines OP 6.1 and OP 6.2, which discuss the evaluation and adjustment of staffing needs based upon use patterns. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Comment OH54-5

*The signage is falling apart, being shot up and weathered beyond describing their function; there's old remnants of ranches (Knickerbocker), exposed broken culverts, barbed wire fences going nowhere.

*The trails are rutted, overgrown, blocked by downed trees and eroded - just to mention a few conditions. Please help...

I urge you to abandon this General Plan and put this money into fixing the precious gem that we have to preserve and appreciate generations to come.

Thank you....

Response OH54-5

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of goals and guidelines that support improved wayfinding and signage and trail improvements. Guideline V 2.1 requires preparation of a Road and

Trail Management Plan that would address the need for a consistent wayfinding and sign program and identify specific enhancements to and maintenance of existing trail facilities. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP outlines interpretive and educational programs that would not only inform the public about the value, sensitivities, significance of ASRA/APL natural and cultural resources, and how the resources are managed but would also enhance the wayfinding and signage in ASRA/APL (Goal I&E 2 and Guidelines I&E 2.1, I&E 2.2, and MZ 10.3).

Hazards, such as those mentioned in this comment, could be removed on a case-by-case basis, as needed.

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP but no changes are made to the GP/RMP in response to this comment.

Comment OH54-6

Water: The GP proposed using the GPUD agriculture water!

We already pay high prices – we raise crops and animals with this water. Please don't assume you can redirect this for outside "camper," tying up the dangerous roads, bringing in campfires, homeless and added crime. Keep the Divide serene.

Response OH54-6

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses water supply concerns and effects of water demand in ASRA/APL on other nearby water users. Also see response to comment I229-7, which also addresses concerns related to loss of agricultural water supplies.

Letter OH55 Connie Giuliano

August 15, 2019

Comment OH55-1

I am a retired, single senior. I live in Cool, CA.

I have an annual State Park Pass.

I hike the trails of the ASRA almost everyday.

My favorite hike is on the paved road in the Olmstead Knickerbocker Area. I almost always hike alone – and I see many other solo female hikers, biker riders and equestrian! I feel very safe.

I love the quiet, the wildlife and the scenery. All of this would be completely RUINED by allowing vehicles and camping in this area.

I'm sure there would be trash, noise, speeding cars probably guns too – and FIRE!

The campsites are SIMPLY A TERRIBLE IDEA!

Response OH55-1

The Draft EIR/EIS assesses issues related to solid waste under Impact 4.13-3 beginning on page 4.13-7 of Section 4.13, Public Services and Utilities, in the Draft EIR/EIS. Also see response to comment I68-1 that further discusses trash collection in ASRA/APL.

The Draft EIR/EIS assesses noise impacts in ASRA/APL in Section 4.16, Noise, in the Draft EIR/EIS. Traffic impacts of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP are addressed in Section 4.12, Transportation and Circulation, in the Draft EIR/EIS and are further discussed in Master Response 4 of this Final EIR/EIS.

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guidelines OP 2.2 and OP 3.3 support development of partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, including related to law enforcement and emergency response that could help augment CSP law enforcement. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers to prevent and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance.

The comment's expression of opposition to campsites in the Knickerbocker Management Zone was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH56 No Name

August 15, 2019

Comment OH56-1

Pollution issues – trash & emissions

Vehicle congestion

Public safety

FIRE DANGER!

Response OH56-1

The Draft EIR/EIS assesses issues related to solid waste under Impact 4.13-3 beginning on page 4.13-7 of Section 4.13, Public Services and Utilities, in the Draft EIR/EIS. Also see response to comment 168-1 that further discusses trash collection in ASRA/APL.

Potential air quality impacts associated with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP are assessed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes Goal RES 24 and Guidelines RES 24.1 and RES 24.2 that minimize dust and emissions of air pollutants during construction and from management activities.

Traffic impacts of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP are addressed in Section 4.12, Transportation and Circulation, in the Draft EIR/EIS and are further discussed in Master Response 4.

The comment lists “public safety,” which can be related to a number of concerns. See response to comment 154-1 that discusses increases in law enforcement (i.e., rangers) presence in ASRA/APL with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. See response to comment 1100-3, which discusses impacts of the GP/RMP on emergency services. See response to comment 1151-2, which addresses concerns related to drowning hazards in ASRA/APL. Also, at the time that comprehensive project-level planning occurs for a new campground or other new or expanded facilities, as required by new Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to evaluate, identify, and develop adequate

public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; would identify and implement fire fuel clearance and defensible space around the facility and access routes; develop an emergency evacuation plan for the proposed facility; and coordinate with the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies regarding facility development. Additionally, Guideline RES 10.1 requires CSP and Reclamation to prepare and maintain an emergency access and evacuation plan for ASRA/APL. Guideline RES 10.2 requires coordination with applicable fire agencies in the planning of new or expanded recreation facilities and incorporation of feasible emergency access recommendations prior to constructing or expanding facilities.

Master Response 3 provides a detailed discussion of wildfire risks and the efforts that would be implemented with the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce wildfire risks.

Letter OH57 Jon Brown

August 15, 2019

Comment OH57-1

Not in favor due to traffic impac [sic].

Fire danger

Response OH57-1

Comment noted. The comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate. See Master Response 3, Wildfire, that discusses efforts that would reduce wildfire risk, and Master Response 4, which address traffic.

Letter OH58 Denise Sand

August 15, 2019

Comment OH58-1

Severe fire hazard risk zone – The plan offers no provision for fire protection. Prevention is good but what fire plan could possibly protect us given our fixed geography & limited resources. In 2020 we will have even less. INSUFFICIENT FIRE EVAC ROUTES -We recently had a fire in Greenwood, Hwy 193 was closed at Hwy 49

Response OH58-1

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which provides information regarding proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL, including coordination for emergency and evacuation response planning among various agencies responsible for wildfire emergency response, and other actions to improve emergency access, evacuation, and fire suppression in the event of a wildfire or other emergency. Several emergency response guidelines have also been expanded, as described in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS. Taken together, these measures would result in substantial emergency response improvements.

Comment OH58-2

Overcrowded/Hazardous Roads – The Confluence is already overcrowded with unsafe conditions. I could not locate a “recent” accurate study.

Response OH58-2

See Master Response 1 for further discussion of the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to manage visitation and the approach to provide appropriate facilities, access improvements, and parking to expand visitor capacity and help reduce congestion in more heavily used areas of ASRA/APL, such as in the Confluence. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would also address existing and anticipated future parking congestion and traffic congestion by establishing alternatives for accommodating peak period or special event parking, such as satellite parking areas and shuttle or transit services (see Guidelines FAC 9.1 and FAC 8.3 in Chapter 4, The Plan, of the GP/RMP), which could reduce the number of vehicles traveling through these areas. Traffic issues are further discussed in Master Response 4.

Comment OH58-3

Threats to Public Safety – In recent years emergency personnel have witnessed a sharp increase in drownings & rescue. I could not locate a plan for Human Safety. ASRA drowning rate is the highest.

Response OH58-3

Refer to response to comment I151-2, which addresses a number of concerns raised by commenters regarding drowning risk in ASRA/APL. This response includes a discussion of the relationship between implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and drowning risk. This response also describes efforts that are taken by CSP to reduce that risk and provide public safety measures, and identifies outreach efforts supported by the goals and guidelines of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to educate the public about drowning hazards in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH58-4

Parks can't even manage the 30,000 acres now – on 9/15/19 at 9:59pm there were still 2 vehicles parked at the Confluence. Their [sic] were people still down at the water. Why? Extremely high fire risk & human safety risk.

Response OH58-4

Refer to Guidelines OP 6.1 and OP 6.2, which discuss the evaluation and adjustment of staffing needs based upon use patterns. Also see Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which outlines the Plan's intent to manage the expected increases in visitation to protect resources and public safety. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Letter OH59 Jon & Mary Brommeland

August 15, 2019

Comment OH59-1

After a lot of thought, study of the ASRA development plans and reports, and attendance at various meetings, we have concluded the overriding consideration when it comes to any development in the North and Middle Fork American river canyons must be: **NO ACTIVITY PERMITTED THAT INCREASES THE RISK OF A WILD FIRE.**

On Sept 10, 2019 the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors wrote to California State Parks "**Re: Comment on Preliminary General Plan**". Their letter spoke of their dismay at the lack of outreach throughout the process of updating the ASRA General Plan/Resource Management Plan. We are 24 year residents of Auburn Lake Trails, Cool, CA and members of the dismayed.

Response OH59-1

Please see Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which discusses the risk of wildfire associated with the GP/RMP. It describes proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk. Many of the strategies in the GP/RMP would not only reduce risks associated with implementation of the plan but would also reduce the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL more broadly.

Letter OH60 Nancy & Eileen Gorden-Hagman

August 15, 2019

Comment OH60-1

The plan does not include a specific fire prevention plan. There is no fire break behind Cool businesses or around Northside School. Confluence is a bottleneck for fire evacuation and for emergency responders.

Response OH60-1

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which discusses the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL. It describes proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk, including fuel reduction and emergency preparedness and evacuation strategies. Many of the elements of the GP/RMP would not only reduce risks associated with implementation of the plan but would also reduce the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL more broadly.

Comment OH60-2

Campfires pose extreme danger in the summer. The existence of campsites in a high fire danger zone will make our home owners insurance nonrenewable, thus making it impossible to protect or even to sell our homes.

Response OH60-2

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which discusses the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL. It describes proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk. Many of the strategies in the GP/RMP would not only reduce risks associated with implementation of the plan but would also reduce the risk of wildfire in ASRA/APL more broadly. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1). Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH60-3

Traffic impact report was not done under actual circumstances. Report lists the roads as "rolling hills." FALSE. Our roads are 2 lane mountain roads with multiple switchbacks. Current confluence traffic is slowed by pedestrians & by vehicles pulling in & out of parking along Highway 49. It is already hazardous!

Response OH60-3

The comment contends that the Draft EIR/EIS incorrectly characterizes roadways within the project study area. See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, in Section 3.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Comment OH60-4

EIR never mentions pollution of water & land.

Response OH60-4

Potential air quality impacts associated with implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP are assessed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Potential water quality impacts are assessed in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. The comment does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS as inadequate. Therefore, further response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH60-5

Divide has only 1 source of water. In drought years, Stumpy Meadows hardly has enough water for current residents.

Response OH60-5

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses water supply concerns.

Letter OH61 Diana vande Berg

August 15, 2019

Comment OH61-1

Since evacuations in this area are difficult enough with only 2 lanes of traffic, the increased traffic & congestion caused by campers, RVs, vans, etc, who would have great difficulty navigating our roads, would only endanger those of us who already live here.

Response OH61-1

At the time that comprehensive project-level planning occurs for a new or expanded facility, as required by new Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to evaluate, identify, and develop adequate public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; develop an emergency evacuation plan for the proposed facility; and coordinate with the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies regarding facility development. Additionally, Guideline RES 10.1 requires CSP and Reclamation to prepare and maintain an emergency access and evacuation plan for ASRA/APL. Guideline RES 10.2 requires coordination with applicable fire agencies in the planning of new or expanded recreation facilities and incorporation of feasible emergency access recommendations prior to constructing or expanding facilities.

Letter OH62 William & Carol Forsythe

August 15, 2019

Comment OH62-1

In this area forest fires traditionally travel in a northeastern direction directly toward Foresthill. Foresthill has very poor emergency escape routes. Last year we were evacuated from McKeon Ponderosa Way due to a fire in the American River Canyon. In my opinion it is unsafe.

When the rafters were allowed to travel down McKeon Ponderosa Way the speed they traveled has hazardous.

Response OH62-1

Refer to Master Response 3, which provides information regarding proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL, including coordination for emergency and evacuation response planning among various agencies responsible for wildfire emergency response, and other actions to improve emergency access, evacuation, and fire suppression in the event of a wildfire or

other emergency. Several emergency response guidelines have also been expanded, as described in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS. Taken together, these measures would result in substantial emergency response improvements.

The comment regarding vehicles speeding on McKeon Ponderosa Way related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment. No further response can be provided.

Letter OH63 Henry Higham

August 15, 2019

Comment OH63-1

To [sic] dry of an environment with too many vulnerable homes at risk of fire and crime. Alcohol related incidents are among my most concerns. Also impact on an already stressed environment is what has to be considered for all divide residents. Wildlife is abound in this area and need to remain that way for the animals.

Response OH63-1

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply and fire suppression water supply infrastructure. As discussed in Master Response 1 and shown in Chapter 2, Revisions to the Preliminary GP and Draft RMP, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised so that there would be no new campground in the Foresthill Divide Management Zone, which would remove potential for campsites in a dry area away from the river or other water sources. Additionally, see Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire risk and describes actions that would be taken to reduce wildfire risk in ASRA/APL.

The comment related to concerns about crime does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS as inadequate. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL (Guidelines OP 2.2, OP 3.2, OP 3.3, and OP 6.1).

The potential effects of implementing the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP on wildlife and other environmental resources and issues are addressed in Sections 4.2 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The goals and guidelines in the GP/RMP, in combination with applicable federal and state laws, Reclamation directives and standards, and CSP policies provide the overall framework for the management and protection of natural resources in ASRA/APL, such as wildlife. Protection of biological resources in ASRA/APL would be supported with implementation of Goals RES 1 through RES 4 and their associated guidelines in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

Letter OH64 William Faulkner

August 15, 2019

Comment OH64-1

Will the destroyed bridge at the Confluence be removed?

Response OH64-1

See response to comment O10-19, which addresses human-made debris in the river in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH64-2

Will the park district pay for our fire insurance?

Response OH64-2

See Master Response 3, which discusses wildfire risk, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMPs actions for reducing wildfire risk, effectiveness of fire fuel reduction treatments, and ongoing implementation of the Fire Management Plan in ASRA/APL. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner's insurance.

Comment OH64-3

Will the park district widen Sliger Mine Rd?

Response OH64-3

Specific designs or other specific improvements to Sliger Mine Road have not yet been developed. At the time that comprehensive project-level planning occurs for new campgrounds and campsites, as required by new Guideline FAC 9.1, the project design would be required to consider access along Sliger Mine Road; evaluate, identify, and develop adequate public access and emergency ingress/egress to the proposed facility; identify and implement fire fuel clearance and defensible space around the facility and access routes; and conduct interagency coordination regarding facility development with the State Fire Marshal, CAL FIRE, and local fire and public safety agencies. CSP and Reclamation would coordinate with other agencies, as applicable, to improve Sliger Mine Road prior to campground development (Guidelines MZ 26.2 and MZ 27.3).

Comment OH64-4

Will the park district add fire station to the area

Response OH64-4

See response to comment I100-3, which addresses concerns about impacts on emergency services, such as fire response.

Comment OH64-5

Will the park district add sheriff deputies

Response OH64-5

The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes a number of guidelines to provide additional staffing and law enforcement in ASRA/APL. Guideline OP 6.1 requires CSP to evaluate and adjust staffing based on ongoing management needs and use patterns. Guidelines OP 2.2 and OP 3.3 support development of partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, including related to law enforcement and emergency response that could help augment CSP law enforcement. Guideline OP 3.2 supports increasing the number of law enforcement officers to prevent and respond to incidents throughout ASRA/APL commensurate with increases in visitor attendance.

Comment OH64-6

River drownings

Response OH64-6

Refer to response to comment I151-2, which addresses a number of concerns raised by commenters regarding drowning risk in ASRA/APL.

Letter OH65 Sarah Saunders

August 15, 2019

Comment OH65-1

As a homeowner right on the Cool side of the American River Canyon, I am horrified at the proposal to expand the camping @ ASRA. I know this is a popular area, and it is already hazardous. Every weekend & holiday, it becomes impossible to traverse the canyon due to traffic.

Add to this the already “very high” fire danger, and the poor access to/from residential pockets, and we are another “Paradise Camp Fire” in waiting.

We can’t handle the risk, traffic and loss of insurance this proposal will cause.

We know it’s beautiful here, and we try to be welcoming – but this is not the time and place for this.

Response OH65-1

The comment’s expression of opposition to the addition of campsites proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with campsites. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner’s insurance. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH66 Kathy Kelleher

August 15, 2019

Comment OH66-1

I strongly oppose the Knickerbocker planned campground and opening of the road!!! The amount of traffic, trash and crime this will create [sic] is unacceptable!! Not to mention FIRE DANGER!!! Auburn State Park is already under staffed!!

Response OH66-1

The comment’s expression of opposition to the addition of campsites and opening of the road in the Knickerbocker area proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP in their decision-making processes regarding the GP/RMP. Refer to Master Response 1, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which outlines the GP/RMP’s intent to manage the expected increase in visitation to protect resources and public safety. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH66-2

No new campgrounds!!!

The fire danger is to [sic] high!!!

Response OH66-2

The comment’s expression of opposition to the addition of campsites proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. As described in response to comment OH66-1, the maximum number of new campsites that could be developed at ASRA/APL has been reduced.

Comment OH66-3

No Camping!!!

Fire danger to high!!!

Response OH66-3

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. As described in response to comment OH66-1, the maximum number of new campsites that could be developed at ASRA/APL has been reduced.

Letter OH67 Michael Kelleher

August 15, 2019

Comment OH67-1

I am against plans related to the Knickerbocker Management Zone. The roads leading into the area of Cool are narrow and curved. On weekends traffic is already an issue. By adding additional day and camping facilities will overthink the current roads.

This is a high fire area. Adding campsites which will always include campfires makes no sense. No mention in your plans is any additional staffing mentioned. Your current staffing of 4 rangers is dangerous to the community and then they will not be able to police the campsites safely at night. Returning Knickerbocker Road to vehicle traffic is [missing what was on back of comment, State Parks should have the original comment letter he mailed in, I have a scanned copy]

Response OH67-1

The plan's expression of opposition to the Knickerbocker Management Zone plans proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with campsites. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1). Also see Guidelines OP 6.1 and OP 6.2, which discuss the evaluation and adjustment of staffing needs based upon use patterns.

Comment OH67-2

Additional infrastructure is needed at the Confluence day use parking is overwhelmed and dangerous.

No new camp sites should be added. Fire danger is too high!

Response OH67-2

For the Confluence, no new parking is proposed under the GP/RMP; however, Guideline MZ 10.1 requires CSP and Reclamation to coordinate with Caltrans, Placer County, and El Dorado County to improve and formalize parking along SR 49 and install pedestrian safety improvements at the roadside parking areas. Additionally, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would also address existing and anticipated future parking congestion and traffic congestion by establishing alternatives for accommodating peak period or special event parking, such as satellite parking areas and shuttle or transit services (see Guidelines FAC 9.1 and FAC 8.3 in Chapter 4, The Plan, of the GP/RMP).

See Master Response 1 for further discussion of the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to manage visitation and the approach to provide appropriate facilities, access improvements, and parking to expand visitor capacity and help reduce congestion in more heavily used areas of ASRA/APL, such as

in the Confluence. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would also address existing and anticipated future parking congestion and traffic congestion by establishing alternatives for accommodating peak period or special event parking, such as satellite parking areas and shuttle or transit services (see Guidelines FAC 9.1 and FAC 8.3 in Chapter 4, The Plan, of the GP/RMP), which could reduce the number of vehicles traveling through these areas. Traffic issues are further discussed in Master Response 4.

See Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire hazards and describes actions that will be taken with implementation of the GP/RMP to reduce wildfire risk. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH67-3

No new campsites

Response OH67-3

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites proposed by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Letter OH68 Gary Murray

August 15, 2019

Comment OH68-1

As a long time resident, I am against all of the expansion. First the Confluence, now people stop in the middle of the road, block traffic, walk in the middle of the road with kids & dogs, put dog poop in a bag and leave it on the trail, loud music, and leave trash. You want over night camping, which will bring homeless move in, more crime, more drunk drivers. I are every face land, a 6 lane freeway, Knickerbocker is near our house, more traffic, people stealing from our house & cars who will pay all the billion dollars to make this a city getto?

Response OH68-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP. The comment does not provide evidence that indicates the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Letter OH69 Susan Murray

August 15, 2019

Comment OH69-1

As a 16 yr old resident of Pilot Hill I am against the ASRA PLAN for the following reasons.

- Increased traffic – the Confluence is already a “zoo.” What with people walking in middle of road cars illegally parked, traffic back up across bridge, cars turning around in middle of the road
- Increase in ft + bicycle traffic on already congested trails along river
- Increase in noise
- Increase in traffic

- Fire hazard
- Loss of peaceful environment which most of us have moved here for

Response OH69-1

Traffic impacts of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP are addressed in Section 4.12, Transportation and Circulation, in the Draft EIR/EIS and are further discussed in Master Response 4. For the Confluence, no new parking is proposed under the GP/RMP; however, Guideline MZ 10.1 requires CSP and Reclamation to coordinate with Caltrans, Placer County, and El Dorado County to improve and formalize parking along SR 49 and install pedestrian safety improvements at the roadside parking areas. Additionally, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would also address existing and anticipated future parking congestion and traffic congestion by establishing alternatives for accommodating peak period or special event parking, such as satellite parking areas and shuttle or transit services (see Guidelines FAC 9.1 and FAC 8.3 in Chapter 4, The Plan, of the GP/RMP).

As described in more detail in Master Response 1, visitation to ASRA/APL has increased over the last several decades and is expected to continue to steadily increase, regardless of whether a GP/RMP is adopted. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP acknowledges this reality and includes strategies to manage that increased visitation, while reducing wildfire risk, protecting natural and cultural resources, and providing high-quality recreation opportunities consistent with the purpose of a State Recreation Area. To this end, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes new and expanded parking areas, day use facilities, campgrounds, and other visitor-serving facilities. Additionally, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes Guideline V 2.1 and Guideline FAC 6.1 that require preparation of a Road and Trail Management Plan to construct new trails as well as make other trail improvements. If every facility allowed by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was constructed at the maximum size, the capacity for visitation would increase by approximately 33 percent over the next 20 or more years. In this scenario, visitor capacity would result in a minor increase over the level of visitation that is expected without adoption of a GP/RMP.

The Draft EIR/EIS assesses noise impacts in ASRA/APL in Section 4.16, Noise, in the Draft EIR/EIS.

See Master Response 3, which addresses wildfire risks and describes efforts of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce those risks.

The comment regarding the loss of a peaceful environment for residents does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS as inadequate that are not already addressed within this response, above. Therefore, further response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Letter OH70 April Roberts

August 15, 2019

Comment OH70-1

Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns regarding the ASRA/APL project. I would like to know what accommodations have been made to protect the local wildlife. I don't see any attention given to this already stressed population in your plans. I only see plans to expand tourism.

We are a small rural community and do not want to become a tourist concession with hundreds of campsites, parking slots, picnic sites, more trails, more roads, more rafting, another bridge, commercial enterprises, and less true wilderness.

The wildlife in our area is already surrounded on all sides by human habitation, roads, Hwy 80. We are suppose to be sharing this planet with all species. If you do what you are proposing, you are damaging the wilderness you profess to be preserving.

Please reconsider your plans. If you have so much money for such a large project consider putting into the education of preserving our disappearing wilderness and wildlife. It's not wilderness if everyone is tromping through it.

Response OH70-1

The potential effects of implementing the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP on wildlife and other environmental resources are addressed in Sections 4.2 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The goals and guidelines in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, in combination with applicable federal and state laws, Reclamation directives and standards, and CSP policies provide the overall framework for the management and protection of natural resources in ASRA/APL, such as wildlife. Protection of biological resources in ASRA/APL would be supported through implementation of Goals RES 1 through RES 4 and their associated guidelines in the GP/RMP.

See Master Response 1, which describes the purpose of the GP/RMP to help manage visitation, protect natural and cultural resources, and address congestion in heavily used areas of ASRA/APL by providing appropriate facilities, access improvements, and parking to expand visitor capacity throughout ASRA/APL.

The comment requests a specific change to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP related to education about preservation of wilderness and wildlife in ASRA/APL and expresses opposition to facilities proposed by the GP/RMP, which has not been made at this time. This request is not inconsistent with the interpretation and education goals and guidelines of the GP/RMP.

Letter OH71 Steve Lamb

August 15, 2019

Comment OH71-1

I am in favor of Mammoth Bar improvements for OHV (not camping),

Response OH71-1

The comment's expression of support for OHV improvements at Mammoth Bar was considered by Reclamation and CSP. This comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP goals and guidelines for the Mammoth Bar Management Zone. As described in Master Response 1, the number of campsites that could be developed in the Mammoth Bar Management Zone have been reduced.

Comment OH71-2

I am against all camp site proposals. I don't feel thier [sic] is enough staff (nor has it been addressed). Hwy 49 from Cool to Auburn can not handle the additional traffic. Law enforcement for El Dorado County is to [sic] faraway (slow response) they have to come from Placerville.

Sliger Mine Road cannot handle any additional traffic to Cherokee Bar.

Response OH71-2

The comment's expression of opposition to the addition of campsites proposed by the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH71-3

Restrooms and shaded picnic [sic] tables are always a welcome improvement.

Response OH71-3

The comment's expression of support for the addition of restrooms and picnic tables proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP.

Letter OH72 Georgia Anderson

August 15, 2019

Comment OH72-1

There doesn't seem to be anything approaching an actual "plan." At the meeting none of information provided was clear and was very often contradictory in nature. I would also like to have an understanding regarding how these "plans" will be paid for; judging by the condition of many of the trails it is clear that there isn't money to fund the upkeep of what is already in place much less new amenities. Additionally it sounds very much like the changes will be at the expense of the people already utilizing the facilities. Removing the already existing trails in order to facilitate camping spots makes no sense to me at all. I live here in Cool, CA and make constant use of the trails along with people all along the Divide. I think that the State Parks should be accessible to all Californians, but not at the expense of the Californians that already live in the area.

Response OH72-1

Refer to Guidelines OP 6.3, OP 7.1, OP 7.2, and OP 7.4, which discuss revenue-enhancing strategies. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Comment OH72-2

I believe that placing campsites in the Knickerbocker area would be a grave mistake. Due to the huge fire danger up here we already don't mow our lawns after 10:00 a.m. in the summer for fear of starting a conflagration [sic]. Providing an area where people are cooking over open flames in the area is an open invitation for disaster.

Response OH72-2

Refer to Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which addresses the risk of wildfire associated with campsites. In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment OH72-3

Secondly water usage is highly regulated due to a lack of it. Where will the water come from for the campers? More importantly where will the water come from when the inevitable wild fire does occur?

Response OH72-3

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply and water supply infrastructure for fire suppression.

Comment OH72-4

As for the Confluence many of the same concerns apply as stated above. Additionally encouraging camping next to the river will almost certainly result in pollution of the river due to trash and biohazardous material.

Response OH72-4

Refer to Master Response I, Purpose of the General Plan/Resource Management Plan, which outlines the Plan's intent to provide quality recreation and protect resources and public safety. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Letter OH73 Janell Cornforth

August 15, 2019

Comment OH73-1

Why have you not mentioned equestrians? ASRA is one of the most used parks by equestrians. Good god! The Tevis (Western States Ride) goes right through it!!! A world renowned endurance ride!

The dirt parking behind the fire station is used exclusively by equestrians. Most weekends it is full of trailers. Put the new parking + picnic tables etc. somewhere else. Don't run the horseback riders out. In fact why not include a horse camp!

Keep cyclists off single track trails, if there are severe drop offs.

Horses could get banned when these improvements happen!

Only improve if horseback riders are included and not pushed out nor lose what they have. There is room for everyone if all user groups are considered. Add equestrians to this plan!

Make trails horse friendly with trailer parking + access!

Make more horse accessible with trailer parking + horse camping.

Do not forget the equestrian!! Mention them in this plan!

Improved Driver's Flat & Sliger would be great.

Horse trailer parking! Equestrian trailhead

Bikes, boats, paddle craft, OHV are all mentioned. Do something for the equestrians!

Response OH73-1

Implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP would include development and implementation of a Road and Trail Management Plan that would include opportunities for identifying new trail facilities, extensions, connections; specific enhancements to existing facilities, including minor facility expansion, maintenance projects and programming and signage; and establishing a consistent wayfinding and sign program among other components to consider needs of all trail users (Guideline V 2.1). Development

of the Road and Trail Management Plan would be informed by a public engagement process. Guideline V 1.4 supports providing a range of opportunities for all trail users, including equestrians. Additionally, implementation of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP includes compliance with Guideline V 2.3, which requires following established CSP policies and processes to designate allowable trail uses, to make any changes from established use designations with the goal of accommodating access for all user groups while limiting potential safety conflicts between user groups and providing a variety of trail experiences. Goal MZ 2 and associated guidelines support providing opportunities for equestrians and all other trail users in the Knickerbocker Management Zone. Additionally, Guideline MZ 1.1 related to providing a campground in the Knickerbocker Management Zone has been revised to require consideration of the needs of trail users, such as equestrians, in developing and designing camping facilities (see Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS).

The comment expresses support for improvements to Driver's Flat Road and Sliger Mine Road, which are addressed in Guidelines MZ 26.2, MZ 27.2, MZ 27.3, and MZ 28.1 in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP.

Letter OH74 Lynette

August 15, 2019

Comment OH74-1

These are the items that you did not and can not mitigate [sic] in this ARS General Plan Draft EIR EIS

1. Fire hazard created in all areas
2. Who will fight the fires "Cal Fire" the cannot handle the fire load they have

Response OH74-1

Please see Master Response 3, Wildfire Risk, which discusses the risk of wildfire associated with the GP/RMP. It elaborates on the analysis prepared in the Draft EIR/EIS and describes proposed GP/RMP strategies that would reduce wildfire risk.

Comment OH74-2

3. Where is water coming from

Response OH74-2

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply.

Comment OH74-3

4. How are you going to pay for the projects

Response OH74-3

Refer to Guidelines OP 6.3, OP 7.1, OP 7.2, and OP 7.4, which discuss revenue-enhancing strategies. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS are raised in this comment.

Comment OH74-4

5. Severe traffic impact

Response OH74-4

See Master Response 4, Traffic, Parking, and Access, which address the traffic analysis for the GP/RMP.

Comment OH74-5

6. Who is going to keep homeless out and drug fellows

Response OH74-5

See response to comment I50-1, which addresses concerns related to homeless people and increased staff presence in ASRA/APL.

Comment OH74-6

7. 2 bridges to no where obstructs historic site Poney [sic] Express route Tevis trail

Response OH74-6

Potential impacts on historic resources are assessed in Impact 4.4-1 beginning on page 4.4-2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. CSP and Reclamation procedures and Preliminary GP/Draft RMP guidelines would require identification, documentation, management, protection, and avoidance, or otherwise treat cultural resources appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. These requirements are included in CSP's Department Operations Manual, Departmental Notice 2004-02, Section 106 for Reclamation lands and PRC 5024.5 for state parks lands, and CSP Standard Project Requirements and Guidelines RES 5.1, RES 5.2, RES 6.1, RES 6.3, RES 6.4, RES 6.5, I&E 4.4, I&E 4.5, and I&E 5.3. With implementation of these required guidelines, laws, and regulations with future projects that could be built under the GP/RMP, these projects would avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of historical resources. Additionally, as identified in new Guideline FAC 9.1, comprehensive project-level planning would include public engagement and appropriate level environmental review that would influence design refinements of new or expanded facilities to avoid such impacts on historic resources.

Comment OH74-7

8. How much money was spent on Dam project how much left?

Response OH74-7

This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP or the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH74-8

9. Why has no cooperated with new super Lorli Parlin won't return cells etc

Response OH74-8

This comment was considered by Reclamation and CSP. This comment does not provide evidence that the EIR/EIS is inadequate.

Comment OH74-9

10. Why all meetings for public held in Placer County except August 15, 2019

Response OH74-9

See Master Response 2, which describes the extensive public engagement process conducted for the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP and EIR/EIS planning processes. This master response also explains the rationale for how locations of the public workshops were chosen.

Comment OH74-10

11. Why won't you issue extension on moving forward

Response OH74-10

The Draft EIR/EIS was released on July 19, 2019 for a 47-day comment period scheduled to end on September 3. On August 27, 2019, a notice of public comment period extension was released extending the comment period to September 17, 2019 for a 61-day comment period. Notification of the review period extension was posted on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's website, the general plan website (www.parks.ca.gov/PlanASRA/), and was included in a CSP-issued press release in July 2019. The document was available online at the general plan website and hard copies were available at a number of libraries that were listed on the general plan website.

Comment OH74-11

12. Why an open house a real joke and insult not one person at any table had read the EIS/EIR Draft. This was lip service

Response OH74-11

This comment expresses an opinion and does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH74-12

13. No one knew who was on the deciding committee [sic]

Response OH74-12

As discussed under Section 1.4, Intended Uses of this EIR/EIS, in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Draft EIR/EIS, following completion of the environmental review process, CSP will consider certification of the EIR as adequately complying with CEQA and the California State Park and Recreation Commission will consider approval of the GP. After approval of the GP, CSP will file a Notice of Determination with the State Clearinghouse. Reclamation's Director of the California-Great Basin Region will review and consider the EIS and the RMP and document its decisions on the environmental review and RMP in a Record of Decision that will be filed in the Federal Register.

This comment does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Letter OH75 Frank

August 15, 2019

Comment OH75-1

These are the items that you did not and can not mitigate [sic] in this ARS General Plan Draft EIR EIS

1. Fire hazard created in all areas
2. Who will fight the fires "Cal Fire" the cannot handle the fire load they have

Response OH75-1

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-1.

Comment OH75-2

3. Where is water coming from

Response OH75-2

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-2.

Comment OH75-3

4. How are you going to pay for projects

Response OH75-3

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-3.

Comment OH75-4

5. Severe impact to traffic on Hwy 49

Response OH75-4

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-4.

Comment OH75-5

6. Who is going to handle the homeless and drug addicts

Response OH75-5

This comment duplicates comments Letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-5.

Comment OH75-6

7. 2 bridges to no where. One will cross where the historic site of the Tevis Pony Express route

Response OH75-6

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-6.

Comment OH75-7

8. How much money was spent on dam and how much is left

Response OH75-7

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-7.

Comment OH75-8

9. Why has there been no cooperation with the new El Dorado Superv Lori Parlin won't return calls won't delay moving forward etc

Response OH75-8

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-8.

Comment OH75-9

10. Why have all the meetings up to Aug 15, 2019 been held in Placer city

Response OH75-9

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-9.

Comment OH75-10

11. Why won't you issue delay on Draft EIR/EIS

Response OH75-10

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-10.

Comment OH75-11

12. Why open house a real joke not one person there at read in total the EIR/EIS draft. No one there had any authority to do anything

Response OH75-11

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-11.

Comment OH75-12

13. Who is on the committee that decides our fate and can stop this stupid proposal

Response OH75-12

This comment duplicates comment letter OH74. See response to comment OH74-12.

Letter OH76 Ann Gualtieri

August 15, 2019

Comment OH76-1

General Plan (El Dorado Co) does not address such a plan on state park land in El Dorado – this includes need for roads to accommodate all the cars; fire protection/danger; human sewage & impact on wildlife – county does not have a plan!

Response OH76-1

The purpose and requirements for contents of a general plan for the purposes of CSP and a resource management plan for the purposes of Reclamation are summarized in Section 1.5, Purpose of the General Plan and Resource Management Plan, in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the GP/RMP. The Preliminary GP/Draft RMP is a state and federal document that applies to the federal and state lands and management of ASRA/APL; thus, the local jurisdictions' general plan are not applicable in these areas.

See Master Response 3, which addresses concerns related to wildfire risk and describes actions that would be implemented with the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to reduce wildfire risk. See Master Response 4, which addresses concerns about traffic and parking in ASRA/APL. See response to comment OH4-3 that addresses concerns related to handling human sewage. See response to comment OH42-3, which explains how the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP protects biological resources.

Comment OH76-2

Resource management/environmental impact – well the resources have been managed very well and the natural environment has been minimally impacted – by the current usage by humans – you want to control these natural resources + inevitable the land will pay a heavy price w/higher human use!!

Response OH76-2

See Master Response 1, which describes the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to help manage visitation, protect natural and cultural resources, and address congestion in heavily used areas of ASRA/APL by providing appropriate facilities, access improvements, and parking to expand visitor capacity throughout ASRA/APL.

Comment OH76-3

You, the state bureaucracies have divided this land that is currently well managed and softly used – to allow more access from the public – though right now the public is enjoying access to all of my areas solicited- especially the Confluence!! – don't mess

With something / management by state + human will use it in these checked areas.

But, of course the state of California sees an opportunity to make money at the expense of the natural environment – Yosemite Valley was overused and burn down because the feds allowed it – but then Yosemite Valley's degradation was reversed because govt insisted on a light/use of the valley. – like in this natural part of Calif. All of California needs to be protected from over use!!

Response OH76-3

See Master Response 1, which describes the purpose of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP to help manage visitation, protect natural and cultural resources, and address congestion in heavily used areas of ASRA/APL by providing appropriate facilities, access improvements, and parking to expand visitor capacity throughout ASRA/APL. This comment does not raise specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Letter OH77 Steve Todd

August 15, 2019

Comment OH77-1

Upgrade of road system in + out of area

Response OH77-1

The GP/RMP proposes some roadway improvements to different access points to ASRA/APL, including Knickerbocker Road, Sliger Mine Road, Driver's Flat, and McKeon-Ponderosa Road (Guidelines MZ 3.1, MZ 26.2, MZ 27.1, MZ 27.2, MZ 27.3, and MZ 28.1). The other roadways in the area are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, Placer County, and El Dorado County. Master Response 4 addresses concerns related to traffic on these roadways. The comment does not provide reasons specifying why the Draft EIR/EIS is inadequate. Therefore, a response regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS cannot be provided.

Comment OH77-2

EMS – system update/upgrading

Response OH77-2

See response to comment I100-3, which addresses concerns related to impacts on emergency services.

Comment OH77-3

Water system – additional sources of water supply

Response OH77-3

See response to comment O12-19, which addresses concerns related to water supply.

3.7 Open House Form Letters

Letter OH FL1

August 15, 2019

Comment OH FL1-1

I do NOT support opening the paved road to vehicles at Knickerbocker Flat in the Auburn State Recreation Area.

Response OH FL1-1

The comment's expression of opposition to opening the paved road to vehicles at Knickerbocker Flat proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP, but no change has been made to the GP/RMP.

Letter OH FL2

August 15, 2019

Comment OH FL2-1

I do NOT support the development of new campgrounds in the Auburn State Recreation Area.

Response OH FL2-1

The comment's expression of opposition to the development of campgrounds proposed by the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. See Master Response I, which explains that the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL have been reduced.

3.8 Form Letters

Letter FL1 Divide Residents

September 12, 2019

Comment FL1-1

I live in the ____ community, the area surrounding the American River Canyon public lands. I offer the following public comments regarding the draft Auburn State Recreation Area (ASRA) Management Plan. I reject all Draft Plan Alternatives for the following reasons:

“SEVERE FIRE HAZARD RISK ZONE”* 245+ proposed camp sites and day-use parking in a present fire-prone river canyon would significantly increase the already “severe fire hazard risk” to the surrounding ridge-top communities as well as to visitors. The Plan offers NO provision for fire protection other than “to develop a fire plan.” Prevention is good, but given our fixed geography and our limited fire-fighting, emergency, and maintenance resources, *what* “fire plan” could possible protect us? ***per CalFire**

Response FL1-1

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-2.

Comment FL1-2

INSURANCE RATE INCREASE. Insurance policies on the Divide are being cancelled due to “severe fire hazard risk” and proximity of recreational use. They are becoming more difficult to obtain at reasonable rates, if at all, sometimes even preventing home sales.

Response FL1-2

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-11. Master Response 3 also addresses concerns related to homeowner’s insurance.

Comment FL1-3

INSUFFICIENT FIRE EVACUATION ROUTES. Divide residents have fewer evacuation routes than the town of Paradise, CA. Currently, if a fire ignites in the canyon or anywhere on the Divide, there is NO present, let alone, proposed infrastructure plan in place for residents or visitors to evacuate safely. Many people would likely be stuck on limited roadways or be unable to evacuate at all. Increased vehicle numbers would only exacerbate this danger.

Response FL1-3

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter . See response to comment O12-12.

Comment FL1-4

OVERCROWDED/HAZARD ROADS. The ASRA Proposed Action calls for 45% more visitors which would mean a total of 1.45 million visitors annually. The Confluence is already over-crowded with unsafe parking for vehicles, pedestrians and Divide residents combined. The problem will not be solved by expanding access. It will just spread the congestion to currently low use areas.

Response FL1-4

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-13.

Comment FL1-5

WATER CRISIS. This plan would cause us to run out of water. It would take Georgetown Divide Public Water District water, the community’s only water source for campgrounds. Our water supplies would be exhausted in 15 years. Severe economic hardship for residential, commercial and property values would result.

Response FL1-5

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-19, which addresses water supply concerns and effects of water demand in ASRA/APL on other nearby water users.

Comment FL1-6

THREATS TO PUBLIC SAFETY. This ASRA Plan would encourage visitation by those unfamiliar with the hazards of a river canyon. In recent years emergency personnel have witnessed a sharp increase in drownings and rescues.

Response FL1-6

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-20.

Comment FL1-7

INCREASED TRAIL CONFLICTS/HAZARDS. Campgrounds, with associated increased vehicle traffic, would be superimposed over existing trails and paths. Hiker, runner, mountain biker, and equestrian trail user conflicts are ALREADY a problem. Increasing visitor numbers would only make it worse. There is NO user safety component associated with the ASRA Plan and NO mitigation proposed prior to opening the trails and paths to public traffic, especially at the Cool Fire Station Trailhead.

Response FL1-7

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-21.

Comment FL1-8

PARKS CAN'T EVEN MANAGE THE 30,000 ACRES NOW. To date, NO fire breaks have been created to protect the adjacent elementary school, church, homes or businesses in Cool. Inadequate vegetation and trail maintenance make trails and campgrounds prone to wildfire. Current minimal staff is insufficient for the 30,000 acres. There is NO designated funding for more Rangers to make the park safer or better maintained before more people are encouraged to visit.

Response FL1-8

The comment summarizes detailed comments provided elsewhere in the Divide Action Coalition comment letter. See response to comment O12-20.

Comment FL1-9

We agree that a management plan needs to be completed. None of the proposed alternatives is adequate in addressing residents' concerns. All planning has been devoid of input from Divide residents; principally Cool, Greenwood, Georgetown, Garden Valley, and Foresthill. All ridgetop communities are affected by the Proposed Action. State Parks and BOR need to fully engage with these communities and develop a new management plan.

To address the statewide need to expand recreation and camping opportunities, State Parks should consider developing a new state park in a safer, less impacted area. The Department has not opened a new park in over a decade. Many land trusts and non-profits have thousands of acres available and stand ready to turn them over to Parks management. Open a new state park elsewhere.

Response FL1-9

Master Response 2 describes that public comments were received throughout those public comment periods, from the online surveys, and at public workshops, which included responses from individuals residing in the small communities adjacent to ASRA/APL in El Dorado County. Throughout the planning process, public comments helped inform development of key issues that are addressed in the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP, helped identify and refine alternatives for the GP/RMP, identify the types and amounts of new or expanded facilities, and the management actions needed for ASRA/APL.

The comment's suggestion for opening a new state park was considered by Reclamation and CSP but no change has been made to the GP/RMP.

Letter FL2 Protect American River Canyons

September 15, 2019

Comment FL2-1

I endorse the proposed Preliminary Auburn SRA General Plan and Draft Auburn Project lands Resource Management Plan, which places equal emphasis on increased resource protection and enhanced recreational facilities and access. While I agree with most of the proposed plan's goals and guidelines, there are some recommendations I disagree with, as noted below.

- Support increased funding of Auburn SRA (Goals OP 6 and 7); increase rather than decrease Reclamation's cost share contribution.

Response FL2-1

The comment's expression of support for Goals OP 6 and OP 7 of the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP. See response to comment O10-20, which addresses concerns related to the removal of funding from Reclamation.

Comment FL2-2

- Support construction of a trail bridge across the lower North Fork American River near China Bar (Guideline MZ 4.1).

Response FL2-2

The comment's expression of support for Guideline MZ 4.1 is consistent with the GP/RMP, which includes guidelines that support development of a trail bridge across the lower North Fork of the American River and providing a trail system that connects Auburn and Cool (Guidelines MZ 4.1 and MZ 4.2).

Comment FL2-3

- Support increased vehicle access to China Bar and Oregon Bar through the China Bar entrance station (Guideline MZ 5.1 and MZ 5.2).

Response FL2-3

Comment noted. The comment's expression of support is not inconsistent with GP/RMP Guidelines MZ 5.1 and MZ 5.2.

Comment FL2-4

- Support public vehicle access from Cool to the east side of the river near China Bar along Knickerbocker and Salt Creek/Rocky Island Bar Roads (Guideline MZ 6.1).

Response FL2-4

Comment noted. The comment's expression of support is not inconsistent with GP/RMP Guideline MZ 6.1.

Comment FL2-5

- Oppose proposal for campground in Knickerbocker Management Zone (Guideline MZ 1.1).

Response FL2-5

In response to comments like this one related to new campsites, the Preliminary GP/Draft RMP has been revised to reduce the maximum number of campsites that could be developed in ASRA/APL (see Master Response 1).

Comment FL2-6

- Support creation of a shuttle operation from Auburn to the Confluence (Guideline MZI0.2).

Response FL2-6

Comment noted. The comment is consistent with GP/RMP Guideline MZ 10.2.

Comment FL2-7

- Oppose expansion of OHV use at Mammoth Bar to six days a week; instead maintain existing schedule allowing OHV use three to four days a week (Guideline MZ 22.2).

Response FL2-7

The comment's expression of opposition to Guideline MZ 22.2 of the GP/RMP was considered by Reclamation and CSP but no change to the GP/RMP has been made.

Comment FL2-8

- Support the natural and cultural resource protection goals and guidelines identified in the proposed plan (section 4.3.1).

Response FL2-8

Comment noted. The comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP.

Comment FL2-9

- Support adding a goal of staffing a full-time interpretive specialist.

Response FL2-9

The comment's expression of support for staffing a full-time interpretive specialist was considered by Reclamation and CSP but no specific change has been made to the GP/RMP. Specific staffing decisions are not within the scope of the GP/RMP.

Comment FL2-10

- Support expanding access to interpretive information through smart technologies (Guidelines I&E 6.3 and 6.4).

Response FL2-10

Comment noted. The comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP.

Comment FL2-11

- Support adding a goal of reducing hazards to the public by removing metal debris from the river, especially the collapsed bridge material just downstream of the Confluence.

Response FL2-11

Refer to response to comment O10-19, which discusses revised guidelines in the GP/RMP that clarify efforts to remove debris from the river and educate the public about safety efforts in ASRA/APL, such as debris in the river.

Comment FL2-12

- Support the proposed wildfire risk reduction goals and guidelines (Goals RES 8 and 9).

Response FL2-12

Comment noted. The comment is not inconsistent with the GP/RMP.